

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

APRIL 8, 2024

* * * * *

1 MS. COLLETT: All right. Everybody being 3:15
2 I'm calling this meeting to
3 order. If you are in person
4 please use the sign-in sheets in
5 the back of the room. If you're
6 online, remember, we're catching
7 your attendance by the Zoom
8 recording. I'm going to ask
9 everybody again make sure that
10 you are logged into Poll
11 Everywhere. We have a number of
12 things that we need to get
13 through today. I'm going to kind
14 of go through our initial
15 announcement things fairly
16 quickly, as you all know the
17 spiel. Voting. As always,
18 remember, you had that email on
19 Thursday and then Kristen sent
20 you another email this afternoon
21 just to remind you how to log in.
22 If you have forgotten, please go
23 back to that email and read those
24 instructions. Remember that
25 there's three ways to vote, you

1 can use the website, you can use
2 the App or you can use the text
3 message function. The text
4 message function is the
5 USenate789 you text that to --
6 you text 22333 to that number or
7 that name there and then we feel
8 like the best method is probably
9 using the website because it
10 doesn't lag behind as the others,
11 but it seems like it's been
12 working well for everybody this
13 academic year. All right. So,
14 we need you to log in. We'll do
15 a test run really quickly just to
16 see and make sure. Here I'm
17 going to start muting people as
18 we move along, I'm gonna try at
19 least. Okay. So, our Poll
20 Everywhere is open and activated.
21 I see people still logging in. A
22 couple more folks here. All
23 right. It looks like you all are
24 getting going now. I see people
25 logging in. We have about 75

1 online and we have more or not
2 more in person, but we've got a
3 full house in person. So, it
4 seems like it's working. All
5 right. We're gonna kind of move
6 it forward. Remember just the
7 general practicalities and Open
8 Meetings Laws, this is recorded
9 for note taking purposes and this
10 meeting in the Senate is always
11 transcribed verbatim. We always
12 use Robert's Rules of Order.
13 Remember, this is a hybrid
14 meeting, so we have in person and
15 Zoom. I can't stress this
16 enough, please say your name when
17 you identify yourself once you're
18 called upon and your affiliation
19 and the college that you're
20 affiliated with. Remember, it's
21 hard for them to transcribe
22 meeting notes if they don't know
23 who has said what and plus we
24 like to know who you are and make
25 sure we pronounce your names

1 right, anyway. Remember that
2 it's up to the Chair's discretion
3 on who to call, but it's always
4 priority in this order, Senate
5 Members have first priority,
6 Senators who have not spoken yet
7 about an issue will then come
8 next if they want to speak,
9 again, and those who can offer
10 information to assist the Senate
11 in discussions such as proposers
12 or guests and then non-members if
13 time permitted. Depending on
14 what we are discussing, it's
15 always gonna be Senate Council,
16 or I'm sorry, Senate Members
17 first, because those are the
18 voting members. Civility. I
19 think we're all friends here.
20 Let's keep it clean. Let's be
21 friendly with each other.
22 Debates about expressing an
23 opinion and it's healthy.
24 Biggest thing is keeping your
25 constituents informed,

1 communicating with them on a
2 regular basis. Those who have
3 Distribution Lists I think you
4 all are using them to the full
5 capacity, so I thank you. Those
6 who are not, I hope you're using
7 some way of communicating on a
8 regular, even monthly basis, with
9 your constituents who elected you
10 to this position. I've already
11 said something about, you know,
12 the attendance being captured.
13 Please don't use chat, it
14 distracts from the official
15 proceedings, plus we want to know
16 what you have to say. If we have
17 a side conversation going on it's
18 -- it's really hard. And I can
19 tell right now, with everybody
20 doing the Eclipse people are
21 driving and, you know, trying to
22 listen to this over the phone, so
23 we wanna keep people safe for
24 sure. If you're attending by
25 Zoom just please remain engaged

1 and remember to keep your camera
2 on as much as possible, because
3 the State Law requires that all
4 members shall remain visible on
5 camera while business is being
6 discussed and I know sometimes
7 that can be hard with Wi-Fi and
8 some things like that, so just do
9 your best, please. Reminder, if
10 you're in person or if you're on
11 Zoom a good headset and
12 microphone, so we can hear you.
13 And if you're in person, remember
14 the red light means the mic is
15 off and no light means the mic is
16 on. If the mic is off -- or if
17 the mic is on meaning the lights
18 off the camera -- the room camera
19 will zoom into you so that folks
20 who are on Zoom can see who is
21 talking, but remember, you're
22 gonna introduce yourselves.
23 Again, we've already kind of
24 discussed this, but you know
25 reasons why you're gonna ask

1 permission to speak is point of
2 order information, so something's
3 not clear about what's being
4 discussed, making a motion and
5 remember, you must seek
6 permission of the floor from the
7 Chair before speaking. So, after
8 you raise your hand, I'll call on
9 you. The folks up here will help
10 me if there's like multiple
11 people calling or having their
12 hands up and I will go in the
13 order as best as possible, based
14 on Zoom and in person. I think
15 I've done a pretty decent job of
16 that this year. And so, you have
17 all these other reasons, make or
18 second a motion, questions of
19 fact and debates or call the
20 question. So, Senate Agenda,
21 what's on our announcements? I
22 think you've already received
23 several emails, one coming out
24 about the Outstanding Senate
25 Senate Service Award. Please

1 fill out those links for people
2 that you feel are worthy of
3 receiving that award. We've had
4 some people that really have been
5 outstanding and we want to
6 acknowledge them publicly, give
7 them an award, also a little bit
8 of cash for them to say how much
9 we care, not a lot. It's not
10 cost of living type of thing, but
11 it's enough just to say, "Thank
12 you," and, you know, acknowledge
13 them. So, please think about
14 that and nominate your
15 colleagues. There's two Senate
16 Awards and then there's one
17 that's a Senate Service Award
18 meaning it does not have to be a
19 Senator, so think about our
20 chairs of our councils and other
21 committee work and things that
22 have -- that we've really, you
23 know, someone who has really
24 stepped up to the plate
25 administrator, whoever, they can

1 be nominated for that one. So,
2 just make that clear. And then
3 we have the Presidential Advisory
4 Committees, you all have received
5 emails about this, this is like
6 your Area Committees, and so, we
7 want to make sure that you are
8 nominating people. A very easy
9 qualtrics form, you start typing
10 in the name and it's going to
11 show up immediately and we'll get
12 those -- I think this week is the
13 ending of those, but I'll try to
14 remind folks in a newsletter, but
15 you should have it. You've had
16 those emails already go out, so
17 if you haven't nominated anyone
18 go back and kind of look and see
19 if there's some people within
20 your area that you would like to
21 nominate, it's definitely
22 important. The next thing we
23 have is Consent Agenda. Today's
24 meeting for Consent Agenda only
25 consists of the minutes from the

1 prior meeting and remember, these
2 are items that are considered
3 adopted unless a member ask for
4 it to be removed. I haven't had
5 any emails or contacted by anyone
6 to ask to remove anything off the
7 Consent Agenda, as of now. So,
8 unless there any requests to
9 remove an item for discussion
10 later, I will hold for a second.
11 These are the March 18, 2024
12 minutes. Hearing no objections
13 then the Consent Agenda for April
14 8th is adopted. Officer reports.
15 First up is myself. Just some
16 information for you all. Senate
17 Council will be meeting with the
18 President this week on Wednesday
19 to discuss, I believe, the draft
20 principles, but I don't really
21 have an agenda for that meeting,
22 so I'm not sure exactly. I say,
23 we will be discussing that and
24 whatever outcomes comes out of
25 the resolution today. Reminder

1 that the Board of Trustee Meeting
2 will occur on April 25th and the
3 26th of this month. I will be
4 sending out a newsletter to
5 everyone, again, like I always do
6 more or less my farewell
7 newsletter, but the newsletter to
8 also urge you to petition to
9 speak in front of the Board as
10 well and that'll come with some
11 information. Next, we have
12 Sandra Bastin Vice Chair. I
13 don't think Sandra was able to
14 attend, I know she had something
15 right at 3:00, so I don't believe
16 that she had any announcements,
17 besides what I just already
18 announced on the Outstanding
19 Senator. Parliamentarian. Greg
20 has nothing right now and Faculty
21 Trustees. No report? So, we do
22 not have a report. Moving right
23 along. First thing on our agenda
24 is the degree recipient, so the
25 degree list. You all have

1 received this by email already.
2 The first thing that we have up
3 is the May 2024 In Memoriam
4 Degree List. Reminder that per
5 State Law and Senate Rules only
6 Senators elected by college
7 faculty members may vote on the
8 degree list, so this is Faculty
9 Senators. So, this motion comes
10 -- actually, this motion didn't
11 come from committee. I need a
12 motion on the floor to accept and
13 approve this In Memoriam Degree
14 List. Cassie. And now, I just
15 need a second. State your name.
16 Jenn Hunt, okay. Any
17 discussions, questions of fact
18 and/or debate? Seeing none, it
19 is time to vote on this In
20 Memoriam Degree List elected
21 Faculty Senators approve the May
22 2024 In Memoriam Degree list for
23 submission through the President
24 to the Board of Trustees. Voting
25 is now open. We're going to do

1 this three more times. Okay.
2 All right. We have three
3 abstentions. We have 64 approved
4 and zero opposed. So, that
5 passes onto the President to the
6 Board of Trustees. Next, we have
7 the May 2024 Degree List. Same
8 thing here, it's per State law,
9 only Senators that are elected by
10 the college faculty and members
11 may vote on the degree list. I
12 need a motion and a second to
13 approve the degree list for May
14 2024. Jennifer Kramer and Akiko.
15 Okay. The motion is now on the
16 floor and open up for members for
17 questions of fact and or debate.
18 Seeing none, it is time to vote.
19 And remember this is elected
20 Faculty Senators are approving
21 UK's May 2024 Degree List for
22 submission through the President
23 to the Board of Trustees. A
24 couple more folks. All right.
25 And I'm moving it forward. We've

1 got stuff to do here. So, we
2 have 64 approve, one opposed and
3 one or two abstentions. That
4 carries forward for submission
5 through the President to the
6 Board of Trustees. Next thing
7 that we have is the August 2024
8 Degree List. Same thing here is
9 that faculty -- only faculty --
10 only the senators elected by
11 college faculty members may vote
12 on the degree list. I need a
13 motion to approve this degree
14 list for -- state your name and
15 second Cassie Gibbs. Okay. Any
16 further questions of discussion
17 or debate? Seeing none, this is
18 a recommended motion elected
19 Faculty Senators approve the
20 August 2024 Degree List for
21 submission through the President
22 to the Board of Trustees. We've
23 got people dropping off. Anybody
24 else? Going once, going twice.
25 All righty. We have 65 approved,

1 zero opposed and two abstentions,
2 so that passes and goes forward
3 for submission through the
4 President to the Board of
5 Trustees. One more left here.
6 We have the May 2024 Degree List
7 for Fort Sam Houston Army Base
8 for the MSW. This is again only
9 Senators elected by college
10 faculty members may vote on the
11 degree list. I need a motion and
12 a second. Akiko and then second?
13 All right. The motion is now on
14 the floor and the floor is open
15 up to members for questions of
16 fact and/or debate. Seeing none,
17 it is time to vote. The
18 recommended motion is elected
19 Faculty Senators approve UK's May
20 2024 Degree List for Fort Sam
21 Houston Army MSW Program for
22 submission through the President
23 to the Board of Trustee. A
24 couple more. Moving on. All
25 right. We have 62 approve, zero

1 oppose and three abstentions.
2 So, that passes and moves
3 forward. Next, we have committee
4 recommendations. First up is
5 Senate Admissions Academic
6 Standards Committee, Leslie
7 Vincent is Chair. So, we have
8 proposed changes to the BS in
9 Biomedical Engineering.
10 Associate Professor Kim Anderson
11 is the proposer. And I believe
12 -- Leslie, is there someone else
13 supposed to be present today or
14 just Kim?
15 MS. VINCENT: I think just Kim.
16 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Nope, not just Kim. It
17 says Associate Professor
18 Sunderam. Dr. Sunderam is here.
19 All righty. So, Leslie?
20 MS. VINCENT: Sure. This is a recommendation
21 to approve the proposed changes
22 to the BS in Biomedical
23 Engineering. The proposal adds
24 in a graduation requirement that
25 students must complete all

1 biomedical engineering prefix
2 courses and the engineering and
3 science electives with a
4 cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher.
5 Additionally, students are
6 required to earn a C or better in
7 these same courses with a maximum
8 of one D permitted to graduate.
9 The proposal also seeks to change
10 the requirements of the degree by
11 moving nine credit hours of
12 guided electives to major
13 requirements for the program.
14 Students will now take 18 credit
15 hours of guided electives as
16 opposed to 27 currently and that
17 will include Four BME electives.
18 Four BME electives, one
19 engineering elective at a 300
20 level or higher and one
21 engineering or science elective
22 from a list provided. The total
23 credit hours of the program does
24 not change. Letters of support
25 are provided by the impacted

1 departments and the faculty vote
2 is reported. The SAASC Committee
3 voted unanimously to approve the
4 proposed changes.

5 MS. COLLETT: Great. So, there's a
6 recommendation from the committee
7 for the Senate to approve the
8 proposed changes to the BS
9 Biomedical Engineering Program.
10 Because the motion comes from
11 committee no second is required.
12 The motion is now on the floor
13 and the floor is open up to
14 members for questions of fact
15 and/or debate. Seeing no hands
16 raised. Oh, Kaveh.

17 MR. TAGAVI: I admit --

18 MS. COLLETT: Who are you?

19 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, College of
20 Engineering.

21 MS. COLLETT: Thank you.

22 MR. TAGAVI: I admit I didn't look this, but
23 what was the GPA necessary
24 before, it changed to two or was
25 it always two?

1 MS. COLLETT: Leslie?

2 MS. VINCENT: I'll let the proposer answer.

3 MS. COLLETT: Is your mic on?

4 MR. SUNDERAM: Is that how you do it?

5 MS. COLLETT: Uh-huh. Thank you.

6 MR. SUNDERAM: There was no previous stated
7 minimum GPA and now there is.

8 MS. COLLETT: So, there was no previously
9 stated minimum GPA, but now there
10 is.

11 MR. TAGAVI: Thank you.

12 MS. COLLETT: Any other questions? Richard
13 Charnigo?

14 MR. CHARNIGO: Hi, Richard Charnigo, Public
15 Health. Just a question. Leslie
16 mentioned that there was
17 documentation of a faculty vote.
18 Could you please say what was the
19 result of that faculty vote?

20 MS. VINCENT: Well, I can probably pull it up
21 in Curriculog. There was a
22 letter, I believe. Unless the
23 proposer happens to know.

24 MS. COLLETT: He doesn't have it right in front
25 of him. I can try to look.

1 MR. SUNDERAM: I don't have it with me,
2 unfortunate.

3 MS. VINCENT: It's no longer on my to-do list.
4 This might take me a minute.

5 MR. CHARNIGO: Leslie, do you recall that it was
6 unanimous or near unanimous?

7 MS. VINCENT: Just seeing that it was there and
8 it looked clean. It didn't raise
9 any questions in the committee
10 review.

11 MR. CHARNIGO: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. COLLETT: Any additional questions? Okay.
13 Seeing no hands raised then it's
14 time to vote. As a reminder,
15 Senate is voting to approve the
16 proposed change to the BS
17 Biomedical Engineering. All
18 right. We have 73 approve, two
19 opposed and three abstentions.
20 So, that passes. Thank you.
21 Next, Leslie, you're still on the
22 list for proposed changes to the
23 BA in Education, Special
24 Education, Learning and Behavior
25 Disorders. I believe Assistant

1 Professor Kera Ackerman is the
2 proposer and she is in
3 attendance. Leslie?

4 MS. VINCENT: Okay. So, this is the
5 recommendation to approve the
6 proposed changes to the BAEDU in
7 Special Education Learning and
8 Behavior Disorders. This
9 proposal seeks to change the
10 program name, required courses
11 and progression requirements for
12 the degree. The proposal's
13 rationale is to allow students to
14 be certified in learning and
15 behavior disorders and elementary
16 education to address the shortage
17 in special educators in
18 elementary schools. This
19 proposal also addresses a gap in
20 the colleges programs compared to
21 other institutions. The name of
22 the degree will change from
23 Special Education, Learning and
24 Behavior Disorders to Learning
25 and Behavior Disorders in

1 Elementary Education. As part of
2 the changes the overall required
3 credit hours will now be 120 down
4 from the 121 currently. The
5 required pre major courses will
6 go from 52-credit hours to 46-
7 credit hours and will include
8 special education and elementary
9 education course work. In
10 addition, the major core will go
11 from 33-credit hours to 40 and
12 again, course work will focus on
13 both special education and
14 elementary education. With the
15 proposed change the program will
16 have two-credit hours of guided
17 electives. Originally, there
18 were no guided elective
19 requirements as part of the
20 degree. The number of free
21 electives remains unchanged. The
22 SAASC Committee voted unanimously
23 to approve the proposed changes.

24 MS. COLLETT: All right. So, there's a
25 recommendation from committee for

1 Senate to approve the proposed
2 changes to the BA Education,
3 Special Education and Learning,
4 Special Education Learning and
5 Behavior Disorders. Because the
6 motion comes from committee no
7 seconds required. The motion is
8 now on the floor and the floor is
9 open up to members for questions
10 of fact and/or debate. Kiersten?
11 MS. WHITE: Kiersten White, Student Senator
12 for the College of Health
13 Sciences. When we were talking
14 about this I had a question come
15 up where -- would this degree
16 program prohibit people from
17 teaching in a middle school and
18 high school setting, because
19 we're adding that elementary Ed
20 component to it or is based off
21 of how the program running now
22 it's only using an elementary Ed
23 setting?
24 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, we'll let the proposer
25 -- just state your name.

1 MS. ACKERMAN: So, the Learning and Behavior
2 Disorders degree leads to a
3 certification, which is P12. So,
4 they could teach all the way
5 through and then elementary Ed,
6 of course, is just elementary.
7 Ed. So, that's a good question.

8 MS. COLLETT: Any other questions. Okay.
9 Seeing no hands raised then it is
10 time to vote. Remember, you are
11 approving the proposed changes to
12 the BA Education, Special
13 Education Learning and Behavior
14 Disorders. Okay. We have 77
15 approved, two opposed and three
16 abstentions. So, that passes.
17 Thank you. Next, we have SAASC
18 Committee, again, with Leslie
19 Vincent. We have proposed
20 changes to the BS in Forestry. I
21 think, Professor John -- is it
22 Lhotka, is the proposer.
23 Hopefully, I said that right?
24 Leslie?

25 MS. VINCENT: Okay. This is a recommendation

1 to approve the proposed changes
2 to the BS in Forestry. The
3 proposed curriculum revision
4 includes changes to the major
5 core requirements, including the
6 revision, addition and removal of
7 courses. The following includes
8 a summary of the changes. First,
9 revision of five current courses,
10 including changes in credit hours
11 and course number and name.
12 Second, creation of two new
13 courses focused on tree biology
14 and forest products utilization.
15 And, three, removing one required
16 course. Due to these changes the
17 number of total semester hours a
18 student must complete to earn the
19 degree has changed from a minimum
20 of 121 semester hours to 120
21 semester hours. SAASC voted
22 unanimously to approve the
23 proposed changes.

24 MS. COLLETT:

All right. Thank you. So,
25 there's a recommendation from the

1 committee for the Senate to
2 approve the proposed changes to
3 the BS in Forestry. Because the
4 motion comes from committee no
5 second is required. The motion
6 is on the floor and the floor is
7 open up to members for questions
8 of fact and/or debate. Seeing no
9 hands raised it is time to vote.
10 As a reminder, you're voting to
11 approve the proposed changes to
12 the BS in Forestry. All right.
13 We have 85 approved, zero opposed
14 and one abstention. So, that
15 passes. Next, we have Senate
16 Academic Programs Committee,
17 SAPC, Sandra Bastin is Chair.
18 Justin Nichols is sitting in for
19 Sandra today. So, first thing we
20 have up is the proposed new
21 Masters of Art and Teaching
22 Degree in Special Education.
23 Associate Professor Amy Spriggs
24 is the proposer. Justin?
25 MR. NICHOLS: This is a recommendation that the

1 University Senate approve the
2 establishment of a new graduate
3 degree, Special Education,
4 Masters of Arts in Teaching in
5 the Department of Early
6 Childhood, Special Education and
7 Rehabilitation Counseling in the
8 College of Education. This will
9 be for teachers who are hired by
10 the State of Kentucky on a
11 Temporary Provisional
12 Certificate, while at the same
13 time taking classes from the
14 University. They will attend
15 class in the evenings while
16 teaching during the day. At the
17 end of their program they will be
18 able to take the Praxis II to
19 become certified to teach
20 students with moderate to severe
21 disabilities or learning and
22 behavior disorders. The Option
23 Six Program is a way to increase
24 the special education teachers
25 across the State. The degree

1 will be offered 100 percent
2 online to accommodate teacher
3 schedules, it will provide an
4 option of two tracks, learning
5 and behavior disorders or
6 moderate and severe disabilities.
7 All appropriate files were
8 uploaded and accurate. The
9 Special Education MAT was
10 approved unanimously by the SAPC.
11 MS. COLLETT: Perfect. So, there's a
12 recommendation from the Committee
13 for the Senate to approve the
14 proposed new graduate degree in
15 Special Education, Masters of Art
16 and Teaching. Because the motion
17 comes from committee no seconds
18 required. The motion is now on
19 the floor and the floor is open
20 up to members for questions of
21 fact and/or debate. Seeing none,
22 it is time to vote. As a
23 reminder, you're voting to
24 approve proposed new graduate
25 degree Special Education, Masters

1 of Art and Teaching. All right.
2 We have 80 approved, zero opposed
3 and two abstentions. So, that
4 passes. Thank you. Next, we
5 have is the proposed new
6 Undergraduate Certificate in
7 Biological Anthropology. Heather
8 Worne is the proposer. Justin?

9 MR. NICHOLS: This is a recommendation that the
10 University Senate approve a new
11 Undergraduate Certificate in
12 Biological Anthropology in the
13 Department of Anthropology in the
14 College of Arts and Sciences.
15 The Biological Anthropology
16 Undergraduate certificate is a
17 15-hour interdisciplinary
18 certificate focusing on the study
19 of human biology within the
20 framework of human evolution.
21 Students will gain skills in
22 examining interactions between
23 biology and culture with specific
24 attention to the human
25 environment interactions that

1 shape population and individual
2 well being across space and
3 through time. The structure will
4 provide students with a
5 foundation to pursue graduate
6 studies or further professional
7 training in research in areas of
8 biological anthropology,
9 including biocultural
10 anthropology, nutritional
11 anthropology, skeletal
12 anthropology, bioarchaeology,
13 paleopathology, human
14 paleoanthropology, virtual
15 anthropology and morphometrics
16 All appropriate files were
17 uploaded and accurate. The
18 Biological Anthropology
19 Undergraduate Certificate was
20 unanimously approved by the SAPC.
21 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. So, there's a
22 recommendation from the committee
23 for the Senate to approve the
24 proposed new Undergraduate
25 Certificate in Biological

1 Anthropology. Since the motion
2 comes from committee no seconds
3 required. The motion is on the
4 floor and is open up to members
5 for questions of fact and/or
6 debate. Seeing none, it is time
7 to vote. So, as a reminder,
8 you're voting to approve the
9 proposed new Undergrad
10 Certificate in Biological
11 Anthropology. Seventy-eight
12 approve, two oppose, two
13 abstentions. That carries.
14 Next, we have proposed changes to
15 SR 3.1.4.3.1.5 and 4.2.2.2.6
16 related to the University
17 Scholars Program. Associate
18 Provost and Dean Padraic Kenney
19 is here as the proposer. Go
20 ahead, Justin.

21 MR. NICHOLS: These revisions aim to widen the
22 opportunities for qualified
23 undergraduates to pursue master's
24 degrees on the accelerated path
25 afforded by the University

1 Scholars Program. Current
2 language does not require that
3 the bachelor's and master's
4 degree be identical, but most
5 USPs have been set up in this
6 way. Small changes in
7 descriptors are meant to
8 encourage programs to be more
9 creative. In addition, the GPA
10 expectations for students
11 applying for master's programs
12 has been changed to better
13 reflect master's admissions
14 standards, but doctoral UGPA
15 Expectations remain unchanged.

16 MS. COLLETT: So, there's a recommend -- and
17 so, is the recommendation to
18 accept this from the committee?

19 MR. NICHOLS: That is correct.

20 MS. COLLETT: Okay. There's a recommendation
21 from the committee to the Senate
22 for approved proposed changes to
23 the SR 3.1.4.3.1.5 and 4.2.2.2.6
24 related to University Scholars
25 Program. Because the motion

1 comes from committee no seconds
2 required. The motions now on the
3 floor and open up to members for
4 question of fact and/or debate.
5 MR. TAGAVI: I'm sorry to do this, but --
6 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Hold on. Who --
7 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, College of
8 Engineering. I'm sorry to do
9 this, but I like our minutes to
10 be as inaccurate as possible.
11 There are two occasions of
12 scholar, can you put S -- add S
13 to it so it could be scholars?
14 That's the official name of the
15 program.
16 MS. COLLETT: Yes, we can do that.
17 MR. TAGAVI: Thank you.
18 MS. COLLETT: Any other questions? Seeing
19 none, it is time to vote on those
20 proposed changes. As a reminder,
21 Senate is voting to approve the
22 proposed changes to the SR
23 3.1.4.3.1.5 and 4.2.2.2.6 related
24 to the University Scholars
25 Program. And it already got it

1 up to date on Poll Everywhere.
2 Look at that. All righty. We
3 have 81 approve, zero opposed and
4 four abstentions. So, that is
5 approved and passes. All right.
6 Next, we have Senate Academic
7 Organizational Structure
8 Committee, SAOSC, Greg Rentfrow
9 is the Chair. This proposal is
10 for the proposed College of
11 Education name change to College
12 of Education, Human Development
13 and Sports Science. The proposer
14 Acting Dean Stevens-Watkins is
15 here.

16 MR. NICHOLS: Yes, as Chair Collett mentioned
17 that the College of Education is
18 proposing to change their name to
19 the College of Education, Human
20 Development and Sports Sciences.
21 The college came together over
22 100 years ago and their role has
23 evolved beyond training future
24 educators to include Kinesiology
25 and Human Science Degrees as

1 well. In fact, the vast majority
2 of their degrees awarded are in
3 those previous two mentioned
4 degree categories. Last year
5 this came up for vote and was
6 voted down and they changed the
7 new name to reflect human
8 development, rather than human
9 sciences. They also polled all
10 the colleges in the University
11 and as of those that were pulled
12 eight were in support of the name
13 change. They added a third
14 category as neutral, three were
15 neutral and three were opposed
16 and note that of those three
17 opposed two were colleges and one
18 were institutes. And if you're
19 keeping track at home, that's not
20 the total of the colleges in the
21 University, the others did not
22 reply to the name change. This
23 was presented in front of the
24 SAOSC and it passed unanimously
25 and moved forward.

1 MS. COLLETT: All right. So, you have a
2 recommendation from the committee
3 for the Senate to approve the
4 proposed College of Education
5 name change. Because the motion
6 comes from committee no seconds
7 required. The motion on the
8 floor and the floor is open up to
9 members for questions of fact
10 and/or debate

11 MS. GRADY: Martha Grady, College of
12 Engineering. What were the
13 reasons for the colleges to vote
14 no? Is there a way to summarize
15 that quickly?

16 MS. COLLETT: You want to --

17 MR. NICHOLS: Yeah. Essentially, those that
18 voted no were the ones that voted
19 no on the last year's name change
20 as well, and it's because they
21 have health sciences in their in
22 their name as well. And then
23 I'll ask the proposer, am I
24 accurate on that?

25 MS. STEVENS-WATKINS: Is this on?

1 MS. COLLETT: If the lights off then it's on.

2 MS. WATKINS: Off then it's on?

3 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

4 MS. WATKINS: Yes, thank you. I did have a few
5 remarks, if that's okay?

6 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

7 MS. WATKINS: But -- also and answer that
8 question. The two opposed where
9 college -- college -- College of
10 Communication and Information
11 Science and Health Science were
12 the two opposing and for various
13 reasons. Saying that there may
14 be confusion across campus is one
15 of the primary reasons to that
16 opposition. But thank you for
17 allowing me just a few moments.
18 This is our 100th year
19 anniversary as already indicated
20 and last year when we came before
21 this body we had the term Human
22 Sciences, in which we listened,
23 we went around campus, we sought
24 feedback from individuals and
25 removed that human sciences out

1 of our name. That was really the
2 best part of this process for me
3 was to go around campus and to
4 get additional feedback. There's
5 also one other thing which was
6 also pointed out is that as we
7 went through this process we
8 realized that not everyone
9 necessarily was opposed to the
10 name and thus that category of
11 neutral sort of came into play in
12 which colleges that indicated
13 neutral support were public
14 health and care and fine arts.
15 The colleges that did support
16 were arts and sciences, law,
17 social work, design, medicine,
18 engineering, pharmacy, Lewis
19 Honors College. And lastly, I
20 did want to take just a few
21 moments to acknowledge our
22 extremely valuable partners,
23 which is the Human Development
24 Institute or HDI, this Institute
25 was established over 55 years ago

1 and as a part of the Office of
2 the Executive Vice President for
3 Research maintains multimillion
4 dollars in active research grants
5 and the institute's strong focus
6 will continue. And I want to
7 just state that we believe that
8 adding the word, "human
9 development," does not distract
10 from the length and breadth of
11 work that HDI completes. And so,
12 our -- being in a research one
13 we're gonna have institutes,
14 labs, clinics and there may be
15 some overlap in name. And
16 finally, we can't come to a
17 consensus, we know we'll never
18 land on a name that everyone is
19 happy with, but we are grateful
20 for the opportunity to go across
21 campus and to get the support
22 that we have received
23 particularly given this is our
24 100th year anniversary. Thank
25 you.

1 MS. COLLETT: Any other questions? Seeing
2 none, it is time to vote. So,
3 remember that you are voting to
4 approve the proposed College of
5 Education name change to the
6 College of Education, Human
7 Development and Sports Sciences.
8 We have 69 approved, seven
9 opposed and nine abstentions.
10 That passes. And that will move
11 onto the Board of Trustees.
12 Thank you. All right. Next, we
13 have is Item 5D, which we
14 actually have pulled from the
15 agenda. The proposer and
16 committee have pulled it and
17 we'll have it on the May agenda,
18 just, I believe, more or less for
19 time's sake to discuss -- to have
20 time to discuss the proposed
21 resolution. So, that is Item 6,
22 now we have the proposed
23 resolution on University Senate
24 Principles on shared governance.
25 I believe you all received my

1 email today and you probably
2 received some emails from
3 Senators within your colleges
4 trying to sum up points about
5 what this -- this resolution is,
6 and why we've come this -- let's
7 see here. Okay, Molly is on, but
8 she's she -- she got a place to
9 watch the incredible eclipse, so
10 I'm presenting this starting out
11 and then we'll have a motion in a
12 second and then open for
13 discussion at that point. And
14 so, you all hopefully have read
15 through the resolution and why
16 we've gotten to this point. This
17 is the third resolution that we
18 have now come to, because it
19 seems as though the first two we
20 do not feel were necessarily
21 heard or acted on as nothing has
22 been paused and we have not had
23 collaborative, I guess,
24 discussions that we felt were
25 warranted. And so, this

1 resolution now is being brought
2 before the Senate basically
3 almost as a last resort here
4 before the next draft principles
5 come -- come out. So, you all
6 received the draft principles,
7 initial draft principles, I
8 guess, March 27th for Senate
9 Council members that was the
10 second draft principles that we
11 actually saw, you all have only
12 seen one. And based on the
13 feedback that we've gotten from
14 folks within these faculty
15 interviews that occur, the small
16 interviews, feedback we've gotten
17 from our constituents, this was
18 the appropriate next step that we
19 felt that we needed to take. And
20 so, you all can see that this
21 proposed resolution is
22 recommending that the University
23 Senate retain its delegated
24 authority over educational policy
25 decisions, it's also wanting to

1 extend or expand, I would say,
2 the University Senate for more
3 voices to be in the decision
4 making process, which would
5 include our Staff Senate and our
6 SGA. And so, you know this
7 resolution asks preservation of
8 those decisionary authority over
9 educational policy that has been
10 in the University Senate and
11 outlines a vision for expanding,
12 like I said, the University
13 Senate to include more voices.
14 So, what I'm asking at this point
15 is, I need a motion and a second
16 to approve the proposed
17 resolution before it can go to
18 the floor for discussion. Akiko
19 and Cassie. So, we have a motion
20 and a second. The motion is now
21 on the floor and the floor is
22 open for members for questions of
23 fact and/or debate. So, that's a
24 motion to approve the proposed
25 resolution. What? Oh, we've got

1 a hand up. Okay. Sarah Hall?

2 MS. HALL: Hi. I'm unmuted. Can you all
3 hear me?

4 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

5 MS. HALL: Hi. Sarah Hall, College of
6 Medicine. Thank you for letting
7 me speak. I first want to just
8 thank you all for the amount of
9 work and attention you've put
10 into this. I know that you guys
11 care greatly about your faculty
12 and I definitely appreciate what
13 you all have done. I have some
14 concerns over the proposed
15 resolution. I'm a clinical
16 faculty in the Department of
17 Anesthesia, but I also have a
18 Basic Science Ph.D., so I try to
19 see things from both sides and I
20 definitely want to help preserve
21 shared governance and respect
22 intellectual freedom of research,
23 faculty and non-medical faculty.
24 My concerns with the resolution
25 are whether it's going to achieve

1 the intended effect. I think
2 that what the proposed changes
3 are to the to the shared
4 governance are not particularly a
5 centralization of power and I
6 think there's a lot of fear right
7 now that that this is some kind
8 of centralization of power when
9 it could be viewed as a
10 decentralization of power to give
11 power back to the college level.
12 Another thing is that some of the
13 language and the communications
14 have suggested that students and
15 staff are not in favor of the
16 proposed changes from the
17 President and the Board of
18 Trustees. I wanted to just put
19 it out there that as a clinical
20 faculty I've had a lot of
21 discussions about this and I've
22 not heard concerns or opposition
23 on my end from students or
24 faculty after talking to a lot of
25 people. There's not a lot of

1 communication to suggest that
2 that there's disapproval from
3 students, staff and faculty. I'm
4 concerned that the suggestion in
5 the wording of the proposed
6 resolution is that it would
7 expand the University Senate to
8 have a greater role for all
9 stakeholders. I'm trying to
10 distinguish how that can be
11 achieved when there might be a
12 diminished voice directly from
13 the Staff Senate and the Student
14 Government if they're lumped
15 under the umbrella of the Senate
16 instead of having their own
17 direct voice. Lastly, I wanted
18 to point out that the wording of
19 the resolution said that it
20 increases a perspective that
21 colleges are in competition with
22 each other and that it
23 concentrates too much power in
24 one office. And what I want to
25 ask is, if we're against the

1 concentration of power how does
2 concentrating the power to the
3 Senate, instead of keeping it at
4 college levels protect from that?
5 I respectfully, really appreciate
6 everything that you all have put
7 into this and I thank you for all
8 your thoughtful contributions and
9 thank you for letting me speak.

10 MS. COLLETT:

Thank you, Sarah.

11 MS. KRAMER:

12 Jennifer Kramer, Arts and
13 Sciences. I'd like to talk about
14 the student and staff component
15 of the resolution, because I
16 think that part of what this
17 resolution does is support the
18 proposed expanded advisory
19 capacity for Staff Senate and
20 Student Government, especially
21 with respect to items
22 particularly concerning those two
23 constituent groups. However,
24 that can be achieved without
25 dissolving the University Senate.
Those entities exist, Staff

1 Senate and SGA exist and can be
2 given more advisory capacity
3 without doing anything to the
4 Senate, first of all. But second
5 of all, getting rid of Senate not
6 only loses votes for faculty it
7 does lose votes for our Senate --
8 Student Senators and we have very
9 clear examples of recent efforts
10 by students for students where
11 they brought their concerns to
12 the Senate and things went
13 through and faculty supported
14 them getting these things to
15 happen. We have a fall break
16 now. Students were the ones who
17 proposed the fall break.
18 Students worked hard to get that
19 through and it happened. This is
20 what a vote -- voice means.
21 Having a vote means having a
22 voice. Advisory will not be a
23 voice.
24 MS. COLLETT: Hubie.
25 MR. BALLARD: Hubie Ballard College of

1 Medicine, Trustee. I would echo
2 what Dr. Hall -- Dr. Sarah Hall
3 stated that when I look at what
4 has been proposed by the
5 President I do not see it as a
6 concentration of power, but in
7 fact, pushing it down into the
8 colleges where you still have
9 faculty making decisions on
10 educational policy, so that it
11 maintains in faculty control and
12 decision making and creativity.
13 I understand that it's removing
14 it from University Senate, I
15 think the benefit of that is that
16 it improves efficiency and allows
17 colleges to control where they're
18 the subject matter experts. I
19 also would say that having spoken
20 to staff leadership and student
21 leadership I haven't heard any
22 concerns from them or see any
23 documentation from them regarding
24 concerns about the proposed
25 changes and, in fact, as I

1 witness Senate Council frequently
2 when trustees are called upon,
3 the trustee who's sitting right
4 at the table with us is not
5 invited into the discussion. And
6 so, I think that's a reflection,
7 not purposeful, but what has
8 happened with the process over
9 time that the students don't have
10 the voice that they're looking
11 for. I hear that they have a
12 vote, but I think the impression
13 is they don't have a voice and I
14 think you can say the same thing
15 for staff.

16 MS. COLLETT:

Kaveh and then --

17 MR. TAGAVI:

18 Kaveh Tagavi, College of
19 Engineering. I will use -- I
20 will use a loaded term. I am --
21 I am witnessing gaslighting. In
22 this sense, it is a misnomer that
23 the power would be concentrated
24 down to the colleges. It's my
25 understanding that right now
final power is with the Board of

1 Trustees, but Board of Trustees
2 has given certain authority to
3 the Senate, so I use the words
4 rubber stamp, not to be
5 pejorative, but for all practical
6 purposes when the Senate approved
7 the course I don't remember, in
8 my years and years of history
9 here that the Board of Trustees
10 said, "No, we are not gonna
11 approve the course." So, in for
12 practical purposes, the power,
13 the final decision was in the
14 Senate, which means in the
15 faculty. So, it's gaslighting to
16 say that the power is now with
17 the college, because the college
18 doesn't have a final voice.
19 Under the President's proposed
20 proposal the college would advise
21 the President and the President
22 as a single person, although he
23 would get advice from his
24 council, supposedly, the person
25 or the President would have the

1 power to veto it. So, imagine
2 mechanical engineering says, "We
3 want to have -- drop
4 Thermodynamics II from our
5 curriculum," and for whatever
6 reason, I'm not going to
7 speculate what reason the
8 President is going to say, "Thank
9 you for your advice. I'm going
10 to disapprove it." That's just
11 ridiculous. The power of
12 curriculum should be with the
13 faculty, number one. Number two,
14 a few times I heard from my
15 colleagues that nobody has
16 disagreed with this, that's a
17 little bit very curious way of
18 saying it. I ask my 200 -- 325
19 Level class, 100 students, "How
20 many of you are merely aware you
21 don't have to explain it, just
22 raise your hand if you're aware
23 of what is going on in the
24 campus?" Three people raised
25 their hands. And then I asked,,

1 "How many of the three of you
2 knows the underlying issue?"
3 One percent partially was
4 correct. So, okay. So, people
5 have not -- students and staff
6 have not disagreed, but have they
7 agreed? Do you have -- do you
8 have evidence that they have
9 agreed with the proposal --
10 proposal of the President? I
11 haven't heard of that. If you
12 haven't heard it, please let us
13 know. Thank you.

14 MS. COLLETT: Simon and then Richard and then
15 (*)

16 MR. SHEATHER: Simon Sheather, I'm Dean of the
17 Gatton College of Business and
18 Economics here at the University
19 of Kentucky, finishing my sixth
20 year. I think it's important to
21 point out I'm finishing my 30th
22 consecutive year in sitting on
23 leadership roles across three
24 universities -- in three
25 universities across two

1 countries, including being
2 Associate Dean and Department
3 Head, Academic Program Director
4 of multiple programs, including
5 one of them, was jointly from two
6 colleges and director of a an
7 institute, which is university
8 wide. I have a real problem with
9 some of the wording in Principle
10 4. Like Dr. Hall pointed out our
11 current practices are not nimble,
12 do not promote entrepreneurial
13 thinking across colleges. We are
14 slow to market and we have
15 individual programs. Just look
16 at data science and business
17 analytics. We have at least
18 three colleges that have three
19 separate programs, cross listing
20 is not solution to that. Cyber
21 security is just in engineering.
22 And both all of these things were
23 slow to market and God help us
24 with artificial intelligence.
25 This is something that cannot be

1 done in one college and my
2 experience across the three
3 universities is this is all
4 driven by faculty. So, all of
5 this talk that the faculty are
6 not going to be involved is a
7 rude Australian word that I can't
8 say. And what I say to people,
9 "Hey, take me on. Take me on.
10 Don't leave any petulance. Thank
11 you. You can find my email happy
12 to chat with you," but when you
13 do argue against this, ask
14 yourself, "How much experience
15 outside of the UK System do you
16 have?" and if none, "What
17 knowledge do you have of how this
18 works in other universities?"
19 Thank you.

20 MS. COLLETT: Richard?

21 MR. CHARNIGO: Richard Charnigo, Public Health.
22 I am in favor of this resolution
23 and I'm just going to mention a
24 few points. The guiding
25 principle about not delegating is

1 something that I think does not
2 make sense given the expertise
3 and the strength and numbers that
4 can be availed by the Board as
5 regards to the membership or
6 possibly expanded membership of
7 the University Senate. I think
8 that also if we're talking about
9 bringing more voices to the
10 table, which was what President
11 Capilouto mentioned at the March
12 meeting, I don't see how
13 contracting the University Senate
14 into a Faculty Senate brings more
15 voices, that seems to me to have
16 fewer voices at the table. I
17 would like, and I think this is
18 also in the resolution -- by the
19 way, I didn't have any authorship
20 of the resolution. But I would
21 like, and this is also in the
22 resolution, the idea of an
23 expanded Senate. I would like to
24 see more students in the Senate.
25 I would like to see staff in the

1 Senate. I would like to see more
2 faculty in the Senate. I would
3 like to see changes regarding
4 even administrator participation
5 in the Senate. For example, I
6 would like Deans to be able to
7 vote every year, instead of
8 alternating years. I would like
9 more voices. I don't think that
10 the current guiding principles
11 lead to more voices. It is true
12 that there is a President's
13 Council that's proposed, that's
14 fine, but that's -- that's 12
15 people that's not the same as a
16 larger body such as the
17 University Senate. And a larger
18 body in the University Senate can
19 help efficiency -- can help
20 efficiency, because there will be
21 more people among whom to divide
22 committee work. There's a lot of
23 work to be done on a committee
24 and this is not to say that the
25 contributions of people at the

1 college level should not be
2 appreciated or given considerable
3 weight, they should be
4 appreciated and given
5 considerable weight. But it's
6 good, I think, to have an
7 oversight kind of an overall,
8 broad perspective on what's
9 coming through, what's being
10 proposed for the University and
11 the University Senate has some
12 committees that allow people from
13 across the University to see what
14 is coming from different sources.
15 And with -- with respect with
16 respect to my colleagues when we
17 get proposals there are sometimes
18 oversights in these proposals and
19 it's good to have another pair or
20 several more pairs of eyes to
21 look at them. The last thing I
22 want to mention is that they're
23 just has not been, at at least
24 communicated in our previous
25 Senate meeting with President

1 Capilouto, or otherwise recently,
2 a very clear rationale for the
3 radical change that's being
4 suggested regarding the
5 University Senate and being
6 contracted into a Faculty Senate.
7 We have heard from the previous
8 meeting that there are concerns,
9 I think, legitimate concerns
10 about the Deloitte Consulting
11 Report. I just don't see the
12 clear rationale and impetus for
13 why the University Senate needs
14 to be contracted, a clear reason
15 hasn't been given. The anecdotal
16 example about the Spanish
17 Healthcare Course that didn't go
18 through, that was provided at the
19 last Senate meeting, that was not
20 a relevant example, because, as
21 DeShana pointed out in subsequent
22 email correspondence that course
23 was withdrawn by the proposer
24 after receiving advice from
25 colleagues. So, that's not a

1 failure of the Senate's
2 processes. So, I guess, in the
3 absence of a clear reason and the
4 absence of a clear rationale I
5 would like to keep the University
6 Senate with students and expand
7 the University Senate and include
8 more voices, student staff
9 faculty and administrators.
10 Thank you.

11 MS. COLLETT:

Kiersten?

12 MS. WHITE:

13 Kiersten White, Student Senator
14 for the College of Health
15 Sciences. You say the student
16 voice hasn't been talked or
17 voiced on this topic and I am at
18 the point where I'm so frustrated
19 and I will keep yelling if that's
20 what it takes. Listen to me when
21 I say this, please listen to me
22 when I say this, when you ask a
23 class of engineering students,
24 who have not been involved in
25 shared governance for the last
year they're not going to know

1 what's going on, but when you
2 ignore the three students that
3 have been sitting on the Council
4 for the entire year it is just
5 disrespect. When we talked to
6 you last week on Monday it took a
7 lot to stand up and say something
8 that the student voice was being
9 manipulated and I will say that
10 again and again, but I am beyond
11 frustrated. All of these
12 students behind me support what I
13 am saying and I could say that
14 because we have had
15 conversations. We know what is
16 going on. We are not ignorant.
17 We understand that this is a time
18 of change, but for us we have --
19 we want the President's
20 principles? It is simple math.
21 In Senate Council there are three
22 of us against nine faculty. And
23 in this University Senate there
24 may be 19 or 20 of us, when all
25 of our seats are filled, against

1 100 faculty. In no world can we,
2 as the students -- in no world
3 can we, as students, if we are
4 all supporting of the same
5 initiative, of the same
6 resolution, ever outvote the
7 faculty. And yet, we are the
8 highest number -- highest
9 population of people here at
10 University of Kentucky. The
11 three of us represent 30,000.
12 The 20 of us represent 30,000.
13 And yet, you keep ignoring the
14 voice of the students. So, I
15 don't know what it's going to
16 take, because I am again beyond
17 frustrated. So, I hope you
18 listen to me that time.

19 MS. COLLETT: Go ahead, Lizzy.

20 MS. HORNUNG: I want to just kind of echo
21 Kiersten and offer my support.
22 My name is Lizzy Hornung. I'm
23 the Student Body President. At
24 this time, like we are continuing
25 to engage with the President in

1 these conversations and at this
2 time SGA supports the President's
3 principles. And I just want to
4 reiterate that we are elected by
5 the entire student body to engage
6 in these conversations and think
7 about what shared governance
8 looks like for SGA in the future,
9 so we are like elected by every
10 -- all of the students in order
11 to be able to serve in this
12 capacity and be the student voice
13 in these conversations. So, it
14 makes sense that they would
15 delegate their authority to us to
16 speak on behalf of them in these
17 issues. So, they're not --
18 students in an engineering class
19 might not be as involved as we
20 are, so I would appreciate the
21 opportunity to speak on those
22 instead of other students who are
23 not elected.

24 MS. COLLETT: Cassie and then Kaveh.

25 MS. GIBSON: Thank you. Cassie Gibson,

1 College of Medicine. I
2 appreciate your comment and I --
3 you know, I was on zoom last time
4 that you said that, and so, I
5 have a couple of questions, one
6 is just a clarification. For me,
7 students are really important,
8 like they always have been
9 incredibly important for me. So,
10 to hear that -- and I'm new to
11 Senate Council, so maybe I'm not
12 privy to all of the information,
13 but I would just really
14 appreciate the context of your
15 feelings in terms of the
16 manipulated comment. I just --
17 you may not feel comfortable
18 saying it, but I feel like for my
19 personal knowledge and
20 understanding I would really
21 appreciate more information on
22 that. And then the second thing
23 is, you know, just understanding
24 your processes as a body and like
25 how, you know, you all have been

1 information that only one student
2 was asked on whether or not they
3 thought this was a good idea by
4 changing the blocks and taking
5 away a reading day, that is one
6 student. That is one person who
7 doesn't go back to the
8 constituents and ask, "Hey, what
9 do you think about this?" That
10 is one person's opinion. I'm no
11 longer speaking and I would tell
12 you if I was speaking my opinion.
13 Yes, I am frustrated, but so, is
14 everybody -- so is every other
15 student and when only one
16 student's opinion is taken into
17 account for something that can
18 infect affect hundreds of
19 students, if you ask any nursing
20 student they would say, "No,
21 please do not take away a reading
22 day," they are some of the
23 busiest people I know and yet,
24 based off of one student's
25 opinion hundreds of students

1 lives are about to be changed.
2 So, it took the three of us to
3 speak up and yell and say, "Hey,
4 you cannot do that," for anyone
5 to be -- or the Faculty Senate to
6 be like, "Okay, yeah, these three
7 students are speaking right now."
8 But it's times like that where
9 it's like you're asking one
10 student, that is not -- that is
11 one student's opinion. So,
12 that's where the delineation
13 lies. Asking one student's
14 opinion versus an elected student
15 who's speaking and talking to
16 their constituents throughout the
17 week, coming back to these
18 meetings on Mondays and sharing
19 what their constituents are
20 talking about or for our own
21 meetings coming back on
22 Wednesdays and sharing what their
23 constituents are thinking about.
24 And then can you repeat your
25 second question?

1 MS. GIBSON: First of all, I remember that
2 example. I took that one and I
3 think we sent it back. Yeah.
4 So, I hope that you feel heard in
5 that case and I hope that we can
6 (Inaudible) later. The second
7 question is, about just of your
8 process and, you know, I
9 understand you've been elected to
10 these roles, but I know there are
11 also other members of SGA who are
12 not elected and how are you kind
13 of including them in these
14 conversations and in your
15 opinions are they kind of
16 representing all of that group
17 and how just -- just fill me in
18 on the process.

19 MS. WHITE: So, with our Senate we -- all of
20 our Senators are elected. We
21 have a Senator representing every
22 single college and each of those
23 Senators are expected to speak
24 with their constituents and
25 report back regularly and always

1 keep their thumb on the pulse
2 with all of their constituents.
3 So, those are all elected members
4 and then we also have an
5 executive branch like you
6 mentioned and that's where I'm
7 able to talk to them about what's
8 going on on a regular basis. But
9 both branches, all three
10 branches, really have been
11 invited to participate in these
12 conversations about shared
13 governance and are regularly
14 informed about what's going.

15 MS. COLLETT: Kaveh?

16 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I do
17 not deny that Student Government
18 speaks for students, same way
19 that Faculty Senators speak for
20 faculty. I don't have access to
21 Student Government. I don't have
22 all the time. I don't have
23 access to College of Art and
24 Sciences. I don't even have
25 access to students in Mechanical

1 Engineering. I have access to my
2 students and I did my research
3 and what I gave you was factual
4 number. If Student government
5 has passed the resolution
6 supporting President's proposal,
7 more power to you. I'm not aware
8 of it. I'm not saying it doesn't
9 exist. I'm sorry. I just don't
10 know if it is very fair. Same
11 with the staff. If the Staff
12 Senate agrees with the
13 President's proposal they should
14 pass a resolution like the Senate
15 and SGA should pass a resolution
16 like the University Senate, and
17 support it. On the -- on the
18 notion of, "It's a simple math,"
19 it is simple, maybe simplistic.
20 This is not a table with a pizza
21 on it and three people, three
22 entities, student faculty and
23 staff sitting there, that's a sum
24 zero proposition. If the faculty
25 eat more, the students are going

1 to eat less. This is a case of
2 a fourth entity in the name of
3 the President coming and taking
4 90 percent or seven slices of the
5 pizza and then say, "The rest of
6 you could have that," and maybe
7 the student would get a higher
8 percentage. Big deal. And on
9 top of that, this is not a voice,
10 it's advice. Right now, you have
11 a voice, because you have a vote.
12 Under the President's proposal
13 you would have a higher
14 percentage voice, I agree, like
15 higher percentage of a one slice
16 of pizza when you used to have
17 three slices in the past, but
18 it's advisory. And lastly, I'm a
19 little bit baffled and saddened
20 and I'm sorry that students feel
21 they have not been -- or been
22 ignored. Is that rooted into
23 have only three Senate Council
24 member versus nine faculty or 18
25 Senators on the Senate versus 98

1 faculty? Come to my world. I
2 have been ignored with my
3 colleagues the whole entire my
4 life. Every proposal I make,
5 some of them don't even get a
6 second. Welcome to my world. If
7 you think you are ignored that's
8 not definition of being ignored.
9 You were given a vote and your
10 vote was registered and if it was
11 a close vote, the three students
12 on the Senate Council it's a huge
13 block in my opinion. So, I'm
14 sorry. Educate me. Where is
15 this ignoring? When do -- when
16 have faculty ignored the
17 student? Thank you.

18 MS. COLLETT:

Padraic?

19 MR. KENNEY:

Padraic Kenney, Graduate school.

20 I'd like to offer some
21 reflections on the -- on the
22 matter of curriculum, because I
23 agree that it's extremely
24 important that there be some
25 central campus body that ensures

1 that competing curricular
2 proposals are resolved, that
3 there's not unnecessary overlap
4 or redundancy among programs or
5 that -- or and that programs and
6 colleges be aware of strengths --
7 related strengths in other
8 colleges that could be used in a
9 curriculum that they're
10 proposing. I always want to
11 hesitate invoking previous
12 experience, but I served on the
13 Curriculum Committee on my
14 previous campus for four years
15 and I'm not advocating this as an
16 ideal model, I'm simply pointing
17 out that there is such a model.
18 The Curriculum committee was
19 charged with reviewing any change
20 to a degree or a new degree that
21 was brought forward by any of the
22 schools on campus. The committee
23 was made up of the associate
24 deans of all of the schools on
25 campus, so I guess there are

1 about 20 of us overseen by two
2 vice provosts. And yes, I
3 recognize that that is already a
4 whole lot of administrators in
5 the room all of whom, of course,
6 are faculty, but I'm not gonna
7 belabor that point. My point is
8 not, it's better, or we do a
9 really great job as
10 administrators, my point is
11 rather that this is a different
12 system that did, in my
13 experience, lead to at every
14 meeting very robust discussion
15 across the schools and colleges
16 over what was being proposed that
17 usually went into a great deal of
18 detail. My sense is that this
19 moved relatively efficiently,
20 while also bringing up all of the
21 concerns that any school or
22 college might have. If I were to
23 speculate, I think it's because
24 one of the things that works well
25 in that system, and again, not

1 saying anything about the current
2 system, but that the associate
3 deans have a particular
4 responsibility as representatives
5 of their schools and colleges, to
6 be sure that they understand the
7 program that's being brought
8 forward to being sure that
9 they're aware of all of the
10 resources in their own school or
11 college and to making sure that
12 the interests of their faculty
13 and their students are in the
14 room. So, there -- there are
15 other ways that this is done at
16 other campuses and while I have
17 absolutely no idea, how could I,
18 of where things might go if
19 things did go in that direction I
20 think we'd also be very well
21 served. Thank you.

22 MS. TAKENAKA: Akiko Takenaka, Arts and
23 Sciences. I was going to say
24 something else, but before that,
25 to Padraic's point I would love

1 to know more about it, because
2 one of the things that we keep
3 saying over and over and over
4 again is that we know that our
5 system is not perfect. We are
6 open for change, including
7 delegating out of the Senate,
8 because the Senate does so much
9 work, we have, like, Richard
10 said, we have so many committees
11 and we do have a lot of work.
12 And so, I don't know, maybe if
13 the associate deans are willing
14 to take up a chunk of work from
15 the Senate, maybe we can figure
16 out a way to work it out and I
17 would love for us to have a
18 conversation about that. What I
19 raised my hand to say is that the
20 image that is being set up by the
21 President and Deloitte is that
22 the Senate is this body where a
23 few select faculty have absolute
24 control of everything. I'm not
25 -- that is so not true, but what

1 I'm saying is that that is the
2 image that is put out there and
3 that is so not true. Senate
4 gathers information and we -- we
5 study everything that's gathered,
6 if something is missing we ask
7 for extra information. We give
8 advice on how to go about making
9 proposed changes, and so on, and
10 so forth. And so, in my mind,
11 the Senate acts as a jury of
12 sorts; right? We've been elected
13 by a body to exercise fair and
14 good judgment and I want to bring
15 up an example of the College of
16 Education name change where last
17 year we had a very contentious,
18 you know, couple of meetings
19 about the name change, but that,
20 too SAOSC (Inaudible) that's
21 right, right, advised the College
22 of Education; right, for
23 additional processes and there
24 was a lot of extra back and forth
25 and I think that was necessary

1 and unfortunately the outcome
2 last year was not accepted by a
3 significant number of colleges
4 and therefore I am so glad that
5 you, you know, went through the
6 process again and came up with a
7 name that all of us could accept.
8 And I think that is the right
9 process; right, and that's why
10 the Senate exists -- and for
11 changes; right? And as we've
12 been saying, we want to increase
13 the number of students on the
14 Senate and the Senate Council and
15 we want to add staff; right,
16 voting staff, both voting
17 students, voting staff. We want
18 to add more voices and
19 administrators, like Richard was
20 saying. So, we're not saying we
21 don't want to change anything we
22 are saying, "Let's talk about how
23 to change the Senate so that the
24 University could function much
25 better."

1 MS. COLLETT: Hubie?

2 MR. BALLARD: Hubie Ballard, College Medicine,
3 Board of Trustee. Pursuant to
4 Rule 1.1.1.1 I move for a roll
5 call.

6 MS. COLLETT: Okay.

7 MR. TAGAVI: I didn't hear the last part. Can
8 you repeat what you said?

9 MR. BALLARD: Roll call.

10 MS. COLLETT: A vote call? You want to call --

11 MR. BALLARD: Roll.

12 MS. COLLETT: Roll call? Oh, roll call. That
13 would need a second motion.

14 MS. HALL: I second that. Sarah Hall.

15 MS. COLLETT: Okay. That's -- and I don't know
16 if -- I still think that's up for
17 discussion. Do you have a Poll
18 Everywhere ready? That's up for
19 discussion. The motion is for a
20 roll call, it was seconded, but
21 still up for checking with
22 Parliamentarian. Yeah.

23 MR. TAGAVI: But I'm not aware of that. Does
24 that include a motion -- a
25 question motion, calling the

1 question or is that independent?

2 MS. COLLETT: No, that's just --

3 MR. TAGAVI: So, we are not going to stop the

4 debate?

5 MS. COLLETT: Right.

6 MR. TAGAVI: You're just being asked that when

7 we are ready to vote it would be

8 a roll call?

9 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

10 MR. TAGAVI: Okay.

11 MS. COLLETT: Okay. And Doug?

12 MR. MICHAEL: Yeah, Doug Michael College of

13 Law. I'm sorry, Hubie, I didn't

14 hear what you said. Rule 1.1.1.1

15 of what?

16 MR. BALLARD: Correct.

17 MR. MICHAEL: Of what? My question is, of

18 what? Because if it's of the

19 Senate Rules I have them here in

20 front of me and it doesn't say

21 anything about that, so I'm not

22 sure what you're -- what's being

23 invoked. Thank you.

24 MR. BALLARD: Parliamentary procedure

25 MR. MICHAEL: Of what?

1 (CROSS TALKING)

2 MS. COLLETT: These are for electing.

3 MR. TAGAVI: Parliamentary inquiry?

4 MS. COLLETT: He's saying a roll call vote and
5 I don't think we --

6 MR. TAGAVI: Parliamentary input?

7 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

8 MR. TAGAVI: It's correct that we work under
9 Robert's Rule, but I don't think
10 -- in my opinion, I don't think a
11 rule of the Robert's Rule could
12 be invoked and then be enforced.
13 What a person could do is to
14 question the procedure say
15 (Inaudible) of a rule and then
16 the Parliamentarian would make an
17 opinion on that which is -- even
18 that is advisory to the Chair.
19 The Chair is the final arbitrary.
20 So, I consider out of order to
21 say, based on this rule, I call
22 that. And my last comment about
23 that is, let's be honest, we
24 don't call -- I have not heard --
25 when was the last time that we

1 asked for a roll call? To me,
2 this is my personal opinion not
3 open to debate, that to me is
4 like intimidating people who
5 otherwise might have some level
6 of anonymity even though our
7 Provost sitting here who approves
8 of all the promotions, people
9 might be a little bit courageous
10 and vote against for this and
11 against the proposal. But our
12 representative on the Board is
13 intimidating, in my opinion --
14 wants to intimidate us by saying,
15 "A roll call." And, by the way,
16 earlier -- never mind. Thank
17 you. That's -- that's my point.
18 MS. COLLETT: Okay. and I'm checking
19 Parliamentarian procedures here.
20 It doesn't actually require --
21 so, if you have a rule that
22 certain officers must be in
23 attendance before the meeting can
24 proceed, which we've already
25 done, this is the time that the

1 roll call can be done, but if you
2 do not have that rule required,
3 it says, "Don't waste your time
4 on this item."

5 MR. BRADY: Yeah, a couple of things first.
6 Either we're --

7 MS. COLLETT: State your name.

8 MR. BRADY: Oh, sorry. Christian Brady,
9 Lewis Honors College. If we're
10 governed by Robert's Rules of
11 Order, then we're governed by
12 them. We can't choose when we
13 will and will not be governed by
14 them. Secondly, I'm not sure if
15 what was intended was a quorum, a
16 call for a quorum, that is at at
17 any point appropriate before we
18 go into a vote. So, I'm --

19 MS. COLLETT: That wasn't the motion.

20 MR. BRADY: I recognize it wasn't the
21 question. I'm simply asking if
22 that was the intent.

23 MS. GRADY: Martha Grady, College of
24 Engineering. I'm gonna circle
25 back to thinking through what

1 would happen if we created little
2 college Senates everywhere. And
3 so, I'm an associate professor,
4 not fully promoted. I'm on a
5 committee, let's say, to advise
6 my dean on a program. Let's say
7 my dean is very excited about
8 having this new program or
9 changes these things and, you
10 know, my constituents that I've
11 discussed with are -- they say,
12 "No, I don't -- this isn't a
13 great program. We don't want to
14 do this," or, "We're not talking
15 to other colleges because we're
16 doing a program on AI," or you
17 know, whatever it is and I have
18 to sit in one meeting and say, "I
19 oppose this," you know, my deans
20 there; right and then in the next
21 meeting I want to be promoted or
22 in the next meeting I'm asking
23 for cost share on a grant or in
24 the next meeting, you know, I'm
25 doing something I like having

1 this body outside of the college,
2 so that there's voices from the
3 colleges that have one central
4 place every two weeks to discuss
5 and then I don't have to like sit
6 right across from my dean and
7 say, "I oppose that change to
8 that program that you were very
9 enthusiastic about." So, from my
10 perspective it allows me -- and I
11 happen to right now have really
12 nice dean that I can sit across
13 from at the table and disagree
14 with. That's not always
15 guaranteed to be the case. And
16 so, I like having that buffer
17 where, while I do like the idea
18 of colleges having, you know,
19 maybe, you know, a direct, closer
20 pipeline implementing new
21 programs I'm concerned that we
22 don't have that protection of
23 having the Senate body outside of
24 the colleges where they meet and
25 discuss about, you know, programs

1 and certificates and allows me to
2 voice, you know, my concerns in
3 this body and then go back to my
4 college and say, "This was the
5 result from the faculty body
6 together." And that's -- that's
7 my opinion.

8 MS. COLLETT: Davy?

9 MR. JONES: Just two notes. Our Senate Rules
10 have a place where it says
11 something to the effect, "The
12 Senate follows Robert's Rules of
13 Order, except where the Senate
14 Rules specify otherwise." And we
15 do have a provision about calling
16 or roll call vote, it's in there,
17 but there's some minimal vote
18 that has to approve that, you
19 know, like 25 percent or
20 something. There's some
21 threshold there, which I don't
22 have it at my fingertips.

23 MS. COLLETT: Yeah. You ready to speak? You
24 still want to speak? Yes. I
25 gotta do -- okay. I gotta do,

1 members then -- yes, you had your
2 hand up a second ago, you still
3 want to speak? Okay.

4 MR. : I'm gonna leave after this
5 remark, but I understand, Kaveh,
6 we're not gonna see eye to eye
7 about this, but as a student
8 sitting here, what I just
9 witnessed the blatant disrespect
10 about a student leader, I can't
11 even describe to you that
12 separating the issue of us not
13 seeing eye to eye, you -- two
14 weeks in a row now Kiersten's
15 voice has been disrespected.
16 That is her opinion and she's a
17 representative for it. But I
18 cannot believe that a faculty
19 member just displaced in front of
20 everybody here and on that Zoom
21 phone call what you just said to
22 her. I understand I don't have
23 equity in this committee. I
24 don't equity at any table when it
25 comes to these kinds of things,

1 but I will support my fellow
2 student, peer leaders and I will
3 uplift their voice as much as I
4 can. I think you should speak to
5 outside if you have any other
6 concerns about things that
7 happened, but what I heard is
8 enraging me and I cannot believe
9 that that just happened in front
10 of me. Regardless of what's on
11 the agenda, regardless of what is
12 being said in here separate and
13 aside, you are a faculty member
14 and that is a student and what I
15 just saw was a student being
16 disrespected, plain and simple.
17 Thank you so much for your time
18 and to everybody trying to uplift
19 the student voice. Thank you.

20 MR. TAGAVI: Point of personal --

21 MS. COLLETT: Hold on.

22 MR. TAGAVI: I will wait.

23 MS. COLLETT: I have -- I have Loka. I have
24 Loka next. Loka?

25 MS. ASHWOOD: Hi, everyone. This is Loka

1 Ashwood. I'm a Senator in Arts
2 and Sciences. I just -- I wanted
3 to say something that may seem
4 odd, but I think this discussion
5 is a beautiful thing. I think
6 the debate, the controversy is a
7 beautiful thing. It's part of
8 being a public institution. It's
9 part of having a democratic
10 process and it's a beautiful
11 thing to hear the students
12 voices, I might add. And
13 Kiersten, it was a beautiful
14 thing to hear yours. We don't
15 want to lose this venue for
16 discussion, for debate. It's
17 hard. It's not easy. Sometimes
18 it's difficult. We don't always
19 agree, but if we don't have
20 authenticity of representation
21 how can we have a well-governed
22 university? And beyond
23 authenticity, you know, how can
24 we have good formative public
25 debates if we don't have elected

1 representation and votes? I feel
2 like what we're having here is a
3 microcosm of broader debates
4 going on right now in the United
5 States about the role of
6 democracy and we're having that
7 discussion here in our faculty,
8 our student and our staff Senate.
9 And I think I support this
10 resolution on the principles of
11 shared governance for what it
12 does to also strengthen those
13 voices. So, specifically,
14 Principle 2 on Constituent
15 Groups, I just wanted to point
16 that out to the students who have
17 so bravely spoken that this seeks
18 to also make a greater role for
19 student voices, but remember that
20 you have the right to vote and be
21 elected, that's absolutely
22 crucial for a well-functioning
23 university in a democracy. And
24 so, I just want to again state my
25 support for this resolution and

1 thank those who did such a great
2 job in crafting it.

3 MS. COLLETT: Provost?

4 MR. DIPAOLO: Yeah, I just I just want to add
5 something related both to the
6 students and then also the
7 faculty. I mean, Dean Sheather
8 even mentioned in terms of his
9 three, you know, three decades of
10 experience, I've had also three
11 decades of experience coming up
12 in faculty ranks. I first -- but
13 first, in terms of the students,
14 we need to -- and I applaud you
15 all, we need to respect not just
16 the opportunity to vote or have
17 numbers or pizza, whatever you
18 want to talk about, but what
19 they're comfortable with and
20 where they're comfortable with
21 and their opinion in terms of
22 where they're most comfortable
23 having a voice. It's not just
24 about votes. It's having a voice
25 and we need to respect that;

1 okay, number one. The other thing
2 is, in terms of faculty we're
3 always gonna have a reliance on
4 faculty and their expertise. You
5 can't create curriculum without
6 faculty driving curriculum.
7 We've got to always respect and
8 value the faculty in every single
9 college, wherever they are.
10 There's no way a dean or an
11 administrator can say, "Create
12 this course," and have a faculty
13 member create the course without
14 their own passion and their will.
15 And in terms of checks and
16 balances, no matter whether
17 something's advisory as a group
18 or multiple groups advisory, and
19 I don't know how it all shape out
20 in terms of the vision the
21 President has in terms of that
22 Advisory Council, but it also
23 brings voice really close to him.
24 There are always going to be
25 checks and balances and I would

1 bet we'd have the opportunity to
2 work that out together, meaning
3 whatever happens in terms of the
4 current process there is going to
5 be time to sort out how do you
6 actually make that work, how do
7 we have the checks and balances?
8 Dr. Kenney talked about having
9 checks and balances. I'd be
10 relying on whether it's a
11 University Senate expertise,
12 whether it's a Faculty Senate
13 expertise for faculty expertise
14 to be relying at the faculty in
15 the colleges in terms of the
16 development of a curriculum.
17 We're gonna all assure that --
18 that everyone has voice. But
19 just getting back and finishing
20 up with the students, we've got
21 to respect whatever their opinion
22 is in terms of whichever proposal
23 in terms of the President and how
24 those particular areas are
25 constructed. It's not just about

1 numbers and votes. It's about
2 comfort in terms of voice and
3 then it's how that rolls up and
4 that we all listen to it. There
5 are going to be a lot of checks
6 and balances that have to be
7 worked out, however, this all
8 works out, but we're always going
9 to value the faculty. We're
10 going to need to continue to
11 value the student voice and the
12 staff voice and we need to hear
13 them in terms of how they
14 perceive the opportunity to have
15 voice, either as an independent
16 group that has voice that rolls
17 up or as a group as a whole, not
18 just about votes. So, that's all
19 I wanted to say at the moment.
20 We will work together. Actually,
21 that's not all I want to say.
22 One more thing, if I could. We
23 will work together rigorously
24 with passion no matter what pans
25 out here, to be sure that voices

1 are heard, whether things are
2 advisory or not. I mean our
3 appointments and promotions
4 process is totally advisory. I
5 think we've created together a
6 very fair process. We have a
7 process at the college level and
8 maybe you don't know, I don't
9 know, somebody may not agree, but
10 for the most part we do pretty --
11 we do very well with that. You
12 all do very well and you deserve
13 it. You deserve those
14 promotions. But we have a
15 process that's advisory at the
16 college. We have a process that
17 there's checks and balances
18 above. We have appeals processes
19 if somebody's concerned, we look
20 at it rigorous rigorously and we
21 take it very seriously. So, I
22 could imagine that we'd have to
23 work out different processes
24 where we actually come to the
25 table and it's shared governance,

1 no matter how you look at it.
2 And I think if anyone has
3 comments or thoughts on that,
4 with respect to either resolution
5 or how you might perceive that or
6 how the students feel even better
7 about having voice or the staff
8 feel better about voice, I would
9 also agree, I think there was a
10 comment there that this is good
11 dialogue. This is important to
12 have.

13 MS. COLLETT: Yeah.

14 MR. DIPAOLO: Thank you.

15 MS. COLLETT: I will say, with the roll call,
16 we already to do roll call votes,
17 that's why you're signed into
18 Poll Everywhere and those are
19 accessible on how someone voted
20 through open records if you want
21 those, but I caution people on
22 doing that because of the look
23 and thought of retaliation and
24 what would be your purpose of
25 wanting to know who in your

1 college voted one way or the
2 other? You put yourself in a
3 really tight spot, I would say,
4 and I don't think most people
5 want to open themselves -- it's
6 such a potential legality when we
7 talk about retaliation. So, I
8 would not even push that any
9 further. But, like, I said, we
10 already have the roll call votes,
11 we do that with our Poll
12 Everywhere and that's assigned to
13 each person. Scott Yost And then
14 Molly Blasing.

15 MR. YOST: Thanks DeShana. Did Kaveh get a
16 chance to respond, because there
17 was someone that was criticizing
18 him for something? Did he want
19 to respond?

20 MS. COLLETT: Oh, Kaveh? Yes, but, you know,
21 Kaveh always gets on me about who
22 to call on next, so --

23 MR. YOST: Okay.

24 MS. COLLETT: I'm going to let you two go and
25 then I'm going to come back to

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

Kaveh.
Okay. Thanks for -- I -- I
guess, I just wanted another
perspective that -- you know, I
guess I get a little bit
frustrated that over the last
several weeks or whatever when
people have been giving evidences
of where they don't think people
are being heard or where there's
a problem with the Senate. I
think there's a lot of straw men
or straw people in this whole
conversation, because from my
perspective on the Admissions
Economic Standards Committee and
at various just interfacing with
how we've done things, I have
been one of the chief proponents
of local control, of getting it
back to the colleges. And I can
tell you, almost without
exception, every -- all these
examples that people are bringing
up even today with the nursing

1 program that seems to me, I can
2 tell you, a college issue, not a
3 Senate issue. We have numerous
4 proposals that come out of
5 colleges that have, you know,
6 very little -- I mean whether it
7 be someone just carrying the
8 torch for something or a dean
9 wanted to put something forward
10 and I mean, even out of my own
11 College of Engineering we've had
12 proposals that haven't had much
13 support, they come to the Senate
14 and it's like the Senate has
15 suspect as far as if you don't
16 have faculty and and other voices
17 chiming in, you know, but then
18 you turn around and you blame the
19 faculty when we just questioned
20 the local and I'm all for local
21 control, do not get me wrong, I
22 actually tout it on regular
23 reoccurring basis. But having
24 voices at the center -- having
25 issues with voices at the Senate,

1 I think we're barking up the
2 wrong tree on all these different
3 examples we see. The colleges is
4 where all these policies start,
5 the colleges and the programs and
6 what you need to look at, and I'm
7 telling to my colleagues across
8 the spectrum, this is a challenge
9 to my colleagues across the
10 spectrum, you need to look to see
11 if you have voices there because
12 I can tell you from when I look
13 at the landscape very few voices
14 outside of the local control of
15 things happen at the local level.
16 And so, then when something comes
17 to us as a Senate and we ask
18 questions and we don't get into
19 how you run your business, but if
20 we ask questions or if someone
21 brings up an issue and we say,
22 "You know what, let's go back and
23 look at this." You know, people
24 like to blame the Senate and I
25 will tell you that while it's not

1 a perfect body it is certainly
2 not the focus of all the blame.
3 And the President, it seems to me
4 -- it's kind of like if I were to
5 ask, "How long have you been
6 beating your dog?" okay, "How
7 long you been kicking your dog?"
8 the premise that the President is
9 operating on and most of the
10 people around it are operating on
11 is a false premise and that goes
12 right back to the study. You
13 know, faculty governance,
14 there's a reason for that and
15 there's a reason why, at the
16 local level we should be engaging
17 with our constituents and I will
18 tell you on the landscape that I
19 see that's where the problem is,
20 not so much at the Senate. The
21 Senate is to try to bring back
22 the University together to be a
23 common, you know, work together
24 -- I mean, I'm going to just
25 divert just for a second. And

1 that is even the President, after
2 he put forward his emails and
3 announcing his principles, he
4 sent three different emails
5 rather than one email to the
6 University. That's not a
7 unifying thought, folks, that is
8 a dividing and conquer thought.
9 We need a president and
10 administration that's unified.
11 And I believe the proposal that's
12 discussed by -- that is put on
13 the -- that we're debating right
14 now is a proposal to expand and
15 unify, expand the voices, talk
16 about where the -- I mean, I
17 would say that the issues are at
18 the local colleges and how
19 they're listening to different
20 voices and use that as a unifying
21 thing. The President's premises
22 -- the President's premise,
23 across the spectrum, are faulty,
24 I'm sorry to say and the examples
25 that keep coming up are faulty

1 because they're blaming the
2 Senate when it's not really the
3 Senate that's at fault here. I'm
4 gonna leave it there.

5 MS. COLLETT: Molly?

6 MS. BLASING: DeShana, can you hear me?

7 MS. COLLETT: Yes, I can.

8 MS. BLASING: Okay. Thank you. This is Molly
9 Blasing, College of Arts and
10 Sciences. I'd like to make two
11 points, the first is about
12 academic programs, development
13 and educational policy more
14 broadly. The Senate structures
15 allow us to have equitable
16 treatment of programs and
17 colleges, regardless of their
18 size and regardless of their
19 funding structure. I'm really
20 concerned, because the first
21 meeting that Senate Council had
22 with the President, I asked him a
23 question, you know, when you say
24 that, of course, academic
25 programs will stay with the

1 faculty that is sacred, I asked
2 him, "What is the mechanism by
3 which we will protect the
4 faculty's role in making
5 educational policy and making
6 programs and courses and
7 everything that we do now?" and
8 there was no answer. And we're
9 -- we're at almost two months of
10 talking about this and we've had
11 no -- you know, no one has -- has
12 been interested in how to -- you
13 know, and having conversations
14 about how to make this work well.
15 It's -- it's very unnerving to
16 faculty to be told that, "Of
17 course this is going to happen
18 just trust us," when there's been
19 no -- no attempt to collaborate
20 or come up with systems that are
21 going to work for everyone. The
22 other point I'd like to make has
23 to do with the student voices.
24 So, I had a -- I had the
25 privilege of speaking with two of

1 our Student Senate Council
2 members earlier this week, they
3 gave me an hour and a half of
4 their time, for which I am
5 extremely grateful. We had a
6 chance to talk about ways to
7 improve processes, to make
8 student and staff voices more
9 included, to help mentor students
10 to make their voices as powerful
11 as possible and to improve the
12 culture around respect for
13 student voices. I think it would
14 be tragic for the University
15 Senate to lose student voices.
16 We have a number of recent
17 examples where student voices and
18 the College of Nursing proposal
19 about the calendar and reading
20 days -- you know, eliminating
21 reading days and this was
22 something where the students
23 spoke in a unified voice and
24 showed us what the effects -- the
25 negative effects on students

1 would be and we pulled that
2 proposal back and we sent it back
3 to committee and we said, "We
4 have to do better for our
5 students." I think it would be
6 tragic to lose those student
7 voices. I don't think this is a
8 zero sum game. We think the
9 resolution says that we want
10 staff and students to be more
11 empowered to advise on issues
12 that affect them, but we don't
13 want to lose those voices, we
14 want to expand them in the Senate
15 and that is what the resolution
16 does.

17 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. I have Omar and then
18 Kaveh and then Doug and we are
19 running out of time. So, Omar?
20 Omar?

21 MR. ARAIN: Hi, everyone. Omar.

22 MS. COLLETT: Omar.

23 MR. ARAIN: Yeah. Hi, everyone. My name is
24 Omar Arain. I'm the Student
25 Senator for the College of Law.

1 So, I've been in the Student
2 Government Association for three
3 years. I've been in law school
4 and then in undergrad I went to
5 the University of Wisconsin-
6 Madison, which I'm sure some of
7 you know, has one of the better
8 or stronger shared governance
9 systems in the country. And so,
10 I just wanna clarify on the
11 nuance of things that I am in
12 favor of this resolution, but on
13 the student issue, which I think
14 is an important one, I am still
15 very -- I stand with the students
16 sharing their experience on
17 Senate Council and I don't think
18 that's an uncommon experience to
19 be treated dismissively. And in
20 my mind I think that's across the
21 University, that's not a
22 University Senate issue that's
23 just in every dynamic; right?
24 And so, I applaud the students
25 there for kind of having the

1 courage to share their
2 frustrations and, like others
3 have said, I think it's an
4 important dialogue to have and a
5 dialogue that we can really only
6 meaningfully have if we keep the
7 current structure as it stands.
8 Just my experience in shared
9 governance this just strikes me
10 as, in a general sense, a power
11 grab albeit modest and more
12 detailed, but I don't know. I'm
13 not sure I understand the proper
14 case for why we need to change
15 anything at all. To a couple of
16 other previous speakers points, I
17 just don't fully grasp the
18 problem that we're fixing and I
19 think it just hurts students on
20 the margins because I think
21 having had many years trying to
22 push the University -- push
23 universities from a student
24 perspective both in and out of
25 the formal shared governance body

1 for the students, I think just --
2 it -- it's ultimately dismissed
3 based off greater decision making
4 priorities from administration
5 that have to do with finances and
6 other things and less to do with
7 students. And the best thing
8 that students can do is use
9 University Senate and that's
10 something that we as students
11 should work with faculty on and
12 faculty should be working with us
13 on. And so, that then that's
14 kind of just why I'm in favor.
15 So, thank you.

16 MS. COLLETT: Kaveh and Doug, and then we're
17 going to end discussion.

18 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, College of
19 Engineering. I know by limits.
20 I know that I've already spoke
21 twice, but the reason I raise my
22 hand -- but Scott was right I had
23 a priority because of personal
24 privilege, because my name was
25 mentioned against Senate --

1 against the Robert's Rules of
2 Order we are not supposed to
3 address each other by name or to
4 each other we should only talk to
5 you. A long time ago, when we
6 wanted to do A plus and -- A plus
7 or minus students were totally
8 against it and I wanted to write
9 a article to the journal to be
10 against the students and a
11 colleague of mine said, "Never
12 argue with students, you look
13 bad," and I will not argue with
14 students. The last thing that I
15 want to say is this, disagreeing
16 with the person's opinion is not
17 disrespecting them. I will talk
18 to the young man since he
19 mentioned my name after the -- if
20 he's willing to talk to me, I
21 will talk to him, but I like to
22 know where I was -- when -- where
23 or when I was disrespectful.
24 Disagreeing with the argument is
25 not disrespecting the person.

1 MS. COLLETT: Doug? Oh, we can't hear you.
2 You're muted.

3 MR. MICHAEL: Yeah, that's Zoom life. Doug
4 Michael, College of Law. I just
5 wanted to take a minute to really
6 strongly urge my colleagues to
7 vote for this resolution, I had
8 nothing to do with writing it. I
9 want to point out we are -- we
10 are offering two things as
11 resolutions, the first is the
12 third time now we've said, "Slow
13 down," and I think it's really
14 important that that's the
15 critical part of this resolution.
16 The second, that we take issue by
17 issue with the President's Four
18 Principles, I think, only points
19 out that reasonable minds can
20 differ. Even among the faculty
21 we've seen how we -- is principle
22 for -- should it be called checks
23 and balances or should it be
24 called encouraging innovation?
25 Are we more in favor of

1 competition or collaboration?
2 How can we innovate without
3 duplicating? How can we give the
4 students a useful and equal
5 voice? Under the President's
6 proposal their voice is equal
7 because everybody has zero, and
8 so, now we're all equal. I doubt
9 that that's what anybody had in
10 mind. It's -- it's crystal clear
11 that we need to think about this
12 more and I think we need to be
13 clear that we tell the trustees
14 it needs to come back with the
15 approval of students, faculty,
16 staff and administrators. That's
17 a proposed shared governance
18 arrangement we can live with and
19 we have to just say, "No, no,
20 no," and I think -- I don't think
21 the resolution is perfect either,
22 but I -- I mean that our
23 principles are perfect either,
24 but you should vote for this
25 resolution particularly because

1 of the first thing it says and
2 for the fact that we've taken a
3 couple of hours to talk about
4 where we would even go. I think
5 that's proof positive that this
6 needs a lot more work. Thank
7 you.

8 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Cassie.

9 MS. GIBSON: Cassie Gibson, College of
10 Medicine. I'd like to call the
11 vote.

12 MS. COLLETTE: We need a second. Okay. All
13 those in favor of calling the
14 vote -- that's immediate. All
15 those in favor of calling the
16 vote I need you to -- unless we
17 can get it on Poll Everywhere
18 here. Hold on. I do have --
19 yup.

20 MR. TAGAVI: It's the same as call the
21 question.

22 MS. COLLETT: Call the question. I'm sorry.
23 Call the question. I know, but
24 calling the vote means
25 immediately going -- or calling

1 the question is immediately going
2 to the -- to the vote to call the
3 question. Yes, but I'm clearing
4 it because we didn't have it up
5 there. Now, people, it's open to
6 call the question. It's still
7 locked? Hold on.

8 (CROSS TALKING)

9 MS. COLLETT: We have 58 approved, 15 opposed
10 and 10 abstentions. That vote is
11 called. Now, we go directly to
12 voting on the motion. Do I have
13 a -- do you have a slide for
14 this?

15 (CROSS TALKING)

16 MR. SCROGGINS: Chair Collett, I'm locked out.
17 I'm not able to vote.
18 Something's going on here.

19 MS. COLLETT: Can you -- can you email,
20 Kiersten? Pick it and she can
21 log your vote. Perfect. Thank
22 you.

23 (CROSS TALKING)

24 MS. COLLETT: We have 53 approve, 19 opposed
25 and nine abstentions. That

1 passes. Okay. So, if there's
2 any items from the floor -- none.
3 Okay. So, you know, the next
4 Senate meeting will be May the
5 6th, that would be our last one
6 of the semester --

7 (CROSS TALKING)

8 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, you want an item from
9 the floor?

10 MS. HARPER: Yes. I had my hand up before and
11 was not called on and I just
12 wanted to share my perspective as
13 some of the students --

14 MS. COLLETT: Oh, hold on. Let me just say,
15 even with your hand up I have to
16 go in order of Senators, and so,
17 I have to go by priority, I say
18 that every single time, so that
19 we all know what the priority is
20 of speaking. So, go ahead.

21 MS. HARPER: Understood. Thank you.
22 Christine Harper, Chief
23 Enrollment Officer. So, I just
24 wanted to share from my
25 perspective as an administrator

1 who's been going to these
2 meetings probably over the last
3 two years, because I do oversee a
4 lot of areas through which the
5 Senate Rules impact admissions,
6 Registrar, financial aid, a lot
7 of those things relative to when
8 courses can be scheduled,
9 student's attendance, those sorts
10 of things relate to me, so I
11 attend quite frequently. I can
12 support and feel similar to the
13 students in that I do feel that
14 there are a number of times where
15 administrators, guests, what have
16 you, that come to Senate or
17 Senate Council make/share
18 information that isn't taken into
19 consideration. I do think that
20 there have been multiple -- I
21 know that there have been
22 multiple times where I have had
23 my hand raised and I do
24 understand the order, but when
25 it's something critical to which

1 it is my content expertise there
2 have been three instances where
3 former Senate Council Member Bob
4 Grossman raised his hand and then
5 said, "Let me give my time to
6 Christine, because I think she
7 has important information." He's
8 the only Senator that -- Senate
9 Council Member that did that.
10 But that's a challenge when we're
11 supposed to have -- and I know I
12 don't have a seat on Senate
13 Council, but I think there's a
14 fair amount of time where that
15 expertise in those areas do help
16 move information forward. When
17 we look at what was taken off the
18 agenda today the prerequisite
19 waiver, both Lizzy and I -- we
20 had two reads at Senate Council
21 shared concern, she, from a
22 student perspective of how
23 quickly things could get turned
24 around and said, "I went to get a
25 waiver today for a class I needed

1 for graduation and I saw my
2 faculty member, they waived it.
3 I got in. It was filling up,"
4 was told by a member of the
5 Senate Council that the proposal
6 which was go from the Senate to a
7 Senate Committee to a Dean could
8 all happen in one day. Does
9 anyone in here believe that a
10 faculty member, a faculty group
11 and a dean could all agree to an
12 approval in one day? I shared
13 information from where I see some
14 backlogs because of the amount of
15 information that particularly the
16 faculty committees like DGSs that
17 have responsibilities which this
18 would have fallen to or have
19 transfer credit that they need to
20 approve course evaluations, other
21 things like that. There's a lot
22 of information. So, from my
23 perspective, knowing the backlog
24 that we had some DGSs who would
25 have been the group that were

1 approving or disapprove -- or
2 sorry DGS, DUSs that we're
3 approving or disapproving some of
4 these waivers or the committees
5 had backlogs of 60 to 90 days,
6 for course evaluations and shared
7 that on multiple times to say
8 this may add more barriers. It's
9 going to add more steps. That
10 wasn't heard and it took a
11 groundswell of other faculty to
12 come in. Then the conversation,
13 when it got to the third reading
14 at the Senate -- then it changed,
15 and I think now it's in a much
16 better position. I do -- I'll --
17 I'll say that we try to provide
18 content expertise from
19 constituencies, whether it's
20 about the roles in which we
21 serve, because in terms of the
22 University of Kentucky I would
23 argue that in terms of enrollment
24 I have the most information and
25 expertise in that area and that

1 should be listened to and heard
2 as well as areas of financial
3 aid, Registrar, what have you.
4 The students have the most
5 expertise in their experiences as
6 they navigate the administration
7 of getting through the
8 bureaucracy of scheduling and
9 those sorts of things as well as
10 what works and doesn't work
11 within the classroom and the
12 faculty have ultimate authority
13 on what is taught in the
14 classroom, what they want to
15 share, how that works and how you
16 organize yourselves and should
17 have those authorities, but the
18 problem is is that it's as simple
19 as getting called on that doesn't
20 happen and I do agree that there
21 is somewhat of a bit of
22 disrespect at times just from
23 even --
24 MS. COLLETT: Okay.
25 MS. HARPER: -- trying to get voices heard.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. COLLETT: Okay. I have -- did you still
3 want to say something? Molly and
4 then Kaveh, Jennifer. Molly?

5 MS. BLASING: Molly Blasing, College of Arts
6 and Sciences. Christine, I've
7 been in these meetings too and I
8 see what you're seeing. What
9 we're proposing in this
10 resolution is both an expansion
11 of the University Senate and
12 expansion of the leadership body.
13 I would -- I, personally again,
14 if we could get down and sit down
15 and talk about the details, I
16 would personally welcome three
17 voting administrators on Senate
18 Council. I would welcome the
19 Provost to be a voting member of
20 Senate Council. I would welcome
21 Christine Harper to be a voting
22 member of Senate Council if the
23 administration selected, you
24 know, those people as the
25 representatives. I just think we

1 can do better in -- within the
2 existing structure. We can -- we
3 could work together to come up
4 with solutions where we're making
5 best use of the expertise that
6 exists in the Registrar's Office
7 in -- in Student Success; right,
8 we have -- we have fantastically
9 qualified colleagues and I think
10 expanding membership and bringing
11 those in as real voices at the
12 table is a better -- is a better
13 way to proceed or at least it's
14 another way to proceed that I
15 think should be under
16 consideration.

17 MS. COLLETT: Kaveh?

18 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I
19 want to respond to my colleague
20 here behind me. Nobody -- In my
21 opinion nobody has been
22 brutalized by our Chair than me I
23 think she brutalizes me all the
24 time, but I have to speak in her
25 favor. I am actually against

1 non-members to engage in debate,
2 they have no right to have debate
3 and I have -- I have been
4 pressuring her, "Do not let non-
5 members to debate," and she keeps
6 doing it. And another Senator
7 Bob Grossman, good colleague of
8 mine, he had no right -- your --
9 your time to talk is not a
10 property that you could give to
11 others and if he did it I think
12 our Chair made the mistake to
13 allow him to do that. So, thank
14 you.

15 MS. COLLETT: Christine, and we'll end this
16 with that.

17 MS. HARPER: And only because my name was
18 raised. Whenever --

19 MR. TAGAVI: I didn't mention your name.

20 MS. HARPER: When I -- Christine Harper, Chief
21 Enrollment Officer. I understand
22 not being engaged in debate. I
23 would argue that most times that
24 I've raised my hand it is
25 providing factual information

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

that is hopefully helpful to the
conversation at hand. Thank you.

MS. COLLETT:

Thank you. Okay. Everyone, next
Senate Meeting will be May the
6th, 2024. We are adjourned.
Thank you.