

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 6, 2024

\* \* \* \* \*

1 MS. COLLETT: All right. Being that it is 2:00  
2 o'clock. Those who aren't in  
3 person today you're missing  
4 popcorn and Coca-Cola and some  
5 water, right, so if you are in  
6 person feel free to get up and  
7 grab some popcorn, please,  
8 because we have enough and I will  
9 not be taking it home. So, as  
10 you noticed people received an  
11 email today for the Zoom and as  
12 well as the Poll Everywhere. You  
13 have a different Poll Everywhere  
14 link, so make sure that you're  
15 logging in and looking at the  
16 email you received twice now  
17 today. We're going to ensure  
18 that people who are supposed to  
19 vote are actually voting today.  
20 So, I'm calling this meeting to  
21 order. Remember, if you are in  
22 person to please make sure that  
23 you have signed in at the back of  
24 the room. I'm going to ask all  
25 Senators to make sure that you

1 are logged into Poll Everywhere  
2 now. So, formalities, which we  
3 always do, but I'm going to run  
4 through it fairly quickly. You  
5 need to be ready to vote on Poll  
6 Everywhere. Like I said, you got  
7 an additional email this morning  
8 or afternoon from Kristen and  
9 literally probably five minutes  
10 ago to remind you. There's a new  
11 URL link in there, so you have to  
12 use it if you're voting by web.  
13 If you're not already logged in  
14 do that and then join  
15 presentation, you should see it  
16 come directly up. Again, it's I  
17 your email instructions. If you  
18 are voting by App, again, it's  
19 the join presentation and then if  
20 you're voting by text message  
21 you're going to use that text  
22 message stream that is in your  
23 email from today. As always,  
24 this meeting is subject to Open  
25 Records Laws, it's recorded for

1 note taking purposes. We do  
2 follow Robert's Rules of Order  
3 Newly Revised unless otherwise  
4 stated in the Senate Rules. This  
5 is a hybrid meeting, so in person  
6 and Zoom. As always, we want to  
7 be inclusive. There is no voting  
8 by proxy, so if you're not a  
9 member you cannot vote and I will  
10 be ensuring that that happens  
11 today. Remember to state your  
12 name and affiliation when you're  
13 speaking it helps us identify  
14 through the court reporting when  
15 we do transcription, but also  
16 helps everyone here know who is  
17 speaking, so you want to speak  
18 loud and speak clearly.  
19 Individuals will be called upon  
20 at the Chair's discretion,  
21 priority is in this order,  
22 remember Senate Members always,  
23 always, always have first  
24 priority, Senators then who have  
25 not spoken yet about an issue

1 will be called upon next and  
2 those who can offer information  
3 to assist the Senate's  
4 discussions. Non-members will  
5 then be called upon if time  
6 permits. So, sometimes this  
7 tends to be forgotten and I get  
8 people holding up their hands,  
9 but I have to follow that  
10 priority list that I always  
11 state. Civility. Debate is  
12 always about expressing an  
13 opinion. You are directed when  
14 you have an opinion or must state  
15 something you speak directly to  
16 the Chair, so any statements  
17 should be directed to the Chair,  
18 I will recognize you and you will  
19 address it as such. If you  
20 address another member directly  
21 I'm going to call you out of  
22 order. The last meeting we had a  
23 lot going on, but I am going to  
24 maintain civility and respect in  
25 this meeting. I will call you

1 out of order 100 percent. We are  
2 going to have civility today and  
3 we also will not tolerate any  
4 retaliation tactics. I have  
5 affirmed this with the Provost  
6 and, you know, that will not  
7 happen, okay. We want everybody  
8 to participate and make sure  
9 Senators report back to your  
10 constituents who elected you to  
11 do a job for them. Next, we have  
12 technicalities. Attendance, back  
13 of the room, again, otherwise we  
14 are going to report your  
15 attendance by Zoom. The chat is  
16 disabled, it should have been  
17 disabled last time and I noticed  
18 people were making comments in  
19 the chat. We're not going to do  
20 that. We're going to follow  
21 instructions and we're going to  
22 follow rules. So, instead  
23 remember to raise your hand and  
24 you'll be called upon as I see.  
25 Remember to keep your video on as

1 much as possible with the Open  
2 Meetings Laws it requires all  
3 members to remain visible on  
4 camera and I know sometimes we  
5 have that internet issue with  
6 several folks, but please make  
7 sure that you have your camera  
8 on. Again, quality headset.  
9 We've gone through this before.  
10 If you cannot connect or you're  
11 disconnected I need you to email  
12 Kristen immediately so we can  
13 make sure that we have that in  
14 the in minutes and in the notes  
15 that we take that you were  
16 somehow disconnected and  
17 hopefully you can get right back  
18 on. If you're on Zoom just use  
19 your customary buttons to mute  
20 yourself, if you don't we will  
21 mute for you. If you're in  
22 person the red light on your  
23 microphone is muted, that means  
24 it's muted, if it's off that  
25 means everybody can see you, the

1 camera is zoomed in on you and  
2 you can be heard. We've already  
3 talked about this, but you must  
4 seek permission from the Chair to  
5 speak. There are several  
6 instances where this may happen,  
7 point of order, information,  
8 making or seconding a motion,  
9 questions of fact or debate or  
10 calling a question, when a  
11 question is called it is called,  
12 there is -- we go directly to  
13 voting. So, I know people feel  
14 some type way, but that is the  
15 rule and that's how it works, so  
16 any time that's called I'm going  
17 to follow that. Again, raise  
18 your hand if you need to speak.  
19 So, now we have Poll Everywhere  
20 and hopefully everybody is logged  
21 in. This is for test taking  
22 purposes only and for attendance.

23 MR. ???: Excuse me?

24 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

25 MR. ???: What about deans -- deans and



1 (Inaudible) they get to vote,  
2 they're not elected Senators and  
3 they don't --

4 MS. COLLETT: Deans do get to vote. Half of  
5 the deans get to vote one year  
6 and half the deans --

7 MR. ???: So, if you're a dean, which one  
8 (Inaudible).

9 MS. COLLETT: Either one you want to, it's just  
10 a test slide.

11 MR. ???: Thank you.

12 MS. COLLETT: It could say, "We believe in  
13 Humpty Dumpty," and the next one  
14 could say, "Red Riding Hood," it  
15 doesn't matter. I just need  
16 attendance. And I think all the  
17 deans know if they are voting or  
18 not voting. I'll wait a couple  
19 more seconds. Are people still  
20 struggling to get in? Are we  
21 doing okay logging in? Okay.  
22 That's fine. I still see people  
23 logging in, that's perfect.  
24 We'll have a lot more voting to  
25 go on as the day runs through.

1                   Probably 10 more seconds then I'm  
2                   moving forward. All right.  
3                   Everybody has voted. So, Senate  
4                   Agenda. Announcements from me,  
5                   there are just a couple of  
6                   things. We had to update the  
7                   Degree List, so Senate Council  
8                   approved an addition --  
9                   additional students for the  
10                  Degree List, because it was after  
11                  the Senate Meeting. We do those  
12                  as per the Senate Rules if there  
13                  is some sort of hardship or  
14                  administrative error. So, we  
15                  approved four May degree  
16                  recipients to be added onto the  
17                  approved Degree List, three  
18                  August degree recipients and then  
19                  there were two in memoriam degree  
20                  recipients that Senate Council  
21                  approved on behalf of Senate. We  
22                  will -- Senate Council will also  
23                  be having a Senate Council  
24                  retreat, this will occur some  
25                  time -- or this will occur this

1 week and agenda items will be  
2 posted on the website. Mostly we  
3 will be looking at where we are  
4 moving forward from here as well  
5 as providing some feedback on the  
6 revised GRs and the new ARs to  
7 get those back to the President  
8 as a Senate Council body.  
9 Consent Agenda. So, the Consent  
10 Agenda for today is going to  
11 consist of meeting minutes from  
12 the prior meeting and also there  
13 are some non -- several non-  
14 controversial agenda items that  
15 are listed, you should see those  
16 on your agenda. Items on the  
17 Consent Agenda are considered  
18 adopted unless a member asks for  
19 them to be removed for discussion  
20 later in the meeting. Anything  
21 that's removed later in the  
22 meeting is up to my discretion or  
23 it will go onto the agenda. I  
24 have a hand raised here because I  
25 did receive a request to amend

1 the Consent Agenda, so.

2 MR. MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law. In  
3 order to move us along today and  
4 in recognition of the fact that  
5 we probably all unanimously  
6 approve our wonderful new  
7 certificates I would like to move  
8 the nine items in 4B to the  
9 Consent Agenda, that would be the  
10 items from the Academic Programs  
11 Committee.

12 MS. COLLETT: Do I have a second? Kaveh has  
13 second. There's a motion on the  
14 floor and the floor is open up  
15 for facts or debate, so that is  
16 to move those items to the  
17 Consent Agenda, which would be to  
18 amend the Consent Agenda. Okay.  
19 Seeing no hands raised, I need to  
20 vote on the Consent -- Amended  
21 Consent Agenda. So, approve the  
22 motion to amend the Consent  
23 Agenda by adding Items 4B-1  
24 through 4B-9. We have 77  
25 approve, three oppose and three

1 abstain. So, that amended motion  
2 -- that motion for the Amended  
3 Consent Agenda is approved. So,  
4 now, we have an Amended Consent  
5 Agenda, which includes the April  
6 8<sup>th</sup> minutes, the approved  
7 Committee Reports and the items  
8 that were just added, which is  
9 right here Number 4. Do we have  
10 any requests to remove anything  
11 for discussion later on the  
12 agenda and to remove off the  
13 Amended Consent Agenda? All  
14 right. Seeing no hands raised,  
15 hearing no objections, the  
16 Consent Agenda for May 6<sup>th</sup> is  
17 adopted. All right. Officer  
18 Reports. Me, up first. Again,  
19 I've already talked about the  
20 Senate Council retreat. The  
21 agenda will be posted. It is a  
22 full-day retreat that we have  
23 offsite. Again, we will be  
24 looking at the future of the  
25 University Senate and feedback on

1 the GRs and ARs. Everyone should  
2 have also received an evaluation  
3 or email about the -- on May 6<sup>th</sup>  
4 about the Faculty Evaluation of  
5 the President that's an annual  
6 report and that the Senate  
7 Council always administers and it  
8 is presented to the Board in late  
9 October. The Vice Chair and two  
10 other people run that survey and  
11 so information is then gathered,  
12 statistically analyzed and put  
13 together. You can see previous  
14 reports already on the Senate  
15 website and in that email that  
16 went out you can see the links to  
17 that. It will continue to send  
18 you a reminder, I think, every  
19 couple of days until you complete  
20 it, so even if you log in  
21 whatever, if you don't want to  
22 complete the whole thing, I hope  
23 you do -- we do report back on  
24 how the college's response rates  
25 are, so it is important for you

1 to provide some feedback and the  
2 Board expects to get that report  
3 from us. Let's see. I don't  
4 believe Sandra is here today, so  
5 I just kind of gave her report on  
6 the Faculty Evaluation of the  
7 President. Gregg, as  
8 Parliamentarian, do you have any  
9 reports?

10 MR. RENTFROW: No, I apologize for not being  
11 there. I'm actually up here at  
12 the University of Maine. So,  
13 while you guys are having popcorn  
14 I'm going to have a lobster roll  
15 for dinner tonight, but no  
16 report.

17 MS. COLLETT: Perfect, thank you. Next, we  
18 have Faculty Trustee Reports from  
19 Hollie Swanson and Hubie Ballard.

20 MR. BALLARD: The biggest thing to report,  
21 obviously, was the discussion  
22 centered around CR1, which was  
23 President Resolution 6, which I  
24 think everyone is very aware of.  
25 And outside of that I would say

1 that the next biggest thing was  
2 the purchase of St. Claire  
3 Regional Healthcare Center with  
4 UK Healthcare that was presented  
5 at the Board and that will be  
6 really instrumental in terms of  
7 helping the Commonwealth in  
8 fulfilling the University's  
9 mission in terms of that. Those  
10 would be the two singular biggest  
11 things to present and discuss.

12 MS. COLLETT: Hollie?

13 MS. SWANSON: Thank you, Trustee Ballard. I'd  
14 like to add just a couple more  
15 things. So, on Thursday, April  
16 25<sup>th</sup>, we heard reports from a  
17 number of audits. Work Group 1  
18 focused on workforce development.  
19 Work Group 3 focused on more  
20 partnership, they discussed  
21 partnerships with KCTCS as well  
22 as bench marking to provide  
23 information on the impact of  
24 academic medical partnerships on  
25 local communities. Benefits such



1 as improved health was noted.  
2 But when I asked whether or not  
3 they had reports of whether or  
4 not the cost to patients was  
5 increased or decreased they said  
6 they'd get back to me, I think  
7 that's important. On April 26<sup>th</sup>  
8 the Board first listened to --  
9 and then Work Group 4 focused on  
10 focus groups that were pertaining  
11 to benefits with respect to our  
12 employee benefits. On April 26<sup>th</sup>  
13 the Board first listened to a  
14 number of petitions. After  
15 listening to petitions to the  
16 Board this included five who were  
17 in favor, including three deans  
18 and nine spoke in opposition.  
19 The Board then approved the  
20 Research University  
21 Professorships for 2024-25, the  
22 appointment of Heather Bush as  
23 Dean of the College of Public  
24 Health, appointments to the Gluck  
25 Equine Research Foundation and

1 acquisition of the medical center  
2 like Trustee Ballard mentioned.  
3 One thing that caught my  
4 attention in this agreement was  
5 that in this partnership UK has  
6 agreed to operate in a manner  
7 that recognizes St. Claire's  
8 committment to their ethical and  
9 religious doctrine. So, I think  
10 as faculty we should keep an eye  
11 on that. The Board also approved  
12 the proposals that we mentioned  
13 with GR. Other business of the  
14 Board included approving the  
15 Degree List, accepting a number  
16 of gifts, capital construction  
17 projects, acquisitions and the  
18 Interim Financial Report.  
19 Questions?

20 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Thank you both.  
21 Next, we have committee  
22 recommendations and you all have  
23 shortened my recommendations just  
24 by adding a Consent Agenda.  
25 First up we have SAASC, Leslie

1 Vincent, who is the Chair. The  
2 first proposal that is up is the  
3 Rebound Proposal. We have  
4 Associate Dean of Academic  
5 Affairs in the College of Arts  
6 and Sciences, Clayton Thyne, who  
7 is the proposer and he is here  
8 today. Hi, Clayton. And,  
9 Leslie?

10 MS. VINCENT: All right. Thank you. First,  
11 before I start, I just want to  
12 thank the SAASC Committee for all  
13 of their hard work this semester.  
14 We've processed, I think, when I  
15 counted 26 or so proposals this  
16 year, and so, thank you to  
17 everyone on the committee both  
18 voting and non-voting for all of  
19 your input and efforts. So,  
20 today the one agenda item we have  
21 to present is the Rebound  
22 Proposal. So, this is a  
23 recommendation to approve the  
24 proposed three-year pilot of a  
25 Rebound Program that would begin

1 Spring of 2025. This proposal  
2 seeks to develop a three-year  
3 pilot that targets students who  
4 struggle in their first semester  
5 of college and allows them to  
6 participate in a two-course  
7 sequence that will support them  
8 with knowledge, mentorship and  
9 training to be successful in  
10 college. Students that  
11 participate in the program will  
12 defer suspension from the  
13 University once they have  
14 completed the two courses, then  
15 they will be able to  
16 retroactively withdraw from all  
17 of the courses that they took in  
18 their first semester. As part of  
19 the pilot data is going to be  
20 collected in order to help inform  
21 decisions regarding policies for  
22 this program if it moves forward  
23 into a permanent program for the  
24 University. So, the SAASC  
25 Committee voted unanimously to

1                   approve the Rebound Pilot  
2                   Program.

3   MS. COLLETT:       So, you have a motion that comes  
4                   from the committee, no second is  
5                   required to approve the proposed  
6                   Rebound Proposal Program. The  
7                   motion is now on the table and  
8                   the table is -- or the floor and  
9                   the floor is opened up to members  
10                  for questions of fact and/or  
11                  debate. Okay. Kaveh and then I  
12                  have Richard. Kaveh?

13   MR. TAGAVI:       Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I  
14                   hope Senators have read this  
15                   proposal and they know what it is  
16                   about. Probation is not intended  
17                   to give punishment, like giving  
18                   speeding ticket, it's to help  
19                   students who -- who have got a  
20                   GPA less than .6. Then what we  
21                   say is, "Just enroll in this and  
22                   the moment you enroll in this you  
23                   are not suspended, you could take  
24                   full credit in addition to that,"  
25                   which was one of my question was

1 not clear whether students who  
2 are in this program only take  
3 this one course and rehabilitate  
4 themselves and then take regular  
5 courses, apparently not. So,  
6 then they register for another 12  
7 hours and let's say they get  
8 another .6 don't they have a  
9 point if they say, "You guys let  
10 me take more courses even though  
11 I got .6 what are you doing to  
12 me?" Then the question is what  
13 happen if a student receives a D?  
14 They're supposed to receive two  
15 C, which is a little bit low bar  
16 in my opinion, but that's fine.  
17 It's not clear if they get a D  
18 what happens to them, immediately  
19 suspended? Do they continue?  
20 Then they go to RWA -- if they  
21 successfully get two Cs, I guess  
22 independent of what other grades  
23 they get, it's not clear. It  
24 should say, "And obtaining a GPA  
25 of 2," it doesn't say that, so

1 their GPA could be 3.6. Then  
2 they could retroactive  
3 withdrawals, which is not a  
4 regular retroactive withdrawal,  
5 because retroactive withdrawal is  
6 a non-academic reason. This is  
7 clearly academic reason. People  
8 who get retroactive withdrawal  
9 for non-academic reasons is as if  
10 they never enjoyed or benefitted  
11 from the semester therefore  
12 probably they get a refund of  
13 their tuition. It's not clear  
14 whether these guys get a refund  
15 for tuition, I think it should  
16 say whether they get it or not  
17 get it. And lastly, what are  
18 these two courses, the two  
19 courses are not approved? This  
20 whole program is two courses,  
21 it's not like 120 hours of  
22 mechanical engineering, but two  
23 of the courses are pending  
24 approval, fine. This is just the  
25 entire program and we are

1 approving it without knowing  
2 what's in the course. Now, we  
3 have some idea of whether there  
4 are some preliminary versions of  
5 the course, but here is the part  
6 I'm having difficulty with this,  
7 what if those courses are amended  
8 and changed? What does it do to  
9 our approval based on some  
10 courses which we don't even know  
11 what's in it? I'm done.

12 MS. COLLETT: That was a lot for me to take in,  
13 so, I'm not sure what questions  
14 exactly. It was quite a bit, but  
15 what I'm going to do is I'm going  
16 to ask the proposer to respond.

17 MR. THYNE: Can you hear me?

18 MS. COLLETT: And then Richard I will come to  
19 you. So, I'm going to ask the  
20 proposer to --

21 MR. THYNE: Can you hear me all right? Yeah,  
22 so first, thanks Kaveh. I  
23 appreciate the phone calls and  
24 the discussions we've had over  
25 this and I've thought a lot about



1 the stuff you mentioned. So --  
2 so, I'll just kind of point by  
3 point, if that's okay with you,  
4 because a few of them I just need  
5 to point your attention --

6 MS. COLLETT: Remember, who you're talking to  
7 respond.

8 MR. THYNE: Oh, I'm sorry. I would like to  
9 talk to the body --

10 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

11 MR. THYNE: -- about some of the points  
12 mentioned by one of your  
13 colleagues.

14 MS. COLLETT: Okay.

15 MR. THYNE: So, first, I mean just one of the  
16 foundational aspects of what we  
17 did with this proposal is  
18 reviewed the heck out of the Peer  
19 Reviewed Literature to make sure  
20 we're well-grounded in what we're  
21 doing. I mean this -- this thing  
22 is well-cited and it's well-  
23 grounded and if there wasn't any  
24 evidence we didn't make a rule on  
25 it. So, the first point made

1 about this suspension, I mean it  
2 is a myth that suspension is one  
3 of these sorts of wake-up-call  
4 slap-on-the-hand, "You need to  
5 get it together." Suspension is  
6 not good, if we can avoid that we  
7 need to and the University of  
8 Kentucky is way out of whack with  
9 how we do suspensions. Almost no  
10 other university, it's cited in  
11 one of the footnotes, you can  
12 look at our bench marking, almost  
13 nobody suspends anybody after  
14 their first term. If you do get  
15 suspended at any point in your  
16 life your likelihood of getting a  
17 degree is 6.2 percent, so you're  
18 basically ending these student's  
19 academic careers at the end of --  
20 age of 18. And as I mentioned,  
21 the Peer Reviewed Literature,  
22 should we allow them to take more  
23 credit hours or fewer credit  
24 hours as they were doing these  
25 Rebound courses we couldn't find

1 an ounce of evidence to say that  
2 it matters, so we said, "Let's  
3 leave it open to the students and  
4 their advisors and their  
5 mentors." We're not limiting  
6 anything. We don't want to force  
7 them to only take three-credit  
8 hours, that has all kinds of bad  
9 implications, financial aid and  
10 whatnot. And -- and, yeah, if  
11 they want to take up to 15,  
12 whatever, we're not going to  
13 limit that, that gives us data to  
14 analyze during the pilot stage so  
15 we can -- if we do  
16 institutionalize this it's going  
17 to help us devise that policy.  
18 The -- you know, the parts to  
19 point your attention to, to the  
20 group, that were mentioned, what  
21 if they get a D in one of these?  
22 They follow the regular  
23 suspension path, right, so  
24 everything -- the alternative to  
25 not doing well is the regular

1 suspension path, which puts it in  
2 the hands of the college, which  
3 is where I think it should be.  
4 The -- if you talk about what it  
5 takes to get this academic  
6 retroactive withdrawal that is  
7 actually mentioned -- it's on  
8 Page 2 of the proposal, it's the  
9 -- the C in the courses plus the  
10 2.0 term GPA, so that is specific  
11 in the proposal. It's very  
12 explicit with the retroactive  
13 withdrawals if you look at  
14 Appendix 6 that, "There will be  
15 no tuition reimbursement." This  
16 is not like a normal retroactive  
17 withdrawal, it's as explicit as  
18 it can be. The -- the courses,  
19 it is true the courses are not  
20 approved yet, that just has to do  
21 with timing. Now, what is in the  
22 appendix for you to read hasn't  
23 changed, so it's not going to  
24 change, this is in committees,  
25 it's just a timing thing. Nobody

1 is -- nobody is going to try to  
2 swap out -- the same people who  
3 wrote this that are on this  
4 committee wrote the syllabi for  
5 the courses, so there's not --  
6 there's no attempt to bait and  
7 switch here, it's going to be  
8 exactly what's in here. So,  
9 that's my response to the group.  
10 Thank you.

11 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. No, Richard goes  
12 next. Richard?

13 MR. CHARNIGO: Hi, Richard Charnigo, Public  
14 Health. I have looked over this  
15 proposal, I'm generally  
16 supportive of it. I hope that  
17 students will benefit from this  
18 rebound opportunity. But there  
19 was something I noticed on Page  
20 3, which is that, "The Academic  
21 Fresh Start will replace all  
22 first term grades in which the  
23 student retroactively withdraws  
24 including any courses that were  
25 passed successfully." I have a

1 concern about that. I think that  
2 if a student, for example, got a  
3 C or better in a first semester  
4 course even if most of the other  
5 courses were Ds and Es I think  
6 the student ought to be allowed  
7 to keep the C or better even if  
8 that's only in one course. The  
9 student was able to master the  
10 material at least from that one  
11 course even if that student's  
12 study habits were not optimal  
13 otherwise, that would also be of  
14 some financial implication to the  
15 student not having to do -- to  
16 redo let's say three-credit hours  
17 where a passing grade was already  
18 earned and that might just be a  
19 factor that would incrementally  
20 marginally improve the  
21 probability of completing a  
22 degree. So, I'm supportive of  
23 this concept, but I would like to  
24 see -- I would like students to  
25 be able to keep a grade of C or

1 better rather than have that  
2 wiped away with a fresh start.  
3 Thank you.

4 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Would you like to  
5 respond to the Rebound -- the  
6 reason why the fresh start on  
7 Page 3, the RWA Petition isn't  
8 going to be partial?

9 MR. THYNE: Clayton Thyne, Arts and Sciences.  
10 So, I think a lot of people would  
11 agree with that sentiment. I  
12 just -- after talking to a  
13 zillion people about this, I  
14 think more people are going to  
15 argue that there must be actual  
16 consequences. These -- these  
17 students messed up. This is not  
18 the regular retroactive  
19 withdrawal process where you can  
20 apply with really strong  
21 legitimate reasons, health  
22 concerns or something. These are  
23 students who messed up, there's  
24 no doubt about it, right?  
25 Otherwise, they'd be doing the

1 regular retroactive withdrawal  
2 process and so there must be  
3 consequences to their actions and  
4 so this -- what we try to do as a  
5 group is balance the people that  
6 hate this idea from the  
7 beginning, they just want to  
8 suspend them and say, "Get on  
9 with your life. We don't want  
10 you here," with the people that  
11 are more like the previous  
12 speaker. So, this is the balance  
13 that we found is that they can't  
14 pick and choose. We'll wipe  
15 their slate clean, right, we'll  
16 give -- we'll say, "You have no  
17 GPA coming out of that first  
18 term, but we're not going to let  
19 you pick and choose." So, my  
20 personal opinion aligns a heck of  
21 a lot more with the previous  
22 speaker, but I just I know a lot  
23 of people disagree with me, so I  
24 think this is the right balance.  
25 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Did you have -- okay,



1 Roger?  
2 MR. BROWN: Roger Brown, CAFE. What about a  
3 student who encountered their  
4 biggest problems and challenges  
5 in their life the kinds of things  
6 that would cause them to have a  
7 0.6 GPA, but they experience that  
8 in the second semester? You  
9 know, lots of new things, they  
10 got the first semester. Why --  
11 I'm interested in the fairness  
12 aspect. How do you identify this  
13 one group and then tell other  
14 people who look at that that they  
15 don't get the same thing? Why  
16 can't they have it, you know, one  
17 time during your undergrad career  
18 or something like that? Thank  
19 you.  
20 MS. COLLETT: Clayton, would you like to --  
21 MR. THYNE: Yeah. I appreciate the comment.  
22 I mean one of the -- so, this  
23 thing if you've been part of this  
24 Rebound Proposal from the  
25 beginning it's about a three-year

1                   saga and so what we did in August  
2                   -- the first thing we did is  
3                   start stripping away and making  
4                   it simpler and simpler and  
5                   simpler and said part of that  
6                   simplicity was, "Let's make it a  
7                   pilot and let's just take the  
8                   first step." I can very much see  
9                   the second step. If this works,  
10                  let's make that second step and  
11                  start broadening it and start  
12                  refining it, but what we wanted  
13                  to do with this is just take that  
14                  absolute first step and this is  
15                  what we thought we could get  
16                  passed for that first step.

17   MS. COLLETT:           Kaveh?

18   MR. THYNE:            And don't forget though -- I'm  
19                           sorry. Don't forget that normal  
20                           retroactive withdrawal process  
21                           that totally exists, right, so.

22   MS. COLLETT:           Kaveh and then --

23   MR. TAGAVI:            Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. So, I  
24                           do have a question actually and a  
25                           comment. The question is I

1 forgot to ask and I didn't notice  
2 is the retroactive withdrawal  
3 mandatory or is it optional after  
4 they get into this program? And  
5 the comment that I want to make  
6 and then you could respond is, I  
7 did have a very civilized phone  
8 call with the proposer and  
9 listened to everything that I  
10 said and often said we never  
11 considered these cases and there  
12 was another really good comment  
13 by another Senator just recently  
14 and I want to mention that if  
15 this proposal wouldn't have come  
16 to the Senate it would have never  
17 received this type of level of  
18 scrutiny and information. So,  
19 just remember that, that this is  
20 what we add -- value added to  
21 this proposal.

22 MS. COLLETT: Would you like to respond or the  
23 proposer? Proposer?

24 MR. THYNE: Optional. They'll apply for it  
25 through the regular process.

1 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, now I have Bobby and  
2 then Jane. So, Bobby Scroggins.

3 MR. SCROGGINS: Yes, Bobby Scroggins from College  
4 of Fine Arts, School of Art and  
5 Visual Studies. I know my  
6 colleagues would be interested in  
7 this and their question would be  
8 -- it would be regarding students  
9 who are having academic  
10 difficulties in other colleges.  
11 Would they be allowed to be  
12 taking other courses that would  
13 appear to be able to help their  
14 GPAs outside of the colleges of  
15 their major?

16 MS. VINCENT: I'm not sure if -- my  
17 understanding is with this pilot  
18 proposal that colleges may decide  
19 to create specific courses for a  
20 Rebound Proposal that would  
21 better meet the needs of their  
22 own students and that would be an  
23 option if there's interest,  
24 otherwise I think it would be  
25 more of a universal, you know,

1 two-course sequence that the  
2 students could take to complete  
3 the Rebound. I'm not sure if I  
4 answered your question.

5 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. SCROGGINS: Okay.

7 MS. COLLETT: Jane Jensen?

8 MS. JENSEN: Hi, Jane Jensen, College of  
9 Education speaking to you from  
10 London. I just wanted to say  
11 that although this committee has  
12 done commendable work for the  
13 last few years, this process --  
14 this particular question has been  
15 up for over 20 years and the  
16 various different associate deans  
17 have tried very hard to try to  
18 find an answer and I commend this  
19 committee on trying to find  
20 something that could be universal  
21 for the University.

22 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Christine?

23 MS. HARPER: Christine Harper, Chief  
24 Enrollment Officer. I would just  
25 make a comment that in my role I

1 have had individual institutions  
2 contact me after we've had  
3 students suspended after their  
4 first semester asking if it was  
5 really academic or behavioral  
6 because -- and I can ask the  
7 proposer to speak to this, we are  
8 outside of the norm in terms of  
9 suspending students after the  
10 first semester, the norm is  
11 typically after the first year  
12 because that first semester can  
13 be a big semester of transition.  
14 But I can speak from my role in  
15 saying that I have had people  
16 contact and question a student  
17 who was actually academically  
18 suspended if there was something  
19 else going on because it is that  
20 outside of the norm.

21 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Anymore questions? Seeing  
22 none, it is time to vote. As a  
23 reminder the Senate is voting to  
24 approve the proposed Rebound  
25 Program. Voting is now open.

1 All right. We have 84 approve,  
2 five oppose and six abstentions.  
3 That is passed. Okay. Next,  
4 these are all -- good job,  
5 Clayton. And I'll just preface  
6 this with Clayton worked with  
7 quite a few committees, SAASC,  
8 SAPC, he really did a lot of work  
9 on this. So, congratulations on  
10 getting that approved. Since we  
11 put these on the Consent Agenda  
12 I'm just going to go really fast  
13 by those and move right onto the  
14 Calendar Committee. Let's see  
15 here. There we go. So, next on  
16 our agenda is the Senate Calendar  
17 Committee, SCC, this is Richard  
18 Charnigo who is the Chair. This  
19 is on the proposed new  
20 application deadline for summer  
21 admissions for international  
22 students. Richard, would you  
23 like to just give an overview?  
24 MR. CHARNIGO: Thank you, DeShana. Richard  
25 Charnigo, College of Public

1 Health speaking as the Chair of  
2 the Senate Calendar Committee.  
3 So, the Senate Calendar Committee  
4 received a proposal some time ago  
5 requesting the establishment of  
6 an application deadline for  
7 international students who wanted  
8 to enter graduate programs in the  
9 summer semester and when the  
10 Senate Calendar Committee first  
11 consented to this idea and  
12 brought it to the Senate Council  
13 the Senate Council raised some  
14 concerns about whether there were  
15 consultations of appropriate  
16 people, for example people in the  
17 International Center. And I  
18 followed up then with the Dean of  
19 the Graduate School and with  
20 various parties as you can see in  
21 the pdf attachment for this  
22 meeting and we received -- the  
23 Calendar Committee received a  
24 revised proposal which was then  
25 brought back to the Senate



1 Council. The revised proposal  
2 makes clear that the application  
3 deadline for summer admission  
4 would be applicable only  
5 regarding those programs that are  
6 cohort based and which have their  
7 starting -- their curriculum  
8 start in the summer. There are  
9 not many of those, there are only  
10 a few of them, one them for  
11 example I believe is the MBA  
12 Program. So, the idea -- the  
13 basic idea here is to give  
14 international students an  
15 opportunity to apply to programs  
16 to which they would not otherwise  
17 be able to apply but this  
18 proposal has been adjusted to be  
19 narrow enough that it doesn't  
20 create a free for all whereby  
21 international students can apply  
22 to any program whatsoever for  
23 summer admission because there  
24 are concerns about Visas and  
25 there are concerns about the

1 right number of credit hours  
2 being offered onsite rather than  
3 for example via Zoom to fulfill  
4 Visa requirements. So, those  
5 programs, which are cohort based  
6 in which take people in the  
7 summer and which presumably are  
8 going to have the right numbers  
9 of credit hours onsite are  
10 wanting to be able to admit  
11 international applicants and this  
12 proposal would allow that by  
13 setting an application deadline  
14 for the international applicants,  
15 which would be about three months  
16 preceding the domestic student's  
17 deadline. Obviously, that the  
18 greater lead time is needed  
19 because of Visa issues and to  
20 appropriately vet the  
21 applications and transcripts.  
22 So, that would mean that for this  
23 coming Academic Year 2024/2025  
24 there would be a deadline about  
25 the third week of January 2025 --

1                   there would be a deadline about  
2                   the third week of January 2025  
3                   for international students to  
4                   apply for summer admission,  
5                   again, limited -- limited to  
6                   those graduate programs that are  
7                   cohort based and that start in  
8                   the summer. Thank you.

9   MS. COLLETT:       All right. So, there's a  
10                    recommendation that comes from  
11                    the Committee for the Senate to  
12                    approve the establishment of an  
13                    application deadline for summer  
14                    admissions for international  
15                    students in cohort based programs  
16                    with only a summer start  
17                    proposal. Because the motion  
18                    comes from committee no second is  
19                    required. The motion is now on  
20                    the floor and the floor is open  
21                    up to members for questions of  
22                    fact and/or debate. Okay.  
23                    Seeing none, I think it is time  
24                    to vote.

25   MR. ??:            DeShana?

1 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

2 MR. ?? So, sorry. I know we're not --

3 so, like it's not showing up for

4 some of us in Poll Everywhere,

5 like it's two behind for him and

6 it's one behind for me. I'm

7 logged in. I got to vote on the

8 other ones.

9 MS. COLLETT: Okay. I'm not understanding.

10 What now is happening?

11 MR. ??: It's not refreshing.

12 MS. COLLETT: It's not refreshing? Okay. Go

13 back and re-log in then. Let me

14 -- let me go back to my

15 responses. Okay. I'm ready. We

16 have 91 approve, one oppose and

17 one abstention. So, that is

18 approved and moves forward.

19 Thank you. Thank you so much

20 Richard for everything that

21 you've done and your committee.

22 Next, we have Senate UK Core

23 Education Committee. We have

24 Akiko Tanaka and I believe she is

25 going to be online, she was

1                   rushing over, but we got to her a  
2                   little bit quicker. Keiko, not  
3                   Akiko. Keiko Tanaka, I  
4                   apologize. Keiko, are you on?  
5                   But, Akiko, you can present it if  
6                   you want. I don't think she's --  
7                   she just texted and said she was  
8                   logged in. I may skip her and go  
9                   straight to the next item.

10    MS. TANAKA:        I'm sorry. I wasn't able to log  
11                   in. I'm sorry about that.

12    MS. COLLETT:       Okay. I don't --

13    MS. TANAKA:        Can you hear me, DeShana?

14    MS. COLLETT:       Yes, I see you too. Thank you.

15    MS. TANAKA:        I'm sorry about that.

16    MS. COLLETT:       Okay. No, no problem. It's  
17                   fine. I'll go ahead and let you  
18                   present on the proposed UK Core  
19                   Course Proposal Process, there's  
20                   two actually things that we are  
21                   bringing forward from this  
22                   committee and one -- this is kind  
23                   of bundled here so you'll see as  
24                   Keiko goes through it. So, go  
25                   ahead, Keiko, I'll let you start.

1 MS. TANAKA: Yes. There are three items in UK  
2 Core Course Approval Proposal  
3 Process, one is using the Senate  
4 approved syllabus template. I  
5 developed -- we developed the UK  
6 Core Course syllabus template so  
7 that UK Core Courses have clearly  
8 state when the students complete  
9 the class it will satisfy the  
10 particular core requirement. And  
11 so, if you look at the syllabus  
12 template attached to you --  
13 attached to the agenda you can  
14 see there are certain highlighted  
15 areas, those are addition --  
16 addition to the existing Senate  
17 syllabus template, but it's  
18 specific to UK Core Courses.  
19 This has two purposes, one is to  
20 make it clear to the instructor  
21 they are teaching a UK Core  
22 Course and the second is -- is  
23 also indicate to the students  
24 this class is a UK Core. Second  
25 item is within the Curriculog

1 Form in of itself we'd like to  
2 add certain language to make it  
3 clear that when proposing to  
4 offer UK Core Course -- create  
5 the UK Core Course they have both  
6 instructor and department fully  
7 understand that A, they have the  
8 requirements for offering a UK  
9 Core and the second is that they  
10 agree to participate in  
11 assessment and number three is  
12 that it become the unit  
13 responsibility whether it's going  
14 to be department level, college  
15 level or the so-called school or  
16 any other unit level that they  
17 need to maintain integrity of  
18 that course to meet the UK Core  
19 requirements. Part three is that  
20 adding a section to the current  
21 -- current Senate course  
22 checklist there's a section on  
23 the UK Core Courses for the UK  
24 Core Course checklist so that it  
25 makes it easier for the UK Core

1 Education Committee members to  
2 also read through the syllabus in  
3 the Curriculum Form that what  
4 need to be reviewed carefully and  
5 also it makes it clear for the  
6 proposal what kind of items they  
7 need to consider before  
8 submitting the UK Core Course  
9 proposal.

10 MS. COLLETT:

11 All right. So, we have  
12 recommendation from the committee  
13 for the Senate to approve the  
14 proposed UK Core Course Proposal  
15 Process, which includes these  
16 three items. The motion --  
17 because the motion comes from  
18 committee no second is required.  
19 The motion is now on the floor  
20 and the floor is opened up to  
21 members for questions of fact  
22 and/or debate. Okay. Seeing  
23 none, it is time to vote. And  
24 everybody's vote is working now.  
25 Okay. We have 83 approve, four  
oppose and five abstentions. So,



1 that is approved and passes. The  
2 next thing we have is from the UK  
3 Core Committee -- Senate UK Core  
4 Education Committee still Keiko  
5 is the proposed policy on UK  
6 Core's subtitled required  
7 courses.

8 MS. TANAKA: Okay. This policy came about  
9 after month and month of --  
10 actually, years of discussion and  
11 our concern on so-called subtitle  
12 required UK Core Courses. The  
13 reason we are concerned is it  
14 tend to -- we only reviewed one  
15 subtitles syllabus and the  
16 subsequent syllabi never get  
17 reviewed so we are concerned that  
18 there is -- curriculum --. So,  
19 at this moment in time what we  
20 are proposing is A, we no longer  
21 accept any new Core Course  
22 proposal with a subtitle required  
23 and the second -- but only  
24 exception are given to HON, which  
25 is honors prefix and then TECH --

1 I cannot remember the whole title  
2 of the TECH, but TECH courses.  
3 The reason for that is those two  
4 programs have rotating faculty  
5 members who offer those courses  
6 and they depend on subtitle  
7 required courses to be able to  
8 meet their curriculum.  
9 Therefore, for each program we  
10 developed particular institution  
11 mechanism to review the syllabi  
12 of any new proposed subtitle and  
13 so that this policy is simply  
14 that and we are not going to do  
15 anything with already approved UK  
16 Core Courses with subtitle  
17 required. So, it's just to  
18 articulate that no more new  
19 courses, except honors and TECH  
20 because we created institutional  
21 mechanism -- sustainable  
22 institutional mechanism to ensure  
23 that all the subtitle syllabi are  
24 reviewed by UK CC.  
25 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, we have a motion on

1 the floor on a recommendation  
2 from the committee for the Senate  
3 to approve the proposed UK Core  
4 Course proposed policy on UK Core  
5 subtitle required courses. The  
6 motion is up there wrong on the  
7 thing. The motion comes from the  
8 committee and no second is  
9 required. The motion is now on  
10 the floor and the floor is open  
11 to members for questions of fact  
12 and/or debate. Kaveh?

13 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, College of  
14 Engineering. To the best of my  
15 recollection I have two somewhat  
16 editorial cleanup (Inaudible)  
17 them before they were approved,  
18 but it's not showing.

19 MS. COLLETT: Okay.

20 MR. TAGAVI: Unless the proposer wants to  
21 change it I'm not going to make  
22 an amendment, but let me just  
23 explain. In the order of  
24 approval there are five bullets,  
25 Number 5, "Syllabi approve sent

1 to HC Honors College for final  
2 approval," the word, "final,"  
3 bothered me. And then the one  
4 after that said, "Once approved  
5 it's submitted to (Inaudible),"  
6 which is the Senate level, "for  
7 review," the word, "review,"  
8 bothered me and I asked, "Does  
9 this mean approval?" and I was  
10 told, "Yes."

11 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

12 MR. TAGAVI: So, for the record I'd like to  
13 ask that question. Does that  
14 review mean approval so that I'll  
15 be able to tell the Rules  
16 Committee to clean this up  
17 editorially? That's my question.

18 MS. COLLETT: And, Keiko, I know that you  
19 agreed to those changes  
20 editorially and I thought those  
21 were updated online. Are they or  
22 not?

23 MR. TAGAVI: It's not on my copy.

24 MS. COLLETT: It's not on your copy.

25 MR. TAGAVI: If they are willing to change it

1                   then let me tell you I said,  
2                   "Let's change the first one to  
3                   for final college approval,"  
4                   which means Honors College and  
5                   then the last one instead of,  
6                   "for review," says, "For final  
7                   University or Senate approval."  
8                   Those were my suggestions.

9   MS. COLLETT:           Keiko?

10  MS. TANAKA:            Okay. I couldn't hear very well.  
11                        So, the final -- okay. So,  
12                        "Final approval need to come from  
13                        the University Senate"? That's  
14                        what was Kaveh's point? I'm  
15                        sorry. It's really hard -- it  
16                        was very hard to hear it, his  
17                        question.

18  MS. COLLETT:            Okay. I'll have Kaveh repeat it  
19                        because I don't have the proposal  
20                        right in front of me, I thought I  
21                        did over here. Kaveh, can you  
22                        point to exactly the two --

23  MR. TAGAVI:             Yes.

24  MS. COLLETT:            -- places in the proposal?

25  MR. TAGAVI:             Under -- under Number 1, bullet

1 -- the fourth bullet, my  
2 suggestion was to change, "final  
3 approval," to "final college," --  
4 or, "college approval."  
5 (Inaudible). And then the next  
6 bullet, "Once approved the  
7 proposal be submitted to  
8 (Inaudible) for final approval."

9 MS. COLLETT: Did you get that?

10 MS. TANAKA: Oh, I see.

11 MS. COLLETT: Did you --

12 MS. TANAKA: I understood what he said. Was  
13 that what we agree at the Senate  
14 Council meeting?

15 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

16 MS. TANAKA: Okay.

17 MS. COLLETT: That is what we agreed.

18 MS. TANAKA: Okay. So, if that's the case,  
19 yes, that -- that should be --  
20 what we voted on at the Senate  
21 Council should be the one we are  
22 proposing, but I think amendment  
23 was not included in --

24 MS. COLLETT: I will edit this pdf, because  
25 that is what we approved at

1 Senate Council.

2 MS. TANAKA: Yeah.

3 MS. COLLETT: Daniel?

4 MR. KIRCHNER: Yeah, thank you. Daniel

5 Kirchner, Lewis Honors College.

6 I just have a friendly editorial

7 amendment in the Lewis Honors

8 College description there about

9 proposals. We don't have an

10 assistant dean for academic

11 affairs, we have an associate

12 dean, so that just needs to

13 change.

14 MS. TANAKA: Yes. I apologize. I thought

15 that that was the edited version

16 of it, but, yeah, my apology.

17 MS. COLLETT: We have edited that. Would you

18 accept that friendly amendment,

19 Keiko?

20 MS. TANAKA: Yes. Yes, absolute.

21 MS. COLLETT: We are amending now approving --

22 saving it and we'll update it on

23 the website. Okay. Any further

24 questions/comments on the

25 proposal? Kaveh?

1 MR. TAGAVI: Can we add (Inaudible) --

2 MS. COLLETT: Yes, we can.

3 MR. TAGAVI: -- accommodation?

4 MS. COLLETT: Yes, we can. Voting is open.

5 Now, I know we had more votes

6 than this. We have 81 approve,

7 four opposed and three

8 abstentions. That is approved.

9 Thank you so much, Keiko, for all

10 the work you're doing with the

11 Core Committee. We truly, truly

12 appreciate it.

13 MS. TANAKA: Thank you.

14 MS. COLLETT: Next, we have Senate Rules and

15 Elections Committee, SREC, Roger

16 Brown is the chair. This is a

17 approval of a proposed -- a

18 proposal to allow local waiver of

19 course prerequisites. Bob

20 Grossman is going to present this

21 for us today.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's my pleasure to propose

23 approving the proposed proposal.

24 So, this was a -- the origin of

25 this proposal was -- came from



1 the Registrar's Office actually  
2 they came and they alerted Senate  
3 Council Office to the fact that  
4 there were people -- faculty,  
5 departments, colleges, I'm not  
6 sure exactly who but who were  
7 using course waivers as a means  
8 of controlling enrollment in  
9 certain courses, not as it is  
10 intended which is to allow  
11 students who may not have  
12 formally taken a prerequisite,  
13 but may have the required  
14 knowledge or are considered good  
15 enough students that they can  
16 acquire the necessary knowledge  
17 to do well in the course. So,  
18 the rules are actually pretty  
19 clear even though they were  
20 perfectly well ignored by  
21 everyone until recently. But the  
22 rules are that the course  
23 description that's approved by  
24 the Senate should lay out under  
25 what conditions prerequisites can

1 be waived and that can include by  
2 consent of instructor, which many  
3 courses have added to the  
4 description or there can be a  
5 general policy on the part of the  
6 academic unit that's in charge of  
7 that course. But that wasn't  
8 followed by anyone and I think in  
9 a lot of places it was just by  
10 consent of instructor whether the  
11 Senate had approved that or not  
12 or whether the faculty who  
13 proposed the course originally  
14 whether they had approved that or  
15 not. So, you might remember last  
16 fall the Rules Election Committee  
17 presented a proposed policy on  
18 this and it was widely booed down  
19 by the Senate at that time and  
20 mainly being that there wasn't  
21 enough consideration given to  
22 different processes already in  
23 place for approving course  
24 waivers for different students  
25 and that was perfectly fair and

1 valid criticism. So, I took it  
2 upon myself to write a new  
3 version of the rule, which is  
4 what you have before you now and  
5 it says, "The faculty in charge  
6 of a course or a group of courses  
7 shall establish a policy for  
8 waivers of prerequisites in the  
9 courses that that body controls,"  
10 and however you want to create  
11 that process for approving it is  
12 fine there's just a few  
13 requirements, first of all that  
14 students who have not yet  
15 enrolled in the course can see  
16 what the waiver prerequisites  
17 are. So, a lot of people might  
18 say, "I'll just put it in my  
19 syllabus," but where are they  
20 going to find you syllabus if  
21 they're not -- if you put it in  
22 Canvas, but they're not enrolled  
23 in the course and they can't get  
24 into the Canvas to see the -- see  
25 the prerequisite. So, the

1 intention is there will be some  
2 separate place on the  
3 departmental website presumably  
4 or the college website where  
5 students can see what the  
6 prerequisite waiver policy is and  
7 then they can -- it will also say  
8 there who they should apply to  
9 for a waiver and who -- and then  
10 the unit shall establish who  
11 shall agree to the -- decide on  
12 the waiver, whether it's the  
13 instructor or the Director of  
14 Undergraduate Studies, the  
15 Director of Graduate Studies, the  
16 Chair, whatever they want,  
17 Curriculum Committee, whatever --  
18 whoever they want and then their  
19 decision then gets sent back to  
20 the student and sent to the  
21 Registrar and because the  
22 Registrar wants to be sure that  
23 these requests are valid and have  
24 occurred according to regular  
25 academic process they -- the

1 Registrar will establish a  
2 process for reporting these  
3 prerequisite waivers that the  
4 local units shall use to report  
5 them. And then we will also have  
6 -- be able to look at, are there  
7 courses where there are a lot of  
8 prerequisites being waived, if so  
9 perhaps the prerequisites should  
10 be changed appropriately or maybe  
11 someone needs to talk to the  
12 faculty in charge and say, "Look,  
13 you have this unusual number of  
14 waivers being granted and you  
15 should think about this." So,  
16 that's the new policy -- proposed  
17 proposal for a policy.

18 MS. COLLETT: Perfect. So, there's a  
19 recommendation from the committee  
20 for the Senate to approve the  
21 proposed proposal to allow local  
22 waiver of course prerequisites.  
23 The motion comes from committee  
24 and no second is required. The  
25 motion is now on the floor and

1 the floor is opened up to members  
2 for questions of fact and/or  
3 debate. Okay. Seeing none, then  
4 it is time to vote. Thank you.  
5 We have 87 approve, three oppose  
6 and three abstentions. That  
7 passes. Thank you. Thank you,  
8 SREC for all the work you have  
9 done for sure in everything  
10 (Inaudible). Next, we have Ad  
11 Hoc Committee on Teaching  
12 Evaluation Report, Elizabeth Salt  
13 is the Chair. And let me pull --  
14 well, I did pdf this and the  
15 other -- okay. Elizabeth, let me  
16 just pull it up here. Sorry.

17 MS. SALT: Hi, everyone. Thank you. I'm  
18 Elizabeth Salt. I am from -- I  
19 Chair the Senate Ad Hoc Teaching  
20 Evaluation Committee. I just  
21 have a short Power Point to try  
22 to consolidate the 86-page  
23 report, which I'm sure everyone  
24 will appreciate. So, I just want  
25 to just recognize all of the

1 committee members that put forth  
2 a lot of effort to put forward  
3 these recommendations. I also  
4 just want to review too the  
5 committee charge. So, we were  
6 asked to have a -- there were two  
7 parts to our ask, one is to  
8 review aspects of the Teacher  
9 Course Evaluations, reviewing  
10 past relevant faculty reports on  
11 Teacher Course Evaluations, the  
12 current TCE Survey Instruments,  
13 potential new software for TCE  
14 Survey distribution, appropriate  
15 uses of the TCE results, national  
16 standards. And then the second  
17 part of it was that we were asked  
18 to provide recommendations based  
19 on national best practices to  
20 improve Teacher Course  
21 Evaluations broadly in  
22 consideration of trying to  
23 decrease bias. I just want to  
24 recognize that TCE is referring  
25 to Teacher Course Evaluations,

1 which is the student evaluation  
2 of teaching at our institution.  
3 So, the rationale for the charge  
4 is that there's recognized  
5 efforts at institutions of higher  
6 education broadly and then also  
7 organizations representing our R1  
8 level institutions in the US to  
9 improve teaching evaluation.  
10 There's also recognized  
11 limitations to the historical use  
12 of the metrics most notably the  
13 student evaluation of teaching  
14 recognizing that it's a bias  
15 metric that has been broadly  
16 described in the literature,  
17 there is racial/ethnic bias,  
18 gender bias, non-response bias  
19 and measurement bias, similarly  
20 the evaluation had not been  
21 reviewed by Senate since 2017.  
22 So, that brings us to our  
23 committee's approach to our  
24 charge. First, we reviewed the  
25 Senate's past efforts. We



1 reviewed the literature broadly.  
2 We also benchmarked national  
3 institutions or national  
4 standards. We evaluated TCE at  
5 UK and then we considered  
6 potential platform integrations.  
7 So, the Teacher Course  
8 Evaluation, this is just an  
9 overall response rate over the  
10 past few years in the report in  
11 the appendices is by college over  
12 time, so that's just sort of an  
13 overview of part of what we  
14 looked at. Also, looking at the  
15 historical effort of Teacher  
16 Course Evaluation we looked at  
17 prior Senate efforts and I'll  
18 kind of outline those broadly.  
19 So, in 2015 common questions were  
20 identified, in 2016 numerical  
21 scores for TCE were available to  
22 students and faculty and then  
23 there was a -- there was the  
24 delineation of the uses of what  
25 is the current TCE. So, the

1 current TCE has the instructor  
2 evaluation and it has the course  
3 evaluation. The instructor  
4 evaluation part belongs to  
5 administration and is used for  
6 the purposes of performance  
7 evaluation. The course  
8 evaluation is used by faculty for  
9 the purposes of improving courses  
10 and teaching. So, there was also  
11 efforts to address FERPA and  
12 anonymity whenever there are less  
13 than five TCE responses and of  
14 course that was that they would  
15 not be disseminated. So, we also  
16 looked at new software platforms.  
17 Chair Collett and myself attended  
18 the demonstrations of the new  
19 platforms that were potentially  
20 being considered by the  
21 University and we used some of  
22 the features of those potential  
23 options in our recommendations.  
24 We also benchmarked peer  
25 institutions. We had 40

1 benchmark institutions that we  
2 reviewed, that's in the  
3 appendices of the full report.  
4 We used the University benchmarks  
5 outlined by IRES and then we also  
6 met with Claire Berg at the  
7 Association of American  
8 Universities who is chairing a  
9 group -- a learning community to  
10 address teacher evaluations and  
11 she was able to direct us to some  
12 of those institutions that are  
13 doing a lot of work in the area.  
14 I just have some of the work sort  
15 of as a visual of what's being  
16 done at other universities, but  
17 there are considerable efforts  
18 that have been done over the past  
19 decade, including \$9 million in  
20 NSF funding from -- to one  
21 particular university that they  
22 have been doing work for over a  
23 decade in this area. So, we went  
24 to look at TCE at the University  
25 of Kentucky, we used a two-prong

1 approach. The first prong of our  
2 -- the first -- we wanted to --  
3 we got an IRE approved study, we  
4 administered a self -- a self-  
5 reported survey to  
6 administrators, faculty and  
7 students and we used -- we did  
8 some qualitative and quantitative  
9 analysis of the results  
10 specifically to faculty and we  
11 have those reported in the  
12 report, but they are also some of  
13 those major themes reported here.  
14 We also did some predictive  
15 modeling and some comparisons in  
16 our statistical approach to  
17 evaluating this data and we did  
18 find that there were some -- some  
19 predictors of TCE scores, which  
20 aligns with the literature  
21 broadly. We also used  
22 institutional data to look to see  
23 if there are predictors of TCE  
24 scores and there were over  
25 618,000 TCE responses that were

1 used in this data analysis  
2 Again, we were able to find  
3 predictors of TCE scores. So,  
4 that brings us to how we -- this  
5 was the -- the work that we did  
6 in order to develop these  
7 recommendations, but our  
8 recommendations are the current  
9 instrument known as the Teacher  
10 Course Evaluations should be  
11 considered only as a measurement  
12 of the student's perception of  
13 the learning experience entitled  
14 accordingly. Similarly, the TCE  
15 should include items that are  
16 able to produce a valid and  
17 reliable measure of the same.  
18 The committee recommends that the  
19 survey of the student's  
20 evaluation of the learning  
21 experience be titled, "The Survey  
22 of the Student's Learning  
23 Experience." Items of the SSLE  
24 or the Student -- the Survey of  
25 the Student's Learning Experience

1 should be applicable to all  
2 teaching modalities and phrased  
3 accordingly. Future efforts to  
4 address teaching evaluation  
5 should evaluate and adapt current  
6 items to accommodate this  
7 recommendation. The measure of  
8 the student's perception to the  
9 learning experience should be one  
10 of multiple sources of evaluation  
11 of teaching of course quality.  
12 The evaluation of teaching  
13 effectiveness in course quality  
14 should include two additional  
15 metrics to represent the three  
16 relevant perspectives of teaching  
17 and learning, peers or content  
18 experts, student's experience to  
19 learn and self. And then we have  
20 given some examples of what that  
21 might look like, also suggestions  
22 of standardized rubrics and also  
23 emphasize the importance of self-  
24 reflection as a process of  
25 (Inaudible) improvement. Five,

1 is we should offer -- students  
2 should be offered resources on  
3 constructive feedback and  
4 instructors should be provided  
5 with resources on interpreting  
6 student's evaluations of the  
7 learning experience and  
8 approaches to improve teaching.  
9 To the greatest extent possible  
10 the university should survey and  
11 delete student feedback that  
12 relay inappropriate or abusive  
13 comments and personal attacks  
14 prior to providing course  
15 evaluations to instructors. And  
16 in the case that response rates  
17 do not meet the threshold for  
18 reporting survey results  
19 aggregated data by instructor or  
20 course over time should be made  
21 available to faculty. These  
22 results are important to  
23 improving teaching and therefore  
24 should be accessible. And then  
25 also, mechanisms to improve the

1 response rate for the student's  
2 survey of the student's  
3 perception of the learning  
4 experience should be integrated  
5 into courses and there's some  
6 examples there. And then we also  
7 said work on improving the  
8 evaluation of the student's  
9 learning experience should  
10 continue and involve key  
11 stakeholders. Here's just a  
12 visual of recommendations and  
13 there's an info graphic of the  
14 recommendations. We also felt  
15 that there is not a current  
16 section of the Senate Rules to  
17 address this, but we felt that it  
18 would be appropriate in that  
19 there should be consideration in  
20 the Senate Rules somewhat to the  
21 effect of the evaluation of  
22 Teaching effectiveness and course  
23 quality should be comprised of  
24 the three distinct perspectives  
25 of teaching and learning, peer,



1 student experience and self.

2 MS. COLLETT: Whew. You summed that up, my  
3 darling. Thank you so, so, so  
4 much. Okay. Let me pull this  
5 down for a minute. All right.  
6 So, you have a recommendation  
7 from the Ad Hoc Committee to  
8 accept the proposed Teaching  
9 Evaluation Report as well as  
10 direct -- it should say Senate  
11 Council or it does say -- direct  
12 Senate Council to take any next  
13 actions regarding recommendations  
14 related to the Senate Rules. The  
15 motion is now on the floor.  
16 Since the motion comes from  
17 committee no second is required.  
18 The motion is now on the floor  
19 and the floor is opened up to  
20 members for questions of fact  
21 and/or debate. Kaveh?

22 MR TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I  
23 have a quick question. Are the  
24 student's comments only used to  
25 improve teaching or are they also



1 cases as evidence of teaching  
2 excellence or lack thereof. But  
3 my question had to do with  
4 redacting comments that are  
5 abusive or contain offensive  
6 language. I think the intent is  
7 noble, but I would want somebody  
8 or some body to be keeping track  
9 of that and reviewing and that  
10 sort of thing so that if there's  
11 evidence over say three years  
12 that student's comments are  
13 getting more and more hateful and  
14 abusive then we can do something  
15 about it. So, I think there  
16 needs to be some sort of  
17 recording or tracking mechanism  
18 involved with that.

19 MS. COLLETT: I agree. Any other questions of  
20 fact and/or debate? Well, I  
21 thank the Ad Hoc Committee for --  
22 I mean this was like a year and  
23 something long sort of process  
24 and they did a tremendous amount  
25 of work and excellent work,

1 particularly with the data  
2 analysis. So, I hope people  
3 actually do read this report,  
4 look over the Power Point,  
5 because it's alarming. They  
6 found some of the same things  
7 here at our University that go  
8 right along with national trends  
9 as far as some of the qualitative  
10 evidence and who gets scored  
11 lower in particular if we're  
12 using that in promotion and  
13 tenure that's a problem and so we  
14 need to recognize that and figure  
15 out ways in order to rectify  
16 that. So, thank you all and  
17 everyone that's on the committee.  
18 Thank you, Elizabeth. So, our  
19 next item, we have the proposed  
20 University -- oh, I'm sorry. We  
21 have to vote. Getting ahead of  
22 myself, aren't I? We have 90  
23 approve, two oppose and three  
24 abstentions. That passes. Thank  
25 you, Elizabeth and the Ad Hoc

1                   Committee. The next item we have  
2                   is proposed University Senate  
3                   Resolution of No Confidence. I  
4                   will allow Scott Yost to present  
5                   the resolution.

6   MR. YOST:           Thank you, Chair Collett. Given  
7                   the significance of this matter,  
8                   and I know you've all had a  
9                   chance to review it based on the  
10                  agenda, but I am just going to  
11                  take -- and I'm going to read the  
12                  proposal as it is. University  
13                  Senate Resolution of No  
14                  Confidence, "The University of  
15                  Kentucky has a long and  
16                  successful history of shared  
17                  governance. For decades,  
18                  faculty, students and  
19                  administrative staff have decided  
20                  broad educational policy together  
21                  as members of the University  
22                  Senate. Together these  
23                  constituent groups and their  
24                  allies have advanced the  
25                  University in research, teaching,

1 service and patient care  
2 fostering growth and promoting  
3 excellence for the Commonwealth.  
4 President Capilouto has  
5 accomplished much since becoming  
6 president in 2011.  
7 Unfortunately, recent events  
8 surrounding revisions to shared  
9 governance at UK has called into  
10 question President Capilouto's  
11 ability to lead. Whereas, the  
12 Board of Trustees at the  
13 University of Kentucky tasked  
14 President Capilouto in February  
15 of 2024 with recommending changes  
16 to UK Shared Governance  
17 structures. Whereas, the  
18 President created unnecessary and  
19 harmful division when he  
20 amplified false narratives at  
21 faculty members, the University  
22 Senate do not prioritize student  
23 needs or value diverse  
24 representation, despite much  
25 evidence to the contrary and

1 despite the University Senate's  
2 stated openness to membership and  
3 procedural improvements.  
4 Whereas, in formulating his  
5 recommendations the President  
6 made significant repeated  
7 management errors that have  
8 created unnecessary confusion,  
9 anxiety and risks within the  
10 University community. Whereas,  
11 in response to the President's  
12 mismanagement the University  
13 Senate urged the President and  
14 the Board to pause the process  
15 and engage collaboratively with  
16 representative constituent groups  
17 to ensure a more inclusive,  
18 transparent and confidence  
19 building decision making process.  
20 See Resolutions 1, 2 and 3  
21 previously passed by the Senate  
22 body. Whereas, because the  
23 President and Board continues to  
24 rush without a pause despite  
25 mismanagement a foundation of

1 trust now does not exist to  
2 support the President's planned  
3 changes leaving the elected  
4 faculty representatives, in  
5 particular, with no confidence in  
6 the President or his ability to  
7 cultivate strong shared  
8 governance at UK. Be it  
9 resolved, that the University  
10 Senate expresses no confidence in  
11 the President or his shared  
12 governance recommendations  
13 including revisions to the  
14 Governing Regulations. Be it  
15 further resolved, that the  
16 University Senate advises the  
17 Board to redo the process of  
18 shared governance reform, so that  
19 the President can address the  
20 University Senate's concerns and  
21 restore this body's confidence in  
22 the President, his  
23 recommendations and the promise  
24 of vibrant shared governance at  
25 UK. Be it finally resolved, that



1 the University Senate advises the  
2 President to redevelop his  
3 recommendations using a process  
4 characterized by transparency,  
5 openness and genuine authentic  
6 collaboration. This process  
7 should recognize the benefit and  
8 advantages of involving faculty,  
9 staff and students in decision  
10 making and conflict resolution  
11 granting them meaningful agency  
12 and authority beyond advisory  
13 roles." I submit this to the  
14 Senate for consideration and  
15 approval.

16 MS. COLLETT: So, we have the motion, I will  
17 entertain a second. Akiko  
18 seconds the motion. The motion  
19 is now on the floor and the floor  
20 is opened up to members for  
21 questions of fact and/or debate.  
22 Okay. We have --

23 MR. YOST: Scott Yost, College of  
24 Engineering. It's a heavy day at  
25 the University of Kentucky. We

1 have been for several months  
2 through some quite honestly very  
3 difficult, trying, challenging  
4 times and folks this is, you  
5 know, a low point. These last  
6 several months have been a low  
7 point for the University of  
8 Kentucky. Anybody I have spoken  
9 with has not been excited about  
10 this resolution, they have been  
11 certainly taken aback by the  
12 President's -- or I'm just going  
13 to say in general the  
14 leadership's actions and just  
15 know that, you know, through the  
16 last several months nobody here  
17 at the University of Kentucky is  
18 a winner pass or fail of this  
19 resolution. And in fact, I do  
20 want to make it very clear though  
21 that we are here today 100  
22 percent due to the President, not  
23 because of what the Senate is  
24 doing, but it's 100 percent on  
25 the President and the leadership

1 of this University. And so, keep  
2 that in mind as we discuss and go  
3 forward.

4 MS. COLLETT: Thank you.

5 MR. BUCHHEIT: Rudy Buchheit, Engineering. A  
6 question for the Chair or really  
7 anyone from the Senate. I'm  
8 curious if the Senate in part or  
9 in whole has formulated an  
10 alternate governance proposal at  
11 this time?

12 MS. COLLETT: We have tried, yes. We have sat  
13 with the President and I have  
14 personally sat with the President  
15 and the Provost in our meetings  
16 to get alternate structure to the  
17 -- to a new University Senate,  
18 including more voices at the  
19 table. So, yes.

20 MR. BUCHHEIT: Thank you.

21 MS. COLLETT: Are there -- Kaveh Tagavi.

22 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi -- (Inaudible).

23 MS. COLLETT: Yes, yes.

24 MR. TAGAVI: I have asked our Chair, yourself,  
25 several times to please invite

1 the President to come to the  
2 Senate Council so that we could  
3 have a intimate discussion. Yes,  
4 we have met with the President  
5 when he invited us and it was a  
6 very good meeting I felt like,  
7 but to the best of my knowledge  
8 we have never had the President  
9 or the Provost designated to --  
10 to discuss the proposed GRs at  
11 every step and I regret that we  
12 never did that. I brought up the  
13 idea of taskforce, which would be  
14 let's say three or four  
15 administration sitting down with  
16 three or four faculty leaders.  
17 That never happened. To the best  
18 of my knowledge we are talking  
19 past each other to some degree.  
20 We keep saying -- being told  
21 that, "This increases faculty  
22 involvement," but it's a fact,  
23 it's not an opinion, it's a fact  
24 that we will become advisory.  
25 Right now we have decisional

1 authority. You guys notice some  
2 of the discussions today -- these  
3 discussions would evaporate. So,  
4 I wish we would agree on some  
5 facts. I wish I don't have to  
6 raise my hand and correct my  
7 colleagues if they say, "Oh, this  
8 is not going to take away the  
9 faculty authority," it is taking  
10 away the faculty authority.  
11 Let's discuss other stuff, not  
12 facts.

13 MS. COLLETT: Thank you.

14 MR. TAGAVI: Thank you.

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

17 MR. BALLARD: Hubie Ballard, College of  
18 Medicine, Trustee. So, a couple  
19 of comments and points. I would  
20 say that regarding the Board  
21 reassessing and redoing the  
22 process it's very clear that the  
23 Board is unanimously in favor of  
24 this, they voted 19 to 1 for  
25 passing this and the Board is not

1 going to change that perspective,  
2 it's only going to continue to be  
3 very supportive of the President.  
4 Secondly, this does move faculty  
5 decision making away from the  
6 Senate, I agree, but it moves it  
7 to the college level where the  
8 college level faculty members can  
9 make decisions. And so, yes, it  
10 is a different model than what we  
11 currently have, some view that as  
12 good and there is a large body of  
13 faculty that continue to view  
14 that as good. And so -- and  
15 lastly, I would say the most  
16 important thing continues to be  
17 how we move forward from here in  
18 terms of engaging in the process  
19 and collaborating in a positive  
20 manner.

21 MS. COLLETT: I have Richard Charnigo.

22 MR. CHARNIGO: Richard Charnigo, Public Health.  
23 This is a situation that none of  
24 us wanted to find ourselves in.  
25 I don't agree with the course on

1 which President Capilouto has  
2 embarked, however, I am not going  
3 to vote for this motion. I'm  
4 going to vote against this  
5 motion. I know that there are  
6 many good people, people whom I  
7 respect, who favor this motion  
8 and that there are legitimate  
9 reasons to be dissatisfied some  
10 of those were articulated in the  
11 text of the motion, but I don't  
12 see that a no-confidence vote is  
13 going to help matters. I prefer,  
14 at this juncture, to see our  
15 leaders in shared governance  
16 engage with President Capilouto  
17 on modifications of the ARs,  
18 which are a step below the GRs.  
19 The GRs may well be pretty solid  
20 with what the Board wants, but  
21 the ARs may yet be negotiable and  
22 if President Capilouto can be  
23 receptive to this discussion, not  
24 just listening to what people  
25 say, but really working

1 collaboratively with them that is  
2 my hope. And I also hope that in  
3 the interest of avoiding  
4 confusion and disorder that the  
5 existing Senate Rules can be  
6 upheld until and unless they are  
7 found to contradict Governing or  
8 Administrative Regulations. I  
9 don't think we want to throw out  
10 our Senate Rules, there are many  
11 good things in there. But all  
12 that said -- all that said I  
13 can't vote for this resolution.  
14 I don't think this is going to  
15 help matters. Thank you.

16 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Padraic and then  
17 Molly.

18 MR. KENNEY: Padraic Kenney, Graduate School.  
19 I want to speak really carefully  
20 here because I greatly respect  
21 colleagues who are likely to vote  
22 in favor of this motion. I do  
23 want to say that though I am not  
24 primarily a faculty member at  
25 this point I'm confident that if



1 I were a regular tenure-line  
2 faculty member I would also be  
3 voting against this motion and  
4 that just comes from my  
5 experience with faculty shared  
6 governance. But I want to speak  
7 from a different perspective that  
8 I haven't heard brought up and  
9 now is probably the time to do  
10 so. I want to speak as someone  
11 who has spent 30 years studying  
12 non-violent protests and one of  
13 the key things one has to take  
14 into account, and there's really  
15 not a kind of non-violent protest  
16 that I've not written about, one  
17 of the things you always want to  
18 take into account is, is it well  
19 suited to the issue at hand. To  
20 take an extreme example, and I'm  
21 not analogizing here just for  
22 illustration, if people were to  
23 propose a hunger strike, for  
24 example, I think most of us would  
25 agree, "Wow, that's not fitting

1 the action very well." I think  
2 the measures that the Senate has  
3 taken so far, for example  
4 collecting signatures, proposing  
5 alternatives are whether or not  
6 one might agree with the  
7 specifics makes sense. I would  
8 submit that a no-confidence vote  
9 does not make a great deal of  
10 sense. And here I want to be  
11 very careful of what I say.  
12 Let's imagine that some of the  
13 concerns that some faculty have  
14 raised about what might happen in  
15 the new governing system that is  
16 coming and people have talked  
17 about programs will be closed,  
18 rules will be imposed upon how we  
19 can teach in the classroom and so  
20 on, honestly, I don't think any  
21 of those things are likely to  
22 happen, but lets imagine that  
23 they were. At that point it  
24 would make sense for some  
25 faculty, I don't know how I would



1 resolution, although I am  
2 grateful for the opportunity to  
3 debate it. I wish that I shared  
4 my colleagues confidence that  
5 there was a possibility of moving  
6 forward together with productive  
7 partnerships. The resolution as  
8 written is quite focused on the  
9 process up to this point, which  
10 unfortunately for me has not  
11 inspired confidence in the future  
12 of these deliberations. The  
13 process began in February with  
14 manipulation and misinformation a  
15 claim that we are outliers  
16 compared to our benchmarks.  
17 However, if you look at our  
18 institutional benchmarks, our  
19 official UK institutional  
20 benchmarks, of which there are  
21 20, 13 of the 20 have governing  
22 structures that include Senates  
23 with delegated decisional making  
24 authority and responsibilities  
25 over educational policy,

1 including admissions, these  
2 include the University of  
3 California-Los Angeles, the  
4 University of Illinois, the  
5 University of California-  
6 Berkeley, UC Davis, University of  
7 -- nope, Pennsylvania State  
8 University, the University of  
9 Virginia, Minnesota Twin Cities,  
10 University of Maryland, the  
11 University of California-San  
12 Diego, Purdue, the University of  
13 North Carolina, Rutgers and UK  
14 makes 13. So, it's -- we began  
15 with a campaign of  
16 misinformation. The process  
17 itself, and this is where I've  
18 had the privilege of being in the  
19 meetings with the President with  
20 Senate Council, the process has  
21 not been transparent and we have  
22 not been allowed to be partners  
23 in moving forward together. I  
24 think that had the President  
25 taken a different approach we may

1 have gotten to a very similar  
2 place in terms of revisions to  
3 the governance structures, but we  
4 would have all been facing  
5 forward together toward the  
6 future. Instead, a question that  
7 I posed in one of these Senate  
8 Council sessions, one of the  
9 things they're taking from us is  
10 admissions, so I asked in order  
11 to open a conversation about  
12 this, "Given that we have record  
13 admissions year over year, what  
14 is it about admissions that you  
15 don't have now from us that you  
16 need?" this question was met with  
17 silence and when I tried to  
18 pursue it again, "Mr. President,  
19 this is a sincere question. It's  
20 important," he said, "Thank you,"  
21 and we moved on. We have not  
22 been partners in formulating  
23 these resolutions and revisions  
24 together. The third and final  
25 point I'd like to make is that

1                   there's also problems around a  
2                   severe lack of transparency and  
3                   the details of these revised  
4                   governing regulations and they go  
5                   beyond the structure of shared  
6                   governance and they go so far as  
7                   to change the definition of  
8                   academic freedom. So, if you  
9                   haven't had the chance to look  
10                  closely I would invite you to  
11                  compare the previous definition  
12                  or current -- excuse me, our  
13                  current definition of academic  
14                  freedom and the one that is  
15                  proposed in these new GRs that  
16                  have already passed with the  
17                  first reading with the Board of  
18                  Trustees. And I would like to  
19                  point out that there has been no  
20                  discussion or deliberation  
21                  whatsoever as far as I am aware  
22                  of these changes to the  
23                  definition of academic freedom.  
24                  So, in our current iteration it's  
25                  quite capacious, "Faculty members

1 shall be permitted and encouraged  
2 to investigate any theory, any  
3 challenge, any premise, engage in  
4 political and social debate and  
5 to express their dissent without  
6 jeopardy to their academic  
7 careers provided their behavior  
8 is not in violation of the law  
9 and does not interfere with the  
10 normal operation of the  
11 educational programs of the  
12 University," that's an excerpt  
13 from our current definition of  
14 academic freedom. Under the new  
15 GRs, this is GR1-A, Part C it  
16 tells us what academic freedom is  
17 and what academic freedom is not,  
18 "While all faculty members of the  
19 University have academic freedom  
20 it is particularly important to  
21 faculty members, regardless of  
22 tenure status or tenure  
23 eligibility, faculty academic  
24 freedom covers all classroom  
25 speech related to the subject of



1 the course and all scholarly  
2 speech related to the faculty  
3 member's area of expertise. Yet,  
4 as (Inaudible) is the value of  
5 academic freedom is it is  
6 important to also delineate what  
7 it is not. In a classroom  
8 faculty members should be free  
9 and must be free to express their  
10 views and perspectives on issues  
11 related to their academic  
12 expertise. Formal instruction  
13 does not allow faculty members to  
14 impose their personal viewpoints  
15 on students or engage in  
16 promotion of ideas outside their  
17 domains of expertise. Formal  
18 instruction is for learning and  
19 discussion, not indoctrination."  
20 That's the new definition of  
21 academic freedom for the  
22 University of Kentucky as  
23 proposed in these revised  
24 Governing Regulations. I am not  
25 here to say whether this is

1 appropriate or not. I am here  
2 simply to point out that this is  
3 very different, that this has  
4 language that is quite connected  
5 with contemporary political  
6 debates and we have not discussed  
7 this as a University community  
8 and the fact that we have not  
9 discussed this, we have not come  
10 to a shared understanding around  
11 the need for these changes or  
12 where -- from where they  
13 originated I find deeply  
14 disturbing. As a result with a  
15 heavy heart I will be voting for  
16 this resolution of no confidence.

17 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Akiko, then Bobby,  
18 Cagle, Doug and then Chipper.

19 MS. TANAKA: Akiko Tanaka, Arts and Sciences.  
20 That is a very difficult act to  
21 follow, but also in response to  
22 two speakers, three speakers ago.  
23 So, I too was in a small group of  
24 faculty leadership who has met  
25 with the President multiple times

1 with recommendations. We have  
2 spent many hours preparing for  
3 these meetings and we have spent  
4 much emotional energy into these  
5 meetings and our voices have not  
6 been heard at all. So, I just  
7 wanted to respond to that point  
8 of the speaker. So, I believe  
9 this is last week, the Board of  
10 Trustees Chairperson wrote an op-  
11 ed in Herald Leader and I wish I  
12 had copied the title of the  
13 piece, but it was to -- it was  
14 something to the effect of the  
15 Members of the Board of Trustees  
16 are successful business people.  
17 We know what is good for the  
18 University of Kentucky and I want  
19 to point out that the University  
20 is not a business, a university  
21 is not a business. The goal of a  
22 business to make more profit and  
23 make the shareholders happy, that  
24 is not the goal of a university.  
25 The goal -- one of the many goals

1 of this University is to provide  
2 quality education and experience  
3 to the students and this cannot  
4 be -- this cannot happen if the  
5 University is run like a  
6 business. This cannot happen if  
7 the University is just interested  
8 in increasing admissions,  
9 increasing its value -- monetary  
10 value. The President has been  
11 very successful in doing that,  
12 however, we are not a business.  
13 That was point one. Point two,  
14 the process of dismantling the  
15 University Senate, which is core  
16 to the ability of the University  
17 to provide quality education and  
18 experience to the students, that  
19 process was conducted based on a  
20 study by an external consultant  
21 that did not engage with  
22 University Senate itself, did not  
23 talk to the Chair of the  
24 University Senate Council and  
25 produced a non-scientific

1 recommendation based on outdated  
2 data. The member of the  
3 consultant company -- an employee  
4 of the consultant company himself  
5 admitted that the data was not  
6 meant to be scientific. And yet,  
7 based on that unscientific data  
8 the consultant recommended that  
9 the University Senate is the core  
10 of all of the problems that this  
11 University has and as a result we  
12 are being dismantled. Did the  
13 University Senate have problems?  
14 Of course. Were some of the  
15 processes too cumbersome?  
16 Absolutely. And so, we saw this  
17 as the perfect opportunity for us  
18 to revisit, change some of the  
19 structures and improve some of  
20 the Senate Rules, streamline the  
21 regulations, right. And we had  
22 also invited, with the previous  
23 resolution, more students onto  
24 the University Senate with voting  
25 power. We proposed to invite

1 staff onto the University Senate  
2 with voting power, not advisory.  
3 If we're advisory there is no  
4 guarantee that whatever we say is  
5 going to be taken seriously. I  
6 heard that staff wants family  
7 care leave, right, the new  
8 version of the University Senate  
9 can do that, the faculty will  
10 work and fight for staff family  
11 leave -- family care leave.  
12 Students wanted attendance  
13 policies modified, they wanted  
14 the fall break earlier, that's  
15 what I heard from students. Come  
16 onto the University Senate and  
17 lets work on doing that.  
18 However, we are now being  
19 dismantled and instead the  
20 President has siloed the three  
21 groups, students, staff, faculty  
22 separately and sort of pitted  
23 against us against each other to  
24 prevent us from working together.  
25 So, we -- the University Senate

1 voted on a resolution to make  
2 these changes, the kind of  
3 changes that I'm talking about,  
4 happen at our previous meeting.  
5 The President did not engage with  
6 that resolution, except to  
7 forward it to the Chair of the  
8 Board of Trustees. I have no  
9 confidence in this President or  
10 the Board of Trustees except for  
11 my esteemed colleague, Hollie  
12 Swanson, and so, I will be voting  
13 yes to this resolution. Thank  
14 you.

15 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Bobby?

16 MR. SCROGGINS: Bobby Scroggins, College of Fine  
17 Arts. I would agree that this is  
18 a really, really sad day that we  
19 are in the position where we have  
20 to consider such a drastic move.  
21 I've been, you know, losing sleep  
22 over this situation for the past  
23 several weeks now. But, you  
24 know, I want to make sure that I  
25 understand, as a relatively new

1                   Senator -- I'm concerned about  
2                   how we make decisions based on  
3                   reaction and -- and also I want  
4                   to ask some questions before I  
5                   cast a vote. I ask this for  
6                   various reasons, one is that we  
7                   always -- we need to be thinking  
8                   about long-term and short-term  
9                   implications to whatever type of  
10                  decision gets made. I think that  
11                  sometimes there are unforeseen  
12                  consequences that are based on  
13                  that and whatever types of  
14                  decisions are made in this regard  
15                  and I think it should be -- we  
16                  should consider this thing very,  
17                  very carefully before, you know,  
18                  such a move is made. I perceive  
19                  a vote of no confidence as  
20                  basically a vote of condemnation  
21                  and while I am very, very  
22                  disappointed that the optics of  
23                  the President's approach to doing  
24                  what he's doing and the Board as  
25                  well, with the exception to one



1 voting member. I would like to  
2 hear from someone who is -- who  
3 is opposed to this and someone  
4 who is -- is in favor in terms of  
5 what do you think the outcomes  
6 will be with regard to a vote of  
7 no confidence and what -- what  
8 are we going to achieve as a  
9 result of this? That's my  
10 question.

11 MS. COLLETT: Okay. I'll let a couple more  
12 people go and if they want to  
13 answer that I will let them do  
14 so. The next person is Cagle.

15 MS. CAGLE: Hi, I'm Cagle, College of Arts  
16 and Sciences. I am not currently  
17 an elected Senator. I was  
18 previously an elected Senator  
19 representing the College of Arts  
20 and Sciences of which I'm very  
21 proud and served on the Senate  
22 Council and I want to speak to  
23 the idea that a vote of no  
24 confidence isn't appropriate to  
25 this situation and that it isn't

1           efficacious, so great timing,  
2           Bobby. So, as to efficaciousness  
3           the steps thus far have not been  
4           efficacious. The Senate has no  
5           remaining moves to express the  
6           true threat to the University  
7           that these changes pose as  
8           evidenced by a number of my  
9           colleagues who have spoken today.  
10          While it is true that we might  
11          think that -- as to  
12          appropriateness, while it's true  
13          that we might think that other  
14          steps taken thus far have been  
15          appropriate, as I just said they  
16          haven't been efficacious and  
17          that's not because the Senate  
18          hasn't tried, it's because the  
19          interlocutors with whom they're  
20          trying are not acting in good  
21          faith. I'm a (Inaudible) and I  
22          know how to spot when someone is  
23          not acting in good faith. So,  
24          this is the next step and it's  
25          appropriate and efficacious

1 because it is what it says on the  
2 box, it is a vote of no  
3 confidence, it is an expression  
4 that the faculty, maybe not 100  
5 percent, but the majority of the  
6 faculty should the motion pass  
7 have lost confidence in this  
8 leadership's ability to lead.  
9 How that might shake out? We  
10 actually can't know. There are  
11 quite a few examples. This has  
12 happened at other universities.  
13 I appreciate the idea that while  
14 if we take this step now -- if  
15 you all take this step now it  
16 perhaps is less impactful in the  
17 future, the problem is there will  
18 be no Senate to take this vote in  
19 the future if you don't take it  
20 now. We know that these changes  
21 are going to happen if nothing  
22 else happens. So, I appreciate  
23 those who have put forth the  
24 motion and our elected  
25 representatives who have spoken

1 in support of it for their  
2 willingness to take this final  
3 action to try and save part of  
4 what makes this University great  
5 and quite frankly makes me proud  
6 to work here, because otherwise I  
7 don't have confidence that I  
8 would want to continue to work  
9 here. That is what a vote of no  
10 confidence is about. And it's  
11 not just me, it's many other  
12 faculty and staff and students,  
13 including staff and students in  
14 the room. We have lost  
15 confidence in the President's  
16 leadership as others have noted  
17 because of his reliance on and  
18 spreading of misinformation,  
19 avoidance of difficult questions.  
20 I was at the Senate meeting in  
21 March where he danced around  
22 every direct question that was  
23 asked, including one that myself  
24 and two others asked directly  
25 three times. He has demonstrated

1                   unwillingness to take University  
2                   Senate input, so the input of our  
3                   elected leaders under advisement.  
4                   The Board of Trustees leadership  
5                   two weeks ago said outright that  
6                   faculty were split while staff  
7                   and students supported them and  
8                   yet Chair Brockman said that  
9                   after I read out loud to them an  
10                  op-ed written by undergraduates  
11                  opposed to the changes. That is  
12                  just one of many examples of  
13                  public statements being made by  
14                  the Board of Trustees and the  
15                  President being factually and  
16                  transparently false. So, I, and  
17                  many others, have no confidence  
18                  he will listen to us once he  
19                  doesn't have to, because that's  
20                  exactly what he has done for the  
21                  last three months. So, I, and  
22                  other constituents, have no  
23                  confidence and we ask you, our  
24                  elected representatives, to  
25                  please approve this motion.

1 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Doug, Chipper,  
2 Shannon, Aaron and then Daniel.

3 MR. MICHAEL: Thank you. Doug Michael, College  
4 of Law. I wanted to speak a  
5 moment to those of you who are  
6 opposed to the motion, but might  
7 be inclined to vote in favor of  
8 it because I'm one of those  
9 people. I don't think it's a sad  
10 moment at all. I think it's a  
11 realistic and educational moment.  
12 Normally a no confidence motion  
13 is something brought by the  
14 opposition bench in parliament to  
15 bring down the government, that's  
16 not what we're doing here. We  
17 obviously don't have the power to  
18 do that and I don't think I'd  
19 want to if that's what it would  
20 accomplish. But I would be in  
21 favor of a vote of no confidence,  
22 it means something else and maybe  
23 that's part of the problem we've  
24 had is that we're talking about  
25 different things. I don't think

1 we should just turn over the  
2 table and leave the room. I  
3 agree that the most important  
4 thing is what's going to happen  
5 next, because it will happen  
6 next. I am slated to be the  
7 shortest serving Senate Council  
8 Chair in history, 13 days, I  
9 counted them and beyond that we  
10 have no idea what will happen.  
11 There will be a future. There  
12 will be a future with this  
13 administration, I don't have any  
14 idea what it would be like, it  
15 will be very different, I may not  
16 have any role in it, we may not  
17 have any role in it and I think  
18 it's important to move into that  
19 space however we do. Most of us  
20 will still be faculty here and  
21 say, "Mr. President, you have  
22 repeated, unequivocally,  
23 intentionally demoralized and  
24 disappointed this faculty," and I  
25 think that's the powerful

1 statement we can make regardless  
2 of what happens going forward and  
3 that's the statement I intend to  
4 make by voting yes. Thank you.

5 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Chipper?

6 MR. GRIFFITH: Thank you, Chair Collett. I'm  
7 Chipper Griffith, College of  
8 Medicine. So, I was -- I  
9 appreciate the reading of the  
10 resolution and I appreciate the  
11 discussion. I was on the Senate  
12 back when I was not in  
13 administration and I appreciate  
14 this body greatly. I was trying  
15 to put my hand around what do we  
16 mean by no confidence and some of  
17 the words would say no confidence  
18 in President Capilouto, no  
19 confidence in the process, no  
20 confidence in the decisions that  
21 were made these past few months  
22 here. I did appreciate in the  
23 resolution the admission very  
24 early on in the resolution that  
25 talked about his achievements,



1 his achievements are astounding  
2 in the past dozen years or so, I  
3 won't recall all of them, but  
4 record enrollment, graduation  
5 retention rates, DEI efforts,  
6 philanthropy, best place to work,  
7 raises throughout the pandemic.  
8 He was the only President who  
9 spoke up for DEI in the  
10 legislature last year in the  
11 Commonwealth, no one did this.  
12 So, all these years and years of  
13 achievements are very, very real.  
14 Now, what is real is the last few  
15 months there has been  
16 disappointment. There's anxiety  
17 I'm hearing people say and that's  
18 very real as well, but we  
19 shouldn't discount what has  
20 happened before. In terms of  
21 what's going to happen next, I  
22 agree with what Padraic said. I  
23 also agree with one of our  
24 Senator colleagues mentioned that  
25 it's a fact that it was changed

1 from advisory -- I'm sorry, from  
2 decisional to advisory, that's a  
3 fact, but what's not a fact is we  
4 don't know what that means. It  
5 is speculation how this may or  
6 may not change things. For all  
7 we know every single decision the  
8 faculty make will be headed by  
9 administration, we do not know  
10 that at this point. This is all  
11 speculation and as a professor I  
12 want to see facts. I want to see  
13 outcomes. I don't want to -- on  
14 something this grave based on  
15 speculation and an untested  
16 hypothesis. We may look back a  
17 year from now and say, "Huh, this  
18 is really pretty good. We  
19 doubted our President, who has  
20 been such an amazing leader for  
21 12 years." We didn't like the  
22 process this spring, I agree the  
23 people have been hurt by this,  
24 but we may look back on this a  
25 year from now and say, "This was

1 the best thing that happened to  
2 us." Thank you.

3 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Shannon?

4 MS. ALTMAN: Hi, Shannon Altman, College of  
5 Communication and Information.  
6 Like others, I am not an elected  
7 Senator, but I have been in the  
8 past and I just have three quick  
9 points I want to make. One is  
10 that I don't think we're making  
11 -- we're discussing this vote  
12 only on speculation. A previous  
13 speaker asked for facts and I  
14 think there are facts that he has  
15 disregarded faculty concerns over  
16 the past several months, he has  
17 disregarded a request to slow  
18 down the process. He has  
19 disregarded requests for us to  
20 read the report that this is all  
21 based on, right. I think these  
22 are facts, so I don't think we're  
23 discussing a vote of no  
24 confidence based purely on  
25 speculation but we have evidence

1 over the last several months to  
2 look at. The second point I want  
3 to make has to do with the  
4 President's record of success.  
5 In many, many ways he has been a  
6 successful President, but I don't  
7 think this is due solely to one  
8 man. I think a lot of the  
9 success has to -- is based on the  
10 work of the Senate in passing  
11 policies and helping programs,  
12 colleges and units be more  
13 successful with retention,  
14 recruitment, enrollment, all of  
15 these things. The Senate and the  
16 President, the Senate and the  
17 administration work hand in hand  
18 to make these things happen. And  
19 then my third point has to do  
20 with shared governance. I was  
21 fortunate enough to be one of the  
22 people from my college to  
23 represent my colleagues at the  
24 President's house during his  
25 listening sessions and he asked

1 those of us who were present what  
2 we thought about shared  
3 governance and I was really  
4 pleased he asked because I had  
5 actually spent a lot of time in  
6 the past several days thinking  
7 about what shared governance  
8 means and what it means to me.  
9 And so, I said, "Mr. President, I  
10 think shared governance has five  
11 components. It involves explicit  
12 goals that are shared. It  
13 involves accountability, which  
14 goes multiple directions. It  
15 involves candor, transparency and  
16 trust." I think those five  
17 elements are essential for  
18 effective shared governance and I  
19 think all five of those are under  
20 attack. I think all five of  
21 those are about to be decimated  
22 and because of that I do not have  
23 confidence in our President. I  
24 ask our elected Senators to vote  
25 no confidence. Thank you.

1 MS. COLLETT:

Thank you. Aaron?

2 MR. KRAMER:

3 Thank you, Chair Collette and  
4 friends. I am Aaron Kramer. I'm  
5 a faculty member and Department  
6 Chair in the Pigman College of  
7 Engineering. What I offer today  
8 are my personal observations. I  
9 served as a Trustee charged with  
10 bringing faculty perspective to  
11 the Board's fiduciary and policy  
12 making responsibilities. Before  
13 that I lead this body for two  
14 years working with faculty, staff  
15 and students across our  
16 University. Before that I served  
17 in and led the Senate's Academic  
18 Programs Committee where I really  
19 learned the Senate's role in  
20 helping the best ideas of our  
21 colleagues come to life for the  
22 good of our students. I heard it  
23 recently stated publically that I  
24 lack perspective. Perhaps --  
25 perhaps I'm the one who lacks  
perspective, nonetheless I will

1 not give my personal opinion on  
2 the resolution before you today,  
3 but I will offer three  
4 observations around the  
5 conversations and the discussion  
6 around it. I've heard concern  
7 that such a resolution will hose  
8 lines of communication. By my  
9 estimation if the doors closed  
10 and locked it's locked from the  
11 other side. Having examined the  
12 resolution I see a call, an  
13 invitation to either this  
14 President or those who would come  
15 after him to another path for  
16 this University. Another concern  
17 I've heard is related to personal  
18 retaliation. Most of you have  
19 been elected to this body by your  
20 peers for a reason. Integrity  
21 requires courage. There's no  
22 room in a University for  
23 retaliation of this sort and  
24 there's no limits to the lengths  
25 your colleagues will go to defend

1 your right to exercise your  
2 office freely. Fear corrupts the  
3 University, your courage can  
4 preserve it. Finally, someone  
5 asked a really pragmatic  
6 question, "What's the use of  
7 this?" If this is a fete des  
8 complete what use is there in  
9 speaking now? I'm an engineer,  
10 pragmatism is part of my  
11 professional identity, but we're  
12 a University, we cannot be so  
13 pragmatic that we lose all sight  
14 of what's ideal. If you believe  
15 that what the Senate says doesn't  
16 matter then the University Senate  
17 is already dead. So, thanks for  
18 allowing me to share these  
19 observations with you. No matter  
20 what happens my confidence is in  
21 you.

22 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Daniel and then Roger.

23 MR. KIRCHNER: Thank you. Daniel Kirchner from  
24 the Lewis Honors College. I'm an  
25 ethicist and so I teach about



1 values and when I look at the  
2 mission statement and the  
3 Strategic Plan that we have at  
4 the University of Kentucky the  
5 top line, "Value is integrity,"  
6 and I think that that's  
7 ultimately where this decision  
8 comes down for me. I think that  
9 it's clear from the proposal and  
10 the process that the integrity of  
11 the values that we have at this  
12 University have been compromised  
13 on several different levels.  
14 Integrity is a value to ask you  
15 to consider how well you're doing  
16 and hold each other accountable  
17 with the other values that are on  
18 your list and this process has  
19 not been one that has taken into  
20 account shared governance, the  
21 decision making authority of the  
22 Senate, it's not one that has  
23 upheld the values that each of us  
24 has learned and execute and teach  
25 to our students in terms of how

1 we engage in inquiry, what kind  
2 of evidence is appropriate, like  
3 how much evidence and we take  
4 that evidence to contribute to a  
5 reasonable proposal or solution  
6 to the problem. And then the  
7 other piece of that for me is  
8 that integrity requires us to  
9 hold each other accountable when  
10 things don't go according to how  
11 we believe they should, when we  
12 aren't acting on our values. And  
13 so, what that means for me it's  
14 the top line value of the  
15 University and of my college is  
16 that it's my obligation to say  
17 when these values are out of  
18 line. The principle of integrity  
19 tells me that when a college or a  
20 university or a leader is in a  
21 position and acting out of line  
22 with the stated value that they  
23 and the institution have that it  
24 is our responsibility as people  
25 who respect each other and who

1 have developed these standards as  
2 a matter of trust that we hold  
3 each other accountable. And so,  
4 I believe on the basis of  
5 integrity that we ought to make  
6 this vote of no confidence.  
7 There also two things that  
8 concern me about the upshot of  
9 these changes. I anticipate  
10 these to be extremely  
11 destabilizing changes in a few  
12 ways. The centralization of  
13 power in the Office of the  
14 Presidency opens up the  
15 possibility for political  
16 influence in a time where that is  
17 clearly something that is afoot  
18 in our country and that political  
19 influence is going to have a  
20 second effect when you look at  
21 the rhetoric that has been used  
22 regarding the decentralized way  
23 colleges and faculty in colleges  
24 are supposed to be able to make  
25 program and curricular decisions.

1 The centralization of power had  
2 coincided with the centralization  
3 of budgetary authority. What  
4 this means is that any time a  
5 college wants to make a decision  
6 that is out of line with whatever  
7 the centralized power determines  
8 the budget can just be withheld  
9 and it could be withheld on the  
10 basis of the advisory role of the  
11 faculty. The rhetoric has  
12 already been set up for this,  
13 faculty are not to be trusted or  
14 believed in what they decide.  
15 They are going to make these  
16 decisions and decentralized ways  
17 in their colleges (Inaudible) and  
18 the expertise and resources  
19 available to their colleagues  
20 across the University and then  
21 those decisions don't have to be  
22 upheld by any kind of Provost or  
23 President administrative position  
24 simply by denying them a budget.  
25 So, I think we should be very

1 thoughtful about what this model  
2 sets out for future influence and  
3 what that influence is going to  
4 look like. The reading of the  
5 change in what academic freedom  
6 means tells us exactly the  
7 direction that this is headed. I  
8 will be voting no confidence.

9 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Roger, Simon and then  
10 Kaveh.

11 MR. BROWN: Roger Brown, CAFE. You would  
12 think that if we were going to  
13 make a big change in the  
14 University that involved  
15 everyone, a shared sort of  
16 concern, that we would use shared  
17 governance to try to figure out  
18 how to solve that. That does not  
19 seem like what's happened. There  
20 are going to be lots of choices  
21 that we have to make in this  
22 University that affects  
23 individual people's lives and our  
24 colleagues and departments and  
25 units, I'd like to think that

1 when we're going to make  
2 decisions like that that you go  
3 to the person or the group that's  
4 causing the problem and you work  
5 with them to figure out the  
6 solution. That's not what  
7 happened this time. What  
8 happened this time is a lot of  
9 suspicion and a lot of anxiety,  
10 you've got to do a crash course  
11 on shared governance because you  
12 never really thought about all  
13 the details, but you have to go  
14 meetings and talk to the  
15 President with, you know, smart  
16 ideas about what you think should  
17 happen in the future about it  
18 all. That produces anxiety, it  
19 causes people to be concerned and  
20 suspicious. It's not shared  
21 governance. That's not what  
22 happened this time. And I'll  
23 just point out two points of  
24 clarification. Number one, just  
25 moments ago we had a resolution

1 that this University Senate  
2 that's in power to make broad  
3 educational policy decisions,  
4 final decisions, delegated that  
5 down to the unit final decision  
6 authority to the unit on  
7 prerequisite waivers, you do  
8 whatever your faculty body says  
9 you ought to do and that's final.  
10 I'm not on the Board of Trustees,  
11 so Trustee Ballard, I'm not sure  
12 if I have all the latest details  
13 but I will say there's nothing in  
14 the current 79 pages of GRs and  
15 ARs that suggest to me that  
16 there's going to be any final  
17 decision authority that flows  
18 down, it's all going to be  
19 advisory. And, number two, to  
20 Dean Chipper, I'll just point out  
21 if the President's plan for  
22 shared governance involves  
23 anything like my experience on  
24 so-called Work Group 5 then you  
25 should all make plans to talk to

1 your primary care provider about  
2 stress about putting people on a  
3 committee where they're one of a  
4 very minor group of people or  
5 dully noted as the normal way of  
6 saying things and you're not  
7 allowed to talk to anybody about  
8 it. That's not shared governance  
9 either. I'm going to vote to  
10 support this resolution and I'm  
11 going to feel really good about  
12 it, even though it's terrible  
13 circumstances I have all my  
14 confidence that there is no  
15 confidence.

16 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. I have Simon, Kaveh  
17 and then Bob.

18 MR. SHEATHER: Simon Sheather of the Gatton  
19 College of Business and  
20 Economics. Respectfully in the  
21 field of economics/strategy an  
22 important concept is this notion  
23 of looking forwards and reasoning  
24 backwards. You want the past to  
25 reform the future, you can't



1 change the past. So, again,  
2 respectfully if you go the  
3 nuclear option and have a vote of  
4 no confidence I put it to you  
5 that that will exacerbate the  
6 differences between the President  
7 and the faculty. Secondly, I'll  
8 also put it to you that the  
9 nuclear option has the potential  
10 to damage significantly the  
11 reputation of the University of  
12 Kentucky in the face of future  
13 faculty members and future  
14 graduate students. Thank you.

15 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. I have Kaveh.

16 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I  
17 really tried to only talk once.  
18 We were told we are 100 more or  
19 less elected -- by the way, think  
20 about that word, "elected," it's  
21 going to lose all its meaning  
22 pretty soon. We are 100 elected  
23 -- elected by thousands of other  
24 faculty and we were told no  
25 matter what you say here -- you

1 could say whatever you want to  
2 say, it's like closing your eyes  
3 and your ears and the Board is  
4 going to approve this. That's  
5 actually quite revealing, I don't  
6 know if it's a Freudian slip or  
7 what, but it's very revealing  
8 that we are told, "What you say  
9 doesn't matter," yet we are told  
10 we have shared governance. How  
11 is that possible? Think about  
12 it. I was hoping not to debate  
13 facts and I think momentarily  
14 there was an agreement that we're  
15 going to lose authority and then  
16 we were told, no, it's going to  
17 go down to the college. If the  
18 GRs would allow for a -- instead  
19 of a University Senate it would  
20 allow for a College Senate with  
21 the same powers of the University  
22 right now, maybe I will have  
23 said, "Okay, fine," but that's  
24 not the case. I mean in fact the  
25 GRs is admittedly loose between

1 the word, "college," and "college  
2 faculty." College faculty is us.  
3 College could be the dean of the  
4 college. Think about that. And  
5 in some colleges authority has  
6 been delegated, which is one of  
7 my pet peeves, this delegations,  
8 delegated to Curriculum  
9 Committee. In my college, as far  
10 as I know, Curriculum Committee  
11 consists of DUS and maybe an  
12 associate dean, DUS appointed by  
13 the dean. So, where is this  
14 governance or faculty power? If  
15 the claim is that the power that  
16 Senate has today is going to be  
17 given to colleges I would like to  
18 see it, I haven't seen it and I  
19 read everything. Thank you.

20 MS. COLLETT:

I will just follow that. GR1 of  
21 the revised GR1 does not say  
22 that, it directly says that  
23 faculty will be advisory and the  
24 GR supercedes an AR. Next, we  
25 have Bob and then Nolan.

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I have not heard a student speak  
2 today.  
3 MS. COLLETT: Okay.  
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Despite the allegations  
5 (Inaudible). I would like to  
6 hear from --  
7 MS. COLLETT: Nolan first.  
8 MR. GROSSMAN: (Inaudible).  
9 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Well, then Nolan is first,  
10 then -- okay.  
11 MR. NOLAN: (Inaudible) for those who have  
12 said that this vote of no  
13 confidence is too harsh for a  
14 nuclear option per say. What  
15 other option is there left? I  
16 think it's quite apparent that  
17 the President is not considering  
18 any other proposal or option and  
19 has not listened to the  
20 University Senate's proposals, so  
21 what other -- what other -- what  
22 other decision could be made  
23 other than no confidence in what  
24 the President is doing. And  
25 second, you know, I was looking

1 at the previous minutes meeting  
2 or the last meeting and UK  
3 students in support of President  
4 Capilouto's proposed principles,  
5 I think I'm alone in student  
6 government in this decision, but  
7 I disagree with the proposal. I  
8 think that taking away voting is  
9 -- that's very, very (Inaudible).  
10 I mean you're almost getting to  
11 totalitarianism at that point  
12 when you have -- you have one man  
13 making all the decisions and like  
14 my fellow Senators in this room  
15 said just advising someone that's  
16 -- that's not really a power role  
17 and that's not (Inaudible).

18 MS. COLLETT: Thank you, Nolan. Any -- any mic  
19 you want to go to and if the --  
20 if the red is off then you --  
21 okay.

22 MR. HURLEY: All right. To make sure I'm  
23 doing this thing right. Can  
24 everybody hear me?

25 MS. COLLETT: You want to get your time back

1 after?

2 MR. HURLEY: Hi, my name is John Hurley. I  
3 graduated from the University of  
4 Kentucky on Friday and will be  
5 returning as a graduate student  
6 in the Martin School. I'll be  
7 returning as a graduate student  
8 in the fall in the Martin School.  
9 The first -- I do have a question  
10 and then I'm going to go into my  
11 thoughts and it's for the  
12 proposal sponsor. Where are you?

13 MS. COLLETT: He's -- Scott Yost, but direct it  
14 to me and then I'll --

15 MR. HURLEY: Yeah. So, when was this proposal  
16 brought to the University Senate,  
17 like when did it get to you all  
18 and then come to the body?

19 MS. COLLETT: So, this proposal came to Senate  
20 Council last week and it was  
21 brought to the -- and it was put  
22 on the agenda to be brought to  
23 the Body today.

24 MR. HURLEY: Okay. So, I'll speak a little  
25 bit to my personal experience in

1                   having heard about the proposal,  
2                   the first time I heard of it was  
3                   whenever it came up in the, I  
4                   believe, it was the Herald Leader  
5                   on Thursday of last week right  
6                   before I was getting ready to  
7                   graduate on Friday, that was a  
8                   little concerning from a student  
9                   perspective that it wasn't  
10                  getting disseminated to us as  
11                  members of this campus community  
12                  as a whole, but I'm not going to  
13                  hamper that voice too hard. I  
14                  have heard repeatedly today that  
15                  this body wants to hear student  
16                  voices more and more, yet you all  
17                  are considering a vote of no  
18                  confidence in the President of  
19                  our University three days after  
20                  the fact the vast majority of  
21                  students have gone home, they  
22                  have returned to places all  
23                  across this country and are not  
24                  here to have effectively voiced  
25                  themselves apart from Zoom. I

1 understand that this is a matter  
2 that has been ongoing for months,  
3 but I want to voice that that is  
4 a major point of concern that I  
5 have as a student. I have the  
6 benefit of living in Lexington,  
7 but if I didn't I don't know that  
8 I would have jumped onto Zoom.  
9 And looking around this room  
10 there are a handful of people  
11 that I believe are students. I  
12 know Nolan is here. I know  
13 Warren is here. And I don't  
14 believe -- are any other active  
15 student members here right now?  
16 MS. COLLETT: I think they're on Zoom.  
17 MR. HURLEY: They're on Zoom. There's a  
18 handful on Zoom. And it's not  
19 because we don't care. In a  
20 (Inaudible) where I currently  
21 serve as a graduate school  
22 representative I've seen that  
23 there is passion for these  
24 changes and a desire to see this  
25 campus thrive. Voices are not in



1                   this room because it was brought  
2                   up at the last minute meeting of  
3                   the University Senate for this  
4                   year after most of us have gone  
5                   home, a sizeable portion of the  
6                   student population has graduated  
7                   and are no longer students at  
8                   this University period, it's not  
9                   because we don't care it's  
10                  because it's the ninth hour for a  
11                  lack of a better term. And I  
12                  understand this body  
13                  hypothetically would be dissolved  
14                  next month, but that doesn't  
15                  change the frustration from the  
16                  student perspective, but I would  
17                  have appreciated it being up  
18                  whenever we were still here to  
19                  have this conversation. Now,  
20                  firsthand, I hear a lot of people  
21                  saying they didn't feel heard by  
22                  the President whenever he came  
23                  and spoke to you all's body. I'm  
24                  going to speak to my experience  
25                  because he came and talked to SGA

1 as well. Firsthand, I brought  
2 feedback to him about the  
3 President's Council because I was  
4 frustrated, I didn't know how it  
5 was going to function, I didn't  
6 understand how the student  
7 members would be selected and I  
8 didn't like the way that it was  
9 initially set up. I was able to  
10 have a conversation with  
11 President Capilouto and I saw on  
12 the first revision that came out  
13 thereafter that the structure had  
14 changed, I don't know if I was  
15 the only person that rang that  
16 bell, but I saw responsiveness  
17 and I saw receptiveness. I voted  
18 to support the proposal that this  
19 body has, from what I can tell in  
20 large, said that they are not  
21 okay with NSGA a month ago and I  
22 stand by that vote because of the  
23 fact that I've heard him listen  
24 and I see that this is a  
25 developing process. I understand

1 that you all are having a lot of  
2 conversations surrounding the  
3 faculty and their engagement in  
4 the process, etcetera, but I want  
5 to remind you that this is a  
6 University Senate and a decision  
7 should be made on behalf of the  
8 entire body, that is staff,  
9 faculty and students. I can't  
10 speak definitively for every  
11 student on this campus, but I  
12 know that I have only heard a  
13 small minority coming up saying  
14 that they are not in favor of  
15 these revisions that we feel  
16 would give us a more amplified  
17 voice. I've heard Staff Senate  
18 did pass their resolution in  
19 favor of this. I understand the  
20 faculty's concern, but I want to  
21 make it clear that as you all are  
22 making this decision that you  
23 need to take into account that we  
24 aren't feeling heard and that we  
25 want to be more engaged, but that

1 opportunity simply hasn't come up  
2 in the current structure and we  
3 feel that the coming one would do  
4 more in that regard, that we have  
5 confidence in the President and  
6 we have confidence in the work  
7 he's doing. That's my  
8 perspective on the matter. I'm  
9 not definitive, but I think that  
10 the student voice should be  
11 listened to in this conversation.

12 MS. COLLETT: Okay, Bob. But I'll just say  
13 everybody got the resolution as  
14 Senators at the same time  
15 everybody did in here and as  
16 elected Senators we know that the  
17 last day for the Senate meeting  
18 has been published for a whole  
19 year, it is May the 6<sup>th</sup>. So,  
20 whether you come in person or  
21 you're on Zoom the expectation is  
22 all the elected Senators will be  
23 here. Bob and then you can go  
24 next. Bob?

25 MR. GROSSMAN: (Inaudible). Oh, I'm sorry.

1 MS. COLLETT: Okay.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: There we go. Okay. A couple of  
3 comments I would like to make.  
4 First of all, the student asked  
5 why we -- who just spoke asked  
6 why we waited until now, but the  
7 case is we passed resolutions at  
8 the previous two Senate meetings  
9 and --

10 MS. COLLETT: Three.

11 MR. GROSSMAN: -- previous three -- two out of  
12 the last three meetings for three  
13 resolutions --

14 MS. COLLETT: We -- yeah, three resolutions.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: Out of the three last meetings  
16 and nothing changed. So, the  
17 reason we are debating this now  
18 is not because we wanted to wait  
19 until May, it's because we've  
20 tried to take other measures  
21 until now that have not been  
22 responded to. We also share your  
23 frustration in that the Board's  
24 final vote on the new GRs vote is  
25 going to be in June when 67

1 percent of the regular faculty or  
2 so are going to be -- who are  
3 nine-month contracts will not be  
4 here on campus or engaged to  
5 participate in revising the GRs  
6 that everyone has individually --  
7 everyone has individually been  
8 invited to participate in to  
9 suggest revisions, but not this  
10 body as the elected members of  
11 the University faculty and  
12 elected student members as well.  
13 So, we have repeatedly asked, not  
14 for this process to end and for  
15 us just to stick to what we have  
16 now, we have asked for the  
17 process to be postponed until  
18 there is time for people to  
19 consider all the possible  
20 implications of these GRs and ARs  
21 that are being hastily written  
22 and put into place without any  
23 vetting and just as an example  
24 the -- who is going to be in  
25 charge of the Academic Calendar

1                   once these rules are enacted?  
2                   There's nothing in the GRs that  
3                   says that the Faculty Senate or  
4                   the Staff Senate or the Student  
5                   Senate will be in charge of the  
6                   Academic Calendar. Rules around  
7                   plagiarism, there's nothing in  
8                   the rules about who will control  
9                   the rules around plagiarism, who  
10                  will decide the penalties, who  
11                  will adjudicate the penalties,  
12                  nothing in there. There's a ton  
13                  of things that are missing and  
14                  we're told, "Oh, don't worry,  
15                  we're just going to copy the  
16                  Senate Rules and put them into  
17                  the ARs." Well, who's going to  
18                  do the copying and how are we  
19                  going to know that they're going  
20                  to put them in the ARs? The  
21                  process of these trusts that is  
22                  needed for these actions to  
23                  happen is gone. So -- so, for  
24                  someone just to promise, "Don't  
25                  worry. I'll just copy all the

1 Senate Rules and put them in the  
2 ARs," is just not something that  
3 we can just accept and you're  
4 going to have faculty scurrying  
5 through the rules trying to  
6 figure out what's gone and what's  
7 still present. So, anyway, so I  
8 feel the frustration. Where did  
9 he go? Oh, there he is. So, I  
10 feel your frustration and we want  
11 -- we are not opposed to --

12 MS. COLLETT: Hey, Bob, can you speak into the  
13 mic a little bit?

14 MR. GROSSMAN: We are not opposed to  
15 reconsidering the GRs and the  
16 ARs, what we are opposed to is  
17 this -- is this head long rush  
18 into change before any of us have  
19 had a chance to have meaningful  
20 feedback and the President  
21 actually have a meaningful  
22 conversation with us, I'm glad he  
23 had a conversation with you, but  
24 he has not had a conversation  
25 with us at all. This body has



1                   been intact for -- has existed  
2                   for over 100 years and for it  
3                   just to be ignored and written  
4                   away is just completely  
5                   unacceptable especially when  
6                   we've had no chance to be told  
7                   why this is necessary and  
8                   presented with an alternate  
9                   vision of what things should be.  
10                  So, I will -- with due respect to  
11                  our speakers who have not -- who  
12                  have expressed opposition to this  
13                  resolution, I agree that it's  
14                  terrible that we have to do this  
15                  and I know people have criticized  
16                  me in the past for defending the  
17                  President when he's done things  
18                  that have upset faculty, but I am  
19                  done supporting him, because what  
20                  he has done in the last semester  
21                  is egregious and totally  
22                  unnecessary.

23       MS. COLLETT:

Thank you.

24       MS. ECKMAN:

Alyssa Eckman, College of  
25                  Communication and Information. I

1 first of all want to echo our  
2 students and I'm so glad we've  
3 had two speak here today. Like  
4 you, we are frustrated. We also  
5 want to be heard and with that  
6 said, I call the question.

7 MS. COLLETT: A question has been called. We  
8 will go to immediate vote to call  
9 the question. I need a second.  
10 Jennifer. Only those who should  
11 be voting should put a vote in.  
12 Michael, I can't respond to you  
13 just yet because we have the call  
14 the question, so we had to go  
15 immediately to -- we have 67  
16 approve, nine oppose and eight  
17 abstain. The motion carries. It  
18 is now time to vote. So, hold on  
19 just a second. Let me get it  
20 presented and I have to do all  
21 the motions again. Before I  
22 announce the final I will just  
23 ensure that who is supposed to be  
24 voting is voting.

25 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, question.

1 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

2 MR. TAGAVI: Please verify that the number of  
3 abstained has been noted  
4 (Inaudible) passage or not  
5 passage.

6 MS. COLLETT: That is true.

7 MR. TAGAVI: They won't even see it?

8 MS. COLLETT: That's true.

9 MR. TAGAVI: Okay.

10 MS. COLLETT: But there's no questions. We're  
11 voting.

12 MR. TAGAVI: (Inaudible) parliamentarian.

13 MS. COLLETT: I know. I know you're a  
14 parliamentarian, but I can't take  
15 any more questions. We were just  
16 at 95 people voting. Where's my  
17 other people? We have 58  
18 approve, 24 oppose and 11  
19 abstentions. That vote of no  
20 confidence does pass. So, next  
21 thing we have is items from the  
22 floor. Do we have any items from  
23 the floor? Scott Yost?

24 MR. YOST: Given that this resolution, wow,  
25 specifically mentioning the

1 President was also, I guess,  
2 supported by, promoted by in  
3 concert with the President I make  
4 a motion that this approved  
5 motion gets also extended to the  
6 Board of Trustees.

7 MS. COLLETT: I would need a second. Alyssa  
8 and Jeff both. So, I have a  
9 second. So, now we have a motion  
10 on the floor to extend or amend,  
11 I guess, the approved motion to  
12 extend the vote of no confidence  
13 to the Board of Trustees. The  
14 motion -- Alyssa. The motion is  
15 now on the floor and the floor is  
16 opened up to members for  
17 questions of fact and/or debate  
18 or speaking to whatever. And  
19 then Kristen.

20 MR. HURLEY: John Hurley, the student that  
21 talked earlier. I just am a  
22 little confused on what actually  
23 you voted on, extending it to be  
24 a vote of no confidence against  
25 the Board of Trustees or just

1 send it to the Board of Trustees?  
2 MS. COLLETT: No against the Board of Trustees,  
3 so it's to add the Board of  
4 Trustees to the vote of no  
5 confidence. Does that make  
6 sense?  
7 MR. HURLEY: Gotcha.  
8 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, now it's just -- we  
9 approved it just for the  
10 President. The motion that was  
11 seconded on the floor was to add  
12 now the Board of Trustees to the  
13 current -- to the vote of no  
14 confidence, hold on -- to extend  
15 it to the Board of Trustees. I  
16 had -- hold on. I had Kirsten,  
17 Padraic and then Christian Brady.  
18 MS. KIRSTEN: I'm -- and maybe because I don't  
19 understand Robert's Rules as  
20 thoroughly as I thought, but at  
21 this point we have already voted  
22 on the resolution, it has passed,  
23 but we cannot do any retroactive  
24 motion on said resolution, so  
25 amending it after the vote is

1 invalid.

2 MS. COLLETT: My parliamentarian?

3 MR. RENTFROW: Are we amending it or are we just  
4 extending it to the Board of  
5 Trustees?

6 MS. COLLETT: I think we're extending it, not  
7 amending it.

8 MR. RENTFROW: Yeah, that's kind of what I was  
9 interpreting as well, we're  
10 extending it to the Board of  
11 Trustees.

12 MS. COLLETT: And therefore, it's a new motion.  
13 Christian and then -- no, did I  
14 say you Padraic, first? I am  
15 sorry. Padraic, Christian, Mark  
16 and then Rob. Let me write it  
17 down again.

18 MR. KENNEY: So, I appreciate that the Senate  
19 has voted on a document that,  
20 although I don't agree with it,  
21 is reasonably well crafted and  
22 where the President is the  
23 subject of many of the sentences.  
24 I would think that it would be  
25 appropriate if the Senate really

1 wants to do this or wants to  
2 discuss this to craft an entirely  
3 new resolution that is  
4 specifically about the Board of  
5 Trustees. This is not -- as I  
6 read the document, I'm looking at  
7 it right now, I don't see how you  
8 can extend something without it  
9 being an amendment.

10 MS. COLLETT: Hold on. I'm going to let Doug  
11 Michael kind of speak to that.  
12 Were you going to speak to that?

13 MR. MICHAEL: Yeah.

14 MS. COLLETT: Go ahead, because my --

15 MR. MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law. I  
16 would have no trouble endorsing a  
17 measure against the Trustees, but  
18 we do need to think about it, I  
19 spoke to them at that last  
20 meeting, I got three minutes and  
21 I said they're being reckless by  
22 doing this and I stand by that  
23 because they have spent two  
24 minutes thinking about what  
25 they're doing and that's not --

1                   how fiduciary is that? I think a  
2                   different resolution ought to be  
3                   written. If you really want to  
4                   talk to the Trustees about that  
5                   in the fashion that might  
6                   potentially get their attention  
7                   in addition to the ones sitting  
8                   next to me, it needs to be  
9                   rewritten and more thoughtful. I  
10                  can appreciate -- and the reason  
11                  I voted for the motion of no  
12                  confidence is the emotion in this  
13                  room, that's what needs to be  
14                  taken for those of us who might  
15                  still be working with the  
16                  administration and the Trustees  
17                  that you have deeply disappointed  
18                  this faculty and that's what I  
19                  took away from the motion of no  
20                  confidence. If you want to take  
21                  it to the Trustees I think it --  
22                  I agree, I think it needs to be  
23                  different and I think you ought  
24                  to really consider withdrawing  
25                  the motion and doing it again in



1 a fashion that is directed  
2 specifically to the Trustees, you  
3 shouldn't have any trouble doing  
4 that.

5 MS. COLLETT: Christian, then Mark.

6 MR. BRADY: Christian Brady, Lewis Honors  
7 College. I would basically echo  
8 the procedural comments of the  
9 last three speakers, I think now.  
10 If nothing else, first of all,  
11 there has to be actual motion on  
12 the floor, we need text of that  
13 to say precisely what it is that  
14 we are debating, let alone voting  
15 on and secondly I agree with  
16 Padraic that if this is -- you  
17 can't simply just extend this to  
18 the Board. The language is very  
19 specific to the President to the  
20 things -- the things that the  
21 writers have claimed that the  
22 President has done or not done,  
23 it's very specific, and so, I  
24 think that first of all  
25 procedurally you need to have a

1 written resolution that's very  
2 clear so we know precisely what  
3 it is what we're discussing let  
4 alone voting on and secondly if  
5 it is the will to have a  
6 resolution vote of no confidence  
7 to the Board of Trustees then I  
8 believe it would need to be  
9 completely rewritten.

10 MS. COLLETT: I have Mark next and then Rob,  
11 Loka and John.

12 MR. KIVINIEMI: Mark Kiviniemi from College of  
13 Public Health. I apologize for  
14 not turning my camera on. I'm in  
15 the middle of shepherding kids to  
16 afternoon activities. I would  
17 like to put to the Senate to  
18 think that I think it would be a  
19 strategic error to extend no  
20 confidence to the Board of  
21 Trustees at this time. I think  
22 that the word, "nuclear option,"  
23 was used several times with  
24 respect to the vote of no  
25 confidence in the President and I

1 do believe that a vote of no  
2 confidence is that serious. I  
3 think having passed the vote of  
4 no confidence in the President  
5 that it would be prudent for the  
6 Senate to wait and see how the  
7 Board of Trustees responds to  
8 that vote of no confidence, if  
9 they take it as the very serious  
10 expression of concern that it is  
11 and respond appropriately I think  
12 that's why you're making the vote  
13 of no confidence. If the Board  
14 of Trustees does not respond  
15 appropriately then I think the  
16 Senate should come back and  
17 consider whether a vote of no  
18 confidence is in order, but I  
19 really do think it would be  
20 strategically premature to do it  
21 now until you see how the Board  
22 responds to the very serious vote  
23 of no confidence that you just  
24 passed. Thank you.

25 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Rob?

1 MR. ??: Doug covered me.

2 MS. COLLETT: Oh, Doug covered you, okay.

3 Loka.

4 MS. ASHWOOD: Sorry, make sure this is working.

5 Loka Ashwood, Senator, Arts and

6 Sciences. I wondered if I could

7 maybe make a friendly amendment

8 to the motion to narrow it, would

9 that be appropriate at this

10 moment?

11 MS. COLLETT: To Scott's motion, yes.

12 MS. ASHWOOD: To Scott's motion, yes. I would

13 like for us to add a statement

14 about Board Chair Britt Brockman

15 after the final paragraph of the

16 resolution about the President

17 and I'd like to offer a series of

18 paragraphs for consideration.

19 MR. RENTFROW: Out of order. This is out of

20 line. (Inaudible).

21 MS. COLLETT: Right. Do you want to -- so, it

22 would be a new -- that's what we

23 were saying before, it would be a

24 new motion, not modifying what

25 we've already approved at this

1 point.

2 MS. ASHWOOD: Okay. It would be a separate  
3 motion?

4 MS. COLLETT: Yup. Did you want to finish or  
5 you want me to -- yo want me to  
6 come back to you?

7 MS. ASHWOOD: No, I think I'm -- I mean I could  
8 read the paragraphs now or wait  
9 to see if people want to open up  
10 the motion.

11 MS. COLLETT: Okay. I'm going to go to Roger  
12 and then Alyssa -- no, hold on,  
13 John, then Roger and Alyssa and  
14 then Provost.

15 MR. HURLEY: Am I good?

16 MS. COLLETT: Yes, you're good.

17 MR. HURLEY: All right, cool. Hi, John, I  
18 guess I don't --

19 MS. ???: Alum, UK Alum.

20 MR. HURLEY: -- UK Alum/UK graduate student,  
21 whatever term you want to use for  
22 me is fine. I want to first echo  
23 Dean Brady and Kristen's concerns  
24 over just the correct sequence of  
25 how this is being done. I had

1 the pleasure of serving in --  
2 I've been in SGA now for over a  
3 year and I had the pleasure of  
4 serving as their parliamentarian  
5 and I know for a fact that I've  
6 advised against doing stuff like  
7 this in conjunction with Robert's  
8 Rules Twelfth Edition, but I also  
9 want to talk to the substance of  
10 whether or not this should even  
11 be considered if it is allowable.  
12 I emphasized that I thought it  
13 was concerning to bring this up  
14 the week after graduation  
15 whenever students have already  
16 gone home. I think it is  
17 borderline reckless on behalf of  
18 this body to consider a  
19 condemnation of the Board of  
20 Trustees that was not, number  
21 one, largely publicized prior to  
22 the meeting, number two, I know  
23 for a fact that if -- I know for  
24 a fact that's something I would  
25 absolutely be opposed to, but I

1 also want to emphasize that  
2 students aren't here. I don't  
3 think a previous vote of no  
4 confidence should have been  
5 brought up because of that and I  
6 definitely don't think something  
7 as nuclear as saying that we do  
8 not have confidence in the Board  
9 of Trustees is something this  
10 body should even be talking about  
11 as an item from the floor, I  
12 think it's reckless and I think  
13 short sided.

14 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Roger?

15 MR. BROWN: Roger Brown, SREC, CAFE. I move  
16 to table this motion.

17 MS. COLLETT: I need a second. Alyssa seconds.  
18 We need a vote to table the  
19 motion.

20 MR. ???: What is needed for a table?

21 MS. COLLETT: Majority, I think. Let's ask my  
22 parliamentarian.  
23 Parliamentarian, to table the  
24 motion is it a majority or two-  
25 thirds?

1 MR. RENTFROW: Majority vote. I'm sorry. I'm  
2 having trouble hearing folks, but  
3 yeah, if you're tabling this  
4 motion it would be a majority  
5 vote.

6 MS. COLLETT: Okay.

7 MS. ??: Discussion?

8 MS. COLLETT: Yes, discussion. That will go to  
9 -- yeah, I was about to say, is  
10 table debatable?

11 MR. RENTFROW: I don't -- I don't see that a  
12 tabled motion is debatable, no.

13 MS. COLLETT: Okay. It's not debatable then I  
14 can't take any questions. Are  
15 you ready? All right. So, we  
16 have a vote -- we have a vote now  
17 to table the motion. Shh.  
18 Order. That was my mom voice.  
19 Got anymore here and then I'm  
20 going to close it. Seventy four  
21 approved to table this motion,  
22 nine opposed and five  
23 abstentions. The motion is  
24 tabled. So, then I have other  
25 items from the floor, because I



1 see people's hands up. Provost?  
2 MR. DIPAOLA: Yeah, Provost DiPaola and also  
3 Co-Executive Vice President for  
4 Health Affairs. I didn't get an  
5 opportunity to talk because it  
6 got called to question before, so  
7 I know the vote already occurred  
8 in terms of no confidence vote,  
9 but I just wanted to say a few  
10 things. Because what I wanted to  
11 talk about is at least the  
12 intention -- this I understand  
13 the future -- can you hear me  
14 okay?  
15 MS. COLLETT: No, I think you gotta speak up  
16 and you gotta do your dad voice.  
17 MR. DIPAOLA: All right. Commencement voice.  
18 MS. COLLETT: Yes, commencement voice.  
19 MR. DIPAOLA: All right. Sorry about that. I  
20 had said that I wanted to say  
21 something before it got called to  
22 question, I didn't have an  
23 opportunity before obviously the  
24 no confidence vote got called,  
25 but I did want to say a few

1 things, because there were a lot  
2 of questions regarding the  
3 future, meaning where do we go  
4 from here? And obviously, you  
5 know, we'll have to see. The  
6 Board of Trustees, you know, will  
7 vote obviously in June, I would  
8 think. But if it goes forward in  
9 the current form one thing I  
10 would say is that the vote of no  
11 confidence I'm not sure it helps  
12 the institution. You know,  
13 basically that would be the  
14 question I would have is, why --  
15 you know, really what is this  
16 going to get us, what will it  
17 achieve? But I did want to say a  
18 couple things related to the  
19 future. One thing that is true  
20 that I've observed, I've been  
21 here a bit more than eight years  
22 -- and by the way, I introduced  
23 my self, I'm also a faculty,  
24 faculty member for almost 30  
25 years in different institutions.

1 But the President -- the thing  
2 that we have observed and has  
3 been said here, the President has  
4 had a track record of caring  
5 about faculty, I think any of you  
6 that have been invited to his  
7 house to have discussions you saw  
8 that on a regular basis, I've  
9 seen that on a regular basis.  
10 Now, I know what's occurred and I  
11 know all the comments and I've  
12 listened carefully as well in  
13 terms of what's gone on in the  
14 last few months, but as mentioned  
15 by a number of people there was a  
16 track record. There's also a  
17 track record of how the  
18 institution has done well. The  
19 other point I wanted to make is  
20 part of the proposal, at least as  
21 it currently stands in terms of  
22 the resolution related to the  
23 Governing Regulations, is the  
24 creation of a Faculty Senate and  
25 the Faculty Senate, I can tell

1           you at least the intention would  
2           be, as best I know it and if I'm  
3           involved at all, as best I know  
4           it, would be to do that hand in  
5           hand in as best possible, even if  
6           it's advisory, in a shared  
7           governance approach, meaning to  
8           engage and empower the experts at  
9           the table as decisions are made.  
10          My understanding would be that  
11          the current Senate Rules would  
12          roll over so that we have  
13          something to start with, so the  
14          processes that we're talking  
15          about would continue. I know  
16          some of you are wondering and so  
17          forth, but I wouldn't see another  
18          way moving forward without having  
19          an expert body to go to to do the  
20          things that we've been doing or  
21          many of the things or most of the  
22          things that we've been doing.  
23          Now, there would be -- somebody  
24          had asked the question before,  
25          "Would there be an opportunity

1 going forward to modify rules  
2 together, to modify ARs  
3 together?" I would look at it  
4 that way that this would be done  
5 together hand in hand in a  
6 collaborative way. That's the  
7 way I functioned when I was Dean  
8 of the College of Medicine in the  
9 Faculty Council and anybody who  
10 saw that function there I think  
11 would attest to that. Empowered,  
12 engaged with a group of experts  
13 weighing in and voting -- and  
14 voting whether it's advisory or  
15 not with voting and making  
16 recommendations. I would think  
17 it would be a rare event to not  
18 listen to recommendations  
19 analogous to what we do with  
20 appointments and promotions  
21 processes, which are advisory.  
22 Committee in the college codified  
23 processes, that would be the  
24 intention. In fact, as a Faculty  
25 Senate we could even imagine

1 codifying processes so that there  
2 is process, appeals process,  
3 recommendations, voting for  
4 recommendations, etcetera. So, I  
5 just want to say that, at least  
6 from my perspective, the  
7 intention would be, if this goes  
8 forward I don't want to be  
9 presumptive -- if this goes  
10 forward in an advisory capacity,  
11 that there be a very strong  
12 Faculty Senate that we work  
13 together as best possible. I  
14 want to look to the future in  
15 that regard if this is going to  
16 move forward.

17 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. DIPAOLO: Thank you.

19 MS. COLLETT: Any other items from the floor?  
20 Doug?

21 MR. MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law. I  
22 would like to change the mood a  
23 little bit and note that this is  
24 the last meeting for our current  
25 Senate Council Chair, indeed the

1 last meeting ever of a University  
2 Senate.

3 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

4 MR. MICHAEL: She has led us for two years in  
5 tumultuous times and indeed into  
6 an uncertain future. She has led  
7 us with deliberate, thoughtful,  
8 courageous and passionate  
9 leadership and I would like to  
10 take the widely out of order  
11 moment to move and second and  
12 applaud.

13 MS. COLLETT: Thank you for that. I appreciate  
14 the support of everyone in this  
15 body and the faculty on this  
16 campus and the students and the  
17 staff. It has been a hard two  
18 years and this last year has  
19 really been rough, but I thank  
20 you all. I thank you for all the  
21 work that you have done and the  
22 fight and the courage that you  
23 have had and continue to have.  
24 While this is a somber moment for  
25 a lot of us and we've spoken and

1 we've heard you, this is a moment  
2 that, you know, the faculty and  
3 the students and staff who are  
4 involved right now are standing  
5 up to say, "We want to be heard."  
6 I hope that what comes next is  
7 that we can work in a shared  
8 governance matter, we can work  
9 towards being a collaborative  
10 partner. I have talked with the  
11 Provost on multiple occasions, as  
12 he said he wants to codify some  
13 of these things because we've had  
14 some concern. You know, what  
15 happens when the next Provost  
16 comes if these things aren't  
17 codified the way, and so, our  
18 next steps will be, as I said --  
19 we will be at a Senate Council  
20 meeting we're going to give some  
21 deliberate feedback on these GRs  
22 and things, I have already did a  
23 track changes on every single one  
24 of them, they will be posted so  
25 anybody can read them, so that



1                   you can see. But hopefully this  
2                   is a move where the President is  
3                   also ready to sit down with  
4                   Senate and Senate Council and  
5                   move in the right direction.  
6                   This was hard for everybody, I  
7                   think, in this room. It was not  
8                   an easy vote for anyone, but it  
9                   was a necessary vote. So, I  
10                  thank you and I'm shepherding in  
11                  Doug Michael as the new Chair.  
12                  And I guess at this moment we are  
13                  adjourned and if we are still  
14                  around September 9<sup>th</sup> will be the  
15                  first next Senate meeting. Thank  
16                  you all so much.  
17