UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * * *

MARCH 8, 2021

* * * * * * * * *

AARON CRAMER, CHAIR

DESHANA COLLETT, VICE CHAIR

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

STEPHANIE WOOLERY, STAFF ASSISTANT

TRISHA B. MORLEY, STENOGRAPHER

* * * *

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1	* * * * * * *
2	CRAMER: also, the Chair of the Senate's Rules
3	and Elections Committee. And we're in the
4	process of appointing a workgroup to begin
5	thinking about activities that can be taken
6	in this area to improve this. So that's an
7	activity I want to make sure that you're
8	aware of.
9	Also, the Admissions and Academic
10	Standards Committee Chair, Jennifer Bird-

11	Pollan, asked Senate Council for input into
12	committee deliberations on Senate Rule 5.2.2.
13	This is on student load. There's an issue of
14	how many credit hours a student can take in a
15	given semester. And this was much simpler
16	when all the courses had the same schedule.
17	They all started on the same day and ended on
18	the same day. It's becoming more complex now
19	with nonstandard course calendars and
20	multiple overlapping courses during the
21	summer and so forth.
22	The SAASC proposed a table showing how
23	many credit hours could be taken in different
24	scenarios. And Senate Council reviewed the
25	table and affirmed that those numbers seemed

l	reasonable, but there was still some sort of
2	difficulty in parsing that as a way to
3	understand the limits that are there to help
1	ensure our students can be successful with
5	the given academic load.
5	So Richard Charnigo, Senate Council
7	member Richard Charnigo, volunteered to work

8	on a formula that would help determine so-
9	called permitted credit-hour intensity. That
10	would be something that would be a little
11	more generlizable and able to be understood
12	for courses that have different calendars and
13	different meeting patterns and so forth. So
14	thank you to Richard for undertaking that
15	task.
16	SAASC will also work to determine if SAP
17	can automatically enforce these limits, and
18	final SAASC recommendation would come to
19	Senate Council and then to the senate for
20	approval. I wanted you to be aware of that

22	Also, Senate Council member Lesley
23	Vincent has been participating in a workgroup
24	developing a formal badge proposal. Recall
25	this idea of a badge is a mirocredential on

1	the order of two to three courses that
2	students can earn. And then include, for
3	example, digitally, on a LinkedIn profile o

- 4 on social media or something along these
- 5 lines. In the summer, Senate Council
- 6 approved a pilot for the summer last summer
- 7 and indicated a willingness to review a
- 8 formal proposal to continue, so if something
- 9 like this were to become permanent, to
- 10 receive such a proposal and consider it.
- 11 It was decided that the senate's input
- 12 early would be helpful to developing such a
- 13 proposal, and so Leslie Vincent agreed to
- 14 work with them on developing that formal
- 15 badge proposal. And so we certainly
- 16 appreciate Leslie Vincent's willingness to
- 17 provide that early Senate input to make sure
- the senate's concerns in this topic would be

understood sort of from the ground floor.

All right. The provost indicated that

he would not be able to provide a report

today, so we'll move past here.

Vice Chair, Collett, do you have a

report today?

COLLETT: I do not have a report today.

- 1 CRAMER: The parliamentarian also is unable to
- 2 join us today, and so he has no report for us
- 3 today either.
- 4 Do the trustees have a report today?
- 5 BLONDER: Yes, we do. We had our board meeting
- 6 February 18th and 19th. We had a
- 7 presentation by Nancy Cox, Vice President for
- 8 Land Grant Engagement and Dean of Café, along
- 9 with Laura Stephenson, Associate Dean, about
- the land-grant activities.
- 11 We approved the creation of the
- 12 Department of Engineering Technology in the
- 13 College of Engineering. We heard a
- 14 presentation by Student Government. Student

15	Government is having their elections today
16	and tomorrow. They've also given \$20,000 in
17	student scholarships for childcare and
18	dependents.
19	Kirsten Turner discussed an
20	implementation of integrated success coaching
21	and certification. So far we have seven
22	certified coaches. This is a more holistic
23	approach to help students.
24	There were several maintenance projects
25	that were approved by the Finance Committee

1	and full board, and the Smart Campus iPad
2	Initiative was approved for another year.
3	This is the program where we buy students
4	iPads and the UK software is loaded onto
5	these and it's been a successful program.
6	And, lastly, we approved two honorary
7	degree recipients recommended by the
8	University Senate.
9	That's my report. The next board
10	meeting is May 3rd and 4th. A lot of these

11	presentations are actually linked on the
12	board website if you're interested.
13	Holly?
14	SWANSON: Yeah. I'd like to tell them a little
15	bit about the Provost's Report because that
16	dovetails with conversations we've been
17	having with the COSFL group. And what he
18	talked about there is he presented an
19	overview of all the considerations that are
20	involved when we are approving new academic
21	programs.
22	The other thing he talked about is the
23	market predictions regarding the loss of the
24	number of college-aged students that will be
25	attending universities. And so, for example,

1	after 2025, they predict a 15 percent drop in
2	enrollment, and because of that, we have to
3	be very aware of appealing to our adult
4	learners and lifelong learning initiatives.
5	And then other thing to think about is
6	they're predicting growth in

7	interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary
8	graduate degrees. And he also showed how our
9	new programs that we've recently approved,
10	like those in public health, criminal
11	justice, IT, align with those market trends.
12	That's all I have.
13	BLONDER: I'd like to add one thing, if that's
14	okay. So it's come to our attention that
15	there have been identity thefts affecting
16	hundreds of UK employees. This is false
17	applications for unemployment insurance.
18	And this affected me and other people,
19	and so I just wanted to mention this. Holly
20	and I have talked about this. Kim Wilson,
21	the head of HR, has sent out sent out in the

22	recent inrive email that she sends to the
23	campus, there's information about this: What
24	to do, who to contact, and there may be
25	another email communication coming, but this

- 1 is nationwide problem. The FBI is involved,
- 2 and there is information in Thrive.

- 3 CRAMER: Thank you to our trustees, particularly
- 4 for that last item. That's something that
- 5 that I think we should all probably be
- 6 attentive to if there's opportunity for
- 7 identity theft, through a sort of new vector,
- 8 that's something that we should all be
- 9 attentive of.
- So here we have our first reminder of
- the day: Remember, state your name and
- 12 college affiliation prior to speaking. So if
- 13 you raise your hand to make a motion or a
- second or to ask a question or to debate,
- 15 please remember -- you know, I would say
- 16 Aaron Cramer, College of Engineering. Do
- that through throughout, please.

18	The first item is an item that we
19	postponed from the last meeting. This is a
20	proposal that came to us. It was discussed
21	sort of among a group, but then discussed by
22	the Council of Associate Deans, And Associate
23	Dean Kim Anderson brought this to the Senate
24	Specifically, it's a motion related to the
25	name of Dead Week that we currently have.

1	i will let Associate Deali Aliderson speak
2	on this recommendation to us. Sorry. One
3	moment. We had to switch her over.
4	ANDERSON: Hello?
5	CRAMER: We can hear you, Kim. There you're.
6	Kim you're all set.
7	ANDERSON: Okay. I couldn't hear you there for a
8	minute.
9	So, yes. I'm Kim Anderson from the
10	College of Engineering. This is a proposal
11	to change the name of Dead Week to the
12	suggested name is Prep Week.
13	The initiative came about when I was

14	talking to a colleague from and she came
15	from a school in Texas where they did change
16	to the name. The purpose of this is really
17	to kind of it's really out of respect for
18	family members, students, faculty and staff
19	who have lost a loved one.
20	It is also Dead Week is kind of
21	negative, and so we're looking for a more
22	positive name. As Aaron mentioned, we did
23	talk about this at the associate deans'
24	meetings. We've talked about it twice the
25	name Prep Week was suggested there and was

10

1	approv	red there. And I don't know if you need
2	any mo	ore information, but that's the
3	propos	al.
4	CRAMER:	So Senate Council just, you know, prior
5	to the	previous meeting, discussed the
6	propos	sal and move to to bring it forward to
7	Senate	e. So are there any questions about
8	this pro	oposal for Associate Dean Anderson?

ANDERSON: I guess I should mention that the

LO	terminology would have to be changed
l1	throughout all the Senate Rules.
L2	CRAMER: Right. So that that would be the effect
L3	of the would be to globally search and
L4	replace Dead Week with Prep Week.
L5	Are there any questions for Associate
L6	Dean Anderson? If not, we have a motion from
L7	the Senate Council to make this change.
L8	Is there any debate on this motion?
19	Bob?
20	GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. I support this
21	proposal. I've always thought Dead Week was
22	a silly name for this. Prep Week is much

more descriptive.

- 24 And, apparently, this resonates out in
- 25 the community because there was already a

11

Herald Leader article about this. Even
 though we have not yet approved it, the
 Herald Leader published an article about it.
 But I did want to just point out to
 everyone that this has nothing to do with the

7 Dead Week are not being changed at all by 8 this proposal. It's just to change the name. 9 CRAMER: That's right if you haven't read the 10 Herald Leader story, I recommended it. And 11 Bob also correctly notes this is not a change 12 to the policy; it's a change to the name. 13 Is there any further debate on the 14 motion? Then University Senate Members who 15 will vote yes on the motion, please use the "raise-hand" feature now. 16

rules about that Dead Week. The rules around

6

17 If you'd like to vote no on the motion,
18 please use the "raise-hand" feature now.
19 If you'd like to abstain on the motion,

20	please use the "raise-hand" feature now.
21	That motion passes.
22	The next item on our agenda is a request
23	to amend a previously the adopted degree
24	list, specifically for December 2020 to
25	rescind a degree and then confer a different

2	where the program degree and major name were
3	changed recently.
4	Students were incorrectly advised to
5	change from an MRC and rehab counseling to
6	the revised degree and major, which was an
7	MAC in counselor education. The
8	accreditation agency, at a similar time
9	frame, merged with another and the program is
10	in the process of being accredited by the new
11	agency.
12	The effect of this on the students is
13	that that well, the graduated students or

alum, are that the students will be eligible

for licensure if the degrees are in rehab

14

16	counseling, their current accreditation, and
17	not in the counselor ED.
18	And so, this is a request, for the two
19	students on the next slide, that we rescind
20	the awarded degrees and confer the new
21	degrees to allow them to be eligible for
22	licensure.
23	This is a question about degree lists,
24	so this is a an item that only elected
25	faculty senators should vote on. The two

1	students are identified as College of
2	Education Student MA88 and College of
3	Education Student JS81.
4	And so the motion brought by senate
5	Council to the to the senate is for the
6	elected faculty senators to amend the
7	December 2020 degree list for College of
8	Education Students MA88 and JS81 by
9	rescinding the MSC counselor education with a
10	specialty in clinical mental health
11	counseling and conferring MRC rehabilitation

12 counseling specialty in clinical mental 13 health counseling. 14 Are there any questions? I think we 15 have Ralph Crystal here. 16 BARRON: This is Susan Barron. 17 CRAMER: Yes. I see your hand now, Susan. Go 18 ahead. 19 BARRON: I just wanted to check. So we're 20 talking about it was just a problem for one 21 Semester and two students? Like, it's not 22 something that will go back further or more 23 students may not need the same thing in the 24 future that were -- that graduated?

That was the question I asked when it

25

CRAMER:

14

1	first came to me. I said, hey, are we sure
2	we have everyone that this is going to be a
3	problem for? And the answer was, yes. I
4	think the timing of the changing of the
5	degree and that the changing of the
6	accreditation was such that's right.

BARRON: Okay. Thanks.

- 8 CRAMER: Are there any other questions about the
- 9 motion -- Eric Blalock?
- 10 BLALOCK: Hi. This is Eric Blalock, College of
- 11 Medicine. I just wanted to make sure that
- this is not -- this is a one-step process.
- So it's not like they'll get their degree
- 14 rescinded, and then they have to do something
- to get the new name. And if they fail to do
- it, they won't get it. I wanted to make sure
- that it's all one -- it's a one-click
- 18 process.
- 19 CRAMER: Right. My understanding of this -- and
- 20 I'm sure the Senate Council office staff in
- the room will nod or shake their heads
- vigorously if I'm wrong -- but that's right;

23	this item will go as sort of an anatomic
----	--

24 rescind-and-confer action to the Board of

Trustees, and that'll happen all at once.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

15

1 BLALOCK: Okay. Thanks.

2 CRAMER: Are there any other questions about the

3 motion? Any debate on the motion?

4	Seeing none, if you'd like to vote in
5	favor of the motion, please use the "raise-
6	hand" feature now.
7	If you'd like to vote no, use the "raise
8	hand" feature now.
9	If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise
LO	hand" feature now.
l1	That motion passes.
12	Again, you guys are doing great, but
L3	remember as we go through, continue to speak
L4	your name and college affiliation prior to
L5	speaking. Bob Grossman, do you have a
L6	question?
L7	GROSSMAN: Yeah. I was just wondering: Why aren't

these flashing subliminally?

L9	CRAMER:	It's an idea for next month, Bob. By
20	the wa	ay, you didn't say Bob Grossman A&S.
21	GROSSMAN:	It works better when it's subliminal
22	rather	than when it's out there.
23	CRAMER:	All right. The next item on the agenda
24	are a ı	number of proposals from the Academic
25	Progra	ams Committee, Leslie Vincent. Ready to

1	go? All right.
2	VINCENT: Okay. I'm ready. First, I just want to
3	thank my committee for all their work. We've
4	been very busy, as you'll see, in today's
5	different items we have.
6	So, first, we have a recommendation that
7	the university senate approve for submission
8	to the Board of Trustees the establishment of
9	a new BS degree, Computer Engineering
10	Technology, in the Department of Engineering
11	Technology within the College of Engineering.
12	The proposed Bachelor of Science in
13	Computer Engineering Technology degree offers

curriculum designed to provide in-depth

15	knowledge of hardware and software design
16	development applications and maintenance,
17	with a mix of both classroom and laboratory
18	experiences that is in demand by industry.
19	The proposed four-year BS in computer
20	engineering technology is designed as a
21	feeder computer program in which students
22	earn an associate in applied science and CPT
23	from the Bluegrass Community and Technica
24	College and then a BS and CPT from UK and
25	this arrangement.

1	ok will offer only junior and senior-
2	level coursework a total of 127 credit hours
3	are required with 68 credit hours taken at
4	BCTC and 59 at UK.
5	Of the courses taken at UK, 50 credit
6	hours consists of major requirements and the
7	other 9 credit hours are guided electives.
8	The proposed program is designed to
9	respond to shortages and critical
10	manufacturing skills within the state and to

11	improve program offerings and enrollment for
12	the College of Engineering.
13	In addition to the collaboration with
14	the BCTC, the proposed program will
15	incorporate industry partnerships to provide
16	students with the needed industrial
17	experiences and applications so they are
18	career-ready.
19	The target audience for this degree
20	program are students seeking distinctive
20	
	program are students seeking distinctive
21	program are students seeking distinctive career paths and opportunities in creative

6

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

18

networking support specialist, automation

engineer, applications engineer,

telecommunications engineer, network support

technical engineer and network administrator.

CRAMER: Are there any questions for either

Leslie or for the proposer, Nelson?

7	Seeing none, we have a motion from the
8	committee. Is there any debate on this
9	motion.
10	seeing none, Senators, please, if you'd
11	like to vote yes, please use the "raise hand"
12	feature now.
13	If you'd like to vote now use the "raise
14	hand" feature now.
15	If you'd like to abstain, please use the
16	"raise hand" feature now.
17	That motion passes.
18	VINCENT: Next, this is a recommendation at the
19	University Senate approve for submission to
20	the Board of Trustees.

21	The establishment of a new BS degree in
22	Lean Systems Engineering Technology in the
23	Department of Engineering Technology within
24	the College of Engineering. The proposed
25	Bachelor of Science in Lean Systems

- 1 Engineering Technology, or LST, offers
- 2 curriculum designed to provide in-depth

- 3 knowledge of lean operations, along with the
- 4 skills needed to improve quality output,
- 5 streamline operations and reduce waste.
- 6 The proposed four-year BS in LST is
- 7 designed as a feeder-computer program in
- 8 which students earn an Associate in Applied
- 9 Science in Integrated Engineering Technology
- 10 from the Bluegrass Community and Technical
- 11 College and then a BS and LST from UK.
- 12 In this arrangement UK will offer only
- 13 junior and senior-level coursework. A total
- of 127 credit hours are required, with 71
- 15 credit hours taken at BCTC and 56 at UK. Of
- the courses taken at UK, 53 credit hours

17	consists of major requirements. and the
18	remaining three credit hours are guided
19	electives.
20	The proposed program is designed to
21	respond to shortages in critical
22	manufacturing skills within this state and to
23	improve program offerings and enrollment for
24	the College of Engineering.
25	In addition to the collaboration with

1	the BCTC, the proposed program will
2	incorporate industry partnerships to provide
3	students with the needed industrial
4	experiences and applications so they are
5	career-ready.
6	The target audience for this degree
7	program are students seeking distinctive
8	career paths and opportunities in creative
9	industrial design production and service.
10	Graduates of the program are prepared for
11	jobs with titles such as lean continuous
12	improvement engineer, lean engineer,

13	manufacturing engineer, lean process
14	improvement engineer, supplier quality
15	engineer, lean manufacturing specialist and
16	quality engineer.
17	CRAMER: Are there any questions for either
18	Leslie or for Nelson again?
19	Seeing none, we have a motion from the
20	committee. Is there any debate on this
21	motion?
22	If you'd like to vote yes on this
23	motion, please use the "raise hand" feature
24	now.
25	If you'd like to vote no, use the "raise

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1	hand" feature now.
2	If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise
3	hand" feature now.
4	That motion passes.
5	VINCENT: This is a recommendation that the
6	University Senate approve for submission to
7	the Board of Trustees the establishment of a
8	new MS degree, Aerospace Engineering in the

9	Department of Mechanical Engineering within
10	the College of Engineering.
11	This 30-credit master's in aerospace
12	engineering provides students with the
13	opportunity for advanced study and research
14	opportunities in modern engineering theory
15	technology and practice associated with the
16	design development testing and production of
17	aircraft, spacecraft and related aerospace
18	systems.
19	This program was developed in response
20	to an increasing aerospace industry within
21	Kentucky and increasing demand from students
22	for a structured graduate program in this
23	area and built on an area of expertise

24	already in	place within	the College of

25 Engineering.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1	The target audience is primarily recent
2	graduates from aerospace and/or mechanical
3	engineering undergraduate programs. The
4	proposed aerospace engineering master's

5	program offers both a thesis option and a
6	non-thesis option.
7	The thesis option is intended for full-
8	time graduate students and requires a minimum
9	of 24 semester hours of coursework and 6
10	credit hours of thesis research, along with
11	the thesis. The non-thesis option is
12	designed for part-time students who are
13	employed and requires a minimum of 30
14	semester hours of coursework.
15	The program is designed to prepare
16	students for aerospace research and
17	development in industry government and
18	academia.

CRAMER: Are there any questions for either

20	Leslie or Mike Renfro? He is the proposer.
21	We have a motion from the committee to
22	approve this new degree program. Is there
23	debate on this motion?
24	If you'd like to vote yes, use the
25	"raise hand" feature now

1 If you'd like to vote no use the "raise 2 hand" feature now. 3 If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise 4 hand" feature now. 5 That motion passes. 6 Sorry to interrupt you, Leslie. This is 7 another reminder: Please state your name and 8 college affiliation prior speaking. Pretend 9 I flicked through a real fast, if you wanted 10 it subliminally. CRAMER: All right, Leslie. Are you ready? 11 VINCENT: This is a recommendation that the 12 University Senate approve for submission to 13 14 the Board of Trustees the establishment of a

new PhD degree, Aerospace Engineering, in the

16	Department of Mechanical Engineering within
17	the College of Engineering.
18	The proposed PhD in aerospace
19	engineering is in response to the growing
20	aerospace industry within the state of
21	Kentucky. The PhD in aerospace engineering
22	built upon the area of expertise housed
23	within the Department of Mechanical
24	Engineering in response to the demand from
25	students for additional graduate-level

1	learning opportunities in aerospace
2	engineering.
3	The proposed doctoral program is
4	intended for full-time graduate students.
5	The degree requires a minimum of 36 semester
6	hours of coursework, 18 for students with an
7	earned master's degree in a related field,
8	along with at least one year residency
9	following completion of an oral qualification
10	exam and completion of a research based
11	dissertation.

12	The courses in the PhD aerospace
13	engineering program are selected by the
14	students with the consent of their advisor
15	and advising committee. Students must take
16	at least 18 credit hours of the 600 or higher
17	level. The target audience is primarily
18	recent graduates from aerospace and/or
19	mechanical engineering undergraduate programs
20	wishing to pursue a direct PhD, and recent
21	graduates from the companion masters and
22	aerospace engineering program that's also
23	being proposed. The program is designed to
24	prepare students for aerospace research and
25	development and industry government and

25

1	acade	mia.
2	CRAMER:	Are there any questions for either
3	Leslie	or Mike Renfro?
4	See	eing none, we have a motion from the
5	comm	nittee. Is there any debate on this
6	motic	n?
7	If y	ou'd like to vote yes, use the

8	"raise hand" feature now.
9	If you'd like to vote no use the "raise
10	hand" feature now.
11	If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise
12	hand" feature now.
13	That motion passes.
14	VINCENT: This is a recommendation that the
15	University Senate approve for submission to
16	the Board of Trustees the establishment of a
17	new MS degree, Biostatistics, in the
18	Department of Biostatistics within the
19	College of Public Health. The 33-credit hour
20	MS in biostatistics is designed to train
21	students in the methodological skills that

22	are foundational to biostatistics.
23	The program will meet the needs of
24	individuals who seek to work in industries
25	where advanced knowledge for the analysis of

1	health science data is required. This is a
2	non-thesis option master's program and
3	students are required to take 21 credit hours

- 4 of core biostatistics courses that include a
- 5 Capstone course focused on experiential
- 6 learning.
- 7 As part of the Capstone course, students
- 8 will be required to construct a consulting
- 9 portfolio, and the presentation of this
- 10 project will serve as the final exam
- 11 requirement for the master's Program. The
- remaining 12 hours will be electives with
- some electives from epidemiology.
- 14 The target audience for this program are
- individuals with an undergraduate degree, who
- seek to further their education in the
- 17 analysis of biomedical data. This will

18	include students planning to work in
19	healthcare health agencies biomedical
20	research or pharmaceutical industries.
21	Projected demand for this program is five
22	students in year one, growing to 25 students
23	by year five.
24	CRAMER: Are there any questions for either
25	Leslie or for Amanda Ellis, who's the

1	proposer?
2	We have emotion from the committee. Is
3	there any debate on this motion?
4	Seeing none, if you'd like to vote yes
5	on the motion, please use the "raise hand"
6	feature now.
7	If you'd like to vote no, use the "raise
8	hand" feature now.
9	If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise
10	hand" feature now.
11	That motion passes.
12	VINCENT: This is a recommendation at the
13	University Senate approve this significant

14	change to the PhD in Studies in Higher
15	Education in the Department of Educational
16	Policy Studies and Evaluation within the
17	College of Education.
18	This proposal seeks to add two
19	specializations to the current PhD in studies
20	in higher education program. The first
21	specialization is institutional research and
22	prepare students to identify information
23	needs, collect analyze interpret and report
24	data and information for planning and
25	evaluation, and assist organizations and

1	utilizing these data and information to make
2	informed decisions, and is comprised of 15
3	credit hours.
4	The second specialization diversity
5	equity and inclusion prepares students for
6	high-level administrative positions in
7	diversity, equity and inclusiveness
8	leadership and higher education settings, and
9	it's comprised of 9credit hours and the

10	completion of the graduate certificate in
11	senior diversity officer leadership.
12	The current PhD program does not have
13	any formalized specializations, and adding in
14	these tracks will allow for better
15	recruitment and invite and advising for
16	graduate students.
17	Furthermore, these tracks align with new
18	and existing online certificates offered at
19	the graduate level. Students will have the
20	option of including required specialization
21	coursework as part of their 18 hours of what
22	is referred to as concentration in the
23	current program, or students can complete the
24	regular studies in higher education degree as

25 it's currently offered.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

29

CRAMER: Are there any questions for either

Leslie or for Jane Jensen, the proposer?

We have emotion from the committee to

produce a significant change is there any

debate on this motion.

6	Seeing none, if you'd like to vote yes,
7	please use the "raise hand" feature now.
8	If you'd like to vote no, use the "raise
9	hand" feature now.
10	If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise
11	hand" feature now.
12	That motion passes.
13	VINCENT: This is a recommendation that the
14	University Senate approve the establishment
15	of a new Graduate Certificate, Senior
16	Diversity Officer Leadership in the
17	Department of Educational Policy Studies and
18	Evaluation within the College of Education.
19	This 9 credit or graduate-level
20	certificate in senior diversity officer

21	leadership, or SDO, is designed to prepare
22	students for high-level administrative
23	positions in diversity, equity and
24	inclusiveness leadership in higher education
25	settings.

2	complete to newly created courses for 6
3	credit hours, and higher education diversity
4	leadership students will also complete one
5	guided-elective course in organizational
6	leadership.
7	This certificate program will be
8	grounded in the National Association for
9	Diversity Officers in Higher Education
10	Standards for Professional Practice for
11	Senior Diversity Officers. The fully online
12	certificate has been developed in response to
13	the growing presence of diversity officers
14	across all sectors of higher education.
15	The only prerequisite for admission to
16	the certificate program is admission to the

17	University of Kentucky Graduate School.
18	Furthermore, this certificate is unique
19	from the diversity and inclusion certificate
20	in the College of Arts and Sciences and that
21	none of the courses that are part of this
22	proposed certificate overlap with the A&S
23	certificate. And the College of Arts and
24	Sciences was consulted during the development
25	of the certificate.

1	F	Projected enrollment for the certificate
2	is fi	ve to eight students in year one growing
3	to 1	6 to 20 students by year three.
4	CRAMER:	Are there any questions for either
5	Les	ie or Jane again?
6	7	hen we have emotion from the committee.
7	ls th	nere any debate on this motion? You're
8	goiı	ng to have to unmute.
9	ROHR:	Is there a difference between the Arts
10	and	d Sciences and this certificate that,
11	bas	sically, you can take either and you're
12	bo	th same qualified I mean

- 13 CRAMER: Listen, do you want me to ask Jane and
- respond to that or.
- 15 JENSEN: Jane Jensen, yeah. I got out and came
- back so. Excuse me. I'm back now.
- 17 We talked through with the Arts and
- 18 Sciences about the differences between the
- 19 two graduate certificates. This graduate
- 20 certificate is specifically -- it's very
- 21 practical. It's very focused on higher
- 22 education. It's very much about higher
- 23 education, administration and leadership, and
- 24 the ANS certificate is an interdisciplinary
- 25 conceptual and content, so we hope for the

32

1	students who are doing doctoral programs that
2	they might actually do both, and as a result
3	of both, get a really rich experience.
4	CRAMER: Thank you. Is there any uh any further
5	questions on this proposal?
6	We have a motion from the committee. Is
7	there any debate on the motion?

8

CHISHTI:

My apologies. I misfired I was voting.

9	CRAMER:	Seeing no debate, then, if you'd like to
10	vote	e yes on the motion, please use the "raise
11	han	d" feature now.
12	II	you'd like to vote no on the motion,
13	plea	use use the "raise hand" feature now.
14	11	you'd like to abstain on the motion,
15	plea	ase use the "raise hand" feature now.
16	Т	hat motion passes.
17	VINCENT:	This is a recommendation that the
18	Univ	versity Senate approve the establishment
19	of a	new Graduate Certificate, Human Resource
20	Mar	nagement in the Department of Management
21	with	nin the Gatton College of Business and
22	Eco	nomics.

23	The proposed 15-credit hour graduate
24	certificate is designed to build skills
25	needed to effectively manage an

1	organization's employees and contribute to
2	its talent strategy.
3	The courses within the certificate focus
4	on talent acquisition, talent management,

5	employment law and the effective use of
6	analytics to manage human capital. The
7	program also features an experiential
8	Capstone course giving students the ability
9	to apply principles and techniques learned in
10	their coursework to solve real organizational
11	problems.
12	The courses included in the certificate
13	are offered both face to face, as well as
14	online with synchronous instruction.
15	The target audience for this certificate
16	includes both recent graduates hoping to
17	better prepare themselves for a career in

human resources and working professionals who

recognize the need for advanced study in this

area.

Projected enrollment for the certificate

is 10 students in year one, growing to 20

students by year three.

CRAMER: Are there any questions for either

Leslie or for the proposer, Scott Soltis?

1 CRAMER: We have emotion from the committee. Is 2 there any debate on the motion? Julianne? 3 OSSEGE: Ignore, please. 4 CRAMER: Seeing no debate, then, if you'd like to 5 vote yes on the motion, please use the "raise hand" feature now. 6 If you'd like to vote no on the motion, 7 use the "raise hand" feature now. 8 9 If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise 10 hand" feature now. 11 That motion passes. 12 Once again, if you'd speak your name and 13 affiliation...

This is a recommendation that the

14

VINCENT:

15	University Senate approved the establishment
16	of a new Graduate Certificate, Substance Use
17	Disorders in the College of Social Work.
18	The proposed 9-credit hour substance use
19	disorder graduate certificate is designed to
20	prepare students to work with individuals,
21	families, agencies and communities to address
22	the impact of substance misuse.
23	This certificate is in response to the
24	need for increased access to practitioners
25	train in substance misuse screening,

1	intervention and treatment services.
2	Substance misuse is a very specific disorder
3	with unique treatment needs and this
4	certificate provides an academic credential
5	that will have value for practitioners across
6	many disciplines focused on addressing
7	substance misuse.
8	The target audience is any graduate
9	student who seeks to work in the substance
10	misuse arena, as well as any working

11	professional who may seek the certificate in
12	post-bach status.
13	This certificate can also count as
14	electives towards the masters in social work
15	program requirements. This program is
16	offered 100 percent online with asynchronous
17	courses where students will take 6 credit
18	hours of major requirements and 3 credit
19	hours of guided electives.
20	Projected demand is 15 students in year
21	one, growing to a steady state of 40
22	students.
23	CRAMER: Are there any questions for their Leslie
24	or for Kelly, who's the proposer?

1	We have a motion from the committee. Is
2	there any debate on this motion?
3	Seeing none, if you'd like to vote yes
4	on the motion, please use the "raise hand"
5	feature now.
6	If you'd like to vote no, use the "raise

7	hand" feature now.
8	If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise
9	hand" feature now.
10	That motion passes.
11	The last one? Let's see.
12	VINCENT: It is last one.
13	This is a recommendation that the
14	University Senate approve the establishment
15	of a new Graduate Certificate, Advanced
16	Specialty Program in Endodontics in the
17	Department of Endodontics within the College
18	of Dentistry.
19	The proposed program graduate
20	certificate in endodontics is a 43 =-credit
21	hour certificate designed to add advanced

22	specialty training in endodontics to the UK
23	College of Dentistry scope of care.
24	The target student for this two-year
25	program are practicing professionals that

- 1 desire additional training in endodontics to
- 2 meet the American Association of Endodontics

- 3 board specialty requirements.
- 4 This 24-month program contains
- 5 curricular courses, a variable link with some
- 6 courses that will be 12 months in duration.
- 7 Students are required to complete 33
- 8 credit hours of endodontic training,
- 9 including both clinical and research focus
- 10 courses and 10 credit hours from the core
- 11 dental curriculum.
- 12 This certificate fills a gap in the
- 13 current graduate curriculum within the UK
- 14 College of Dentistry and will also enhance
- 15 undergraduate dental education through
- increased student exposure to advanced root
- 17 canal treatment techniques and methods. The

18	anticipated demand for the certificate is two
19	students per year.
20	CRAMER: Are there questions for either Leslie or
21	for the proposer, Howard Roberts?
22	We have a motion from the committee. Is
23	there any debate on this motion?
24	If you'd like to vote yes on this
25	motion, use the "raise hand" feature now.

1	if you'd like to vote no on the motion,
2	please use the "raise hand" feature now.
3	If you'd like to stay and use the "raise
4	hand" feature now.
5	That motion passes.
6	At this moment I would absolutely like
7	to thank Leslie Vincent, RSAP chair, and her
8	whole committee for the all their hard work.
9	They've just had ten items that they
10	presented. That represents a considerable
11	amount of work.
12	It's not just my own history with this
13	committee that makes me say it it's truly one

14	of the hardest working committees in the
15	Senate and they're rock stars. Tell them
16	thank you when you see them.
17	Another rock star, I suppose, Jennifer
18	Bird-Pollan, the chair of our SAASC who's
19	also done a lot of work for the Senate in her
20	years.
21	Jennifer Bird-Pollan has some items to
22	present to us as well. Jennifer, you ready?
23	Jennifer, let us know when you're over.
24	BIRD-POLLAN: I think I'm here now. You get promoted
25	to be a panelist when that happens.

1	So thank you for the promotion. I am
2	here on behalf of the SAASC, which is
3	bringing several items to you this month.
4	The first item comes from the College of
5	Chemical Engineering, and it's a change to
6	the MS in Chemical Engineering.
7	Some of you might remember last year the
8	Senate approved a one-time change to many of
9	the master's degrees across campus. We

10	discovered, as part of the SAC's mid-period
11	review, that some of our master's degrees
12	were being granted after only 24 credit
13	hours. And the SAC's requirement was the
14	master's needs at least 30 credit hours.
15	So last year the Senate went through a
16	process of allowing programs to add the 6
17	credits in the form of 768 courses in their
18	department, and we did that through a web
19	transmittal uniform that had been approved by
20	the Senate Council.
21	However, programs didn't have to do it
22	that way. They also have the option to seek
23	an additional path to add the remaining 6

24	credits, so the MS in chemical engineering is

coming to us through that process.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1	This meeting will add 6 credit hours of
2	either 768 780 or 790 chemical engineering,
3	and that will bring the total required
4	credits for that master's up to 30 credit
5	hours, and our committee recommends approval

6 of this change. 7 CRAMER: Are there any questions? Susan Barron? 8 BARRON: Nope. It must not have been on. I 9 don't know why. It shouldn't be. Sorry. 10 No problem. CRAMER: 11 Are there any questions about the 12 proposal? Then we have a motion from the committee 13 14 to approve the proposed changes to the number 15 of credit hours for the MS in chemical 16 engineering. Is there any debate on this 17 motion? 18 If you'd like to vote yes, use the "raise hand" feature now. 19

20	If you	'd like to vote no, use the "raise
21	hand" fe	eature now.
22	If you	'd like to abstain, use the "raise
23	hand" fe	eature now.
24	That	motion passes.
25	BIRD-POLLAN:	So the second item is a suspension of

2	rehabilitation counseling.	This is a
Z	renabilitation counseling.	11115 15

- 3 certificate that was created in response to
- 4 the possibility of people being approved for
- 5 the credential to serve in this
- 6 rehabilitation counseling role without a
- 7 degree which had been approved by the
- 8 accreditation agency.
- 9 However, in the meantime, that
- 10 possibility, that credentialing path has been
- 11 rescinded, and so the program would like to
- suspend admissions in the certificate. Since
- its reason for existence has gone away, we
- 14 recommend approval of this suspension.
- 15 CRAMER: So we have this proposal. Are there any

16	questions about this proposal?
17	Then we have a motion from the committee
18	to approve the proposed suspension.
19	Is there any debate on this motion?
20	If you'd like to vote yes, use the
21	"raise hand" feature now.
22	If you'd like to vote no use the "raise
23	hand" feature now.
24	If you'd like to abstain, use the "raise
25	hand" feature now.

1	That motion passes.
2	BIRD-POLLAN: The next proposal is a proposal
3	that came to us from the Provost's
4	Committee on advising, and it's a
5	proposal to change some of the rules
6	around the academic suspension and
7	reinstatement policies in the Senate
8	Rules.
9	You may already know this, but,
10	just in case you don't, suspension from
11	the university on academic grounds is

12	something that happens as a matter of
13	the Senate Rules, and in order to be
14	readmitted to the university I'm
15	sorry reinstated to the university
16	after an academic suspension, the dean
17	of the relevant college has to agree, so
18	it's a dean-level decision, which makes
19	it a college decision, but the Senate
20	Rules has something to say about some
21	deadlines and some general rules about
22	the way that this has to happen.
23	So the proposal that you see is has
24	a couple of different parts: One is to
25	introduce a new deadline, which would be

1	for students who want to enter after
2	their suspension into in the summer.
3	And then there is some other
4	recommendations in here to clarify part
5	of the process, because we think there
6	wasn't a lot of clarity on the
7	difference between a reinstatement,

8	which has to do with the academic side
9	of things. And that's what has to
10	happen through the dean's office before
11	the student can come back to the
12	university.
13	And readmission, which is sort of a
14	bureaucratic decision that happens in
15	the admissions office, and students
16	can't be readmitted until they've been
17	reinstated, so some of the suggested
18	language there in the Senate Rules is to
19	distinguish between those two processes
20	and set deadlines for each of those.
21	And I'll just let you know that if
22	a student is suspended twice

23	academically, they have to go through
24	what we call the second reinstatement
25	process, and that's a senate-level

1	decision, actually, in general.
2	The Senate Council is designated
3	and has delegated that responsibility t

4	consider students applying for a second
5	reinstatement to a subcommittee that's
6	comprised of the Senate Council Chair,
7	the Senate Council Vice Chair and the
8	SGA President, and so those happen at
9	the university level. That's a
10	centralized process, but the first
11	reinstatement is a college-level
12	decision.
13	I think this committee is
14	recommending some standardizing across
15	the different colleges, but again,
16	that's a dean-level decision about what
17	happens inside the college.
18	So that's the general rationale for

19		the changes, and you can see the
20		specific language changes in the
21		proposal itself. And we recommend the
22		approval of this set of changes as well.
23	CRAMER:	Are there any questions on this for
24		either Jennifer for Marianne Young?
25	BLALOCK:	Hi. Eric Blalock, College of

1		Medicine. I'm just curious how often
2		does this come up? What's the
3		percentage of the student population
4		each year that this happens to?
5	CRAMER:	That is a great question. I don't
6		know if Marianne is here and would be
7		willing to answer that. I think it's
8		probably college-specific.
9	BIRD-POLI	LAN: Probably different in different
10		colleges.
11	YOUNG:	This is Marianne young, Student
12		Success. I got the reminders along the
13		way and play and use myself
14		appropriately. It does vary from

15		college to college, but it is something
16		that, you know each semester there are
17		students who are seeking reinstatement
18		back in, but I don't know if I could
19		give you an exact number from each
20		college that seek reinstatement.
21	BLALOCK:	I was just wondering how busy that
22		committee would be. Right? I mean are
23		they are they doing 50 cases here?
24	CRAMER:	The second reinstatement, which is
25		the one where like me and DeShana

1		Collett and Courtney wheeler do, that's
2		maybe on the order of, like, half a
3		dozen a year, and they get scheduled
4		sort of as they come in.
5	BLALOCK:	Okay. Thanks.
6	CRAMER:	Are there any other questions about
7		the proposal.
8	CRAMER:	All right. We have a motion from
9		the committee. Is there any debate on
10		the motion to approve the proposed

11		changes to the Senate Rules?
12	CRAMER:	All right. Seeing none, if you'd
13		like to vote yes, please use the "raise
14		hand" feature now.
15		If you'd like to vote no, use the
16		"raise hand" feature now.
17		If you'd like to abstain, use the
18		"raise hand" feature now.
19		That motion passes.
20	CRAMER:	Again, just in case Marion did a
21		very good job just now. Please you use
22		your name and your affiliation when
23		speaking.
24		Jeff are you ready?

BIRD-POLLAN: So the next one comes from the

25

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1	College of Arts and Sciences, and this
2	is a proposal to add a new requirement
3	that students take a race and ethnicity
4	course at some point during their time
5	at UK in order to graduate with a degree
6	from the College of Arts and Sciences.

7	It'll apply to degree programs inside
8	undergraduate degree programs inside the
9	college.
10	Just to give you a little bit of a
11	background on the proposal, it
12	originally stems, as you can read in the
13	proposal itself, from a conversation
14	that began on campus, and part of which
15	was a discussion about university-wide
16	race and ethnicity requirements. That
17	proposal, that discussion wasn't really
18	a global proposal and did not move
19	forward.
20	After the 2015 conversation, some

21	faculty members inside Arts and
22	Sciences, motivated by that campus-wide
23	discussion, moved forward a proposal
24	inside the college. So this is a new 3
25	credit hour requirement, but it doesn't

- 1 add to the total number of credit hours
- 2 that are required to graduate in the

- 3 College of Arts and Sciences.
- 4 Because students will be allowed to
- 5 have this requirement overlap with one
- 6 of their other requirements, whether
- 7 that's UK Core requirements, major
- 8 requirements or other college
- 9 requirements, there is a list of courses
- 10 already approved inside the proposal, as
- 11 well courses that are identified as
- meeting as satisfying the new race and
- 13 ethnicity requirement. So you can see
- 14 those, but moving forward, in order to
- be approved to satisfy this requirement,
- of course we'll have this from the

17	proposal itself. Of course, we'll have
18	to address issues of race and race and
19	ethnicity in more than 50 percent of
20	class time and more than 50 percent of
21	course material and more than 50 percent
22	of students assignments.
23	So more courses, I think, are
24	expected to be approved as they
25	demonstrate that they satisfy this

1		requirement. Our committee recommends
2		approving this new graduation
3		requirement and it will be effective for
4		students to enroll at UK in fall of
5		2021.
6	CRAMER:	That was fall 2021, right?
7	BIRD-POLL	AN: And I think Anna Bosch and
8		Christina, they are here and can
9		confirm. But I think, yes, the idea is
10		this will not be a new graduation
11		requirement for students who are already
12		enrolled at LIK but a new requirement

13	moving forward. So students who will,
14	enroll in fall 2021, but we might want
15	to ask.
16	CRAMER: Any questions for Anna Bosch or
17	Christina?
18	BIRD-POLLAN: In violation of the rules on a
19	CRAMER: Alright. But the answer was was
20	yes.
21	Are there any questions for either
22	Jennifer or for Christina about this
23	proposal? Bob?
24	GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman. Did I do that right?
25	But, yeah, actually it should have

1	occurred to me before, but who is the
2	group in A&S who is privileged with the
3	authority to decide which courses are
4	going to satisfy this requirement? Is
5	that the Policy Committee and the
6	college? Is that the Diversity and
7	Inclusion Committee or is it an
8	administrative task of the dean, which

9		probably should not be? Is this clear
10		in the proposal? Or, if not, is there a
11		de facto division of labor? How does
12		that work?
13	CRAMER:	Are you raising your hand, Anna?
14	BOSCH:	Yes, I am. Anna Bosch, College of
15		Arts and Sciences Vice President. Bob,
16		I believe this is addressed in the
17		proposal, but and Christina can
18		correct me, but I believe that it's our
19		college Race and Ethnicity Committee
20		that will do the first review of courses
21		that are proposed. And those
22		recommendations will be forwarded to the
23		PC, the final arbiter, of course, of

24 c	changes and nev	w course proposals	. And
------	-----------------	--------------------	-------

25 from the PC it'll go on to the

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

51

1 Undergraduate Council.

2 GROSSMAN: Thank you.

3 CRAMER: Are there other questions about the

4 proposal? John?

5 CHAIT: Yes. Maybe I -- there's something 6 wrong with my computer, but I can't seem 7 to read the proposal itself or the list 8 of course --You mean from the link on the 9 CRAMER: 10 agenda site? 11 CHAIT: Yes. It doesn't seem -- maybe my 12 computer -- that doesn't seem to work. 13 CRAMER: We'll double-check that real quick, 14 but I think it's -- yeah, it might be a 15 local problem. A local spot check seems 16 to suggest it is working here at this 17 time. 18 Any other questions about the

proposal?

20		We have a motion from the
21		committee. Is there any debate on this
22		motion? Scott?
23	YOST:	Scott Yost, College of Engineering.
24		Having served on the committee, you
25		know, I had a chance, the opportunity to

1	look at this proposal a little more in
2	depth. And I do want to say that
3	there's a couple comments that I have on
4	the surface.
5	I think we need to be careful of
6	proposing such a requirement, only from
7	the standpoint of how it could
8	potentially open up to other things.
9	For instance, you know, with the opioid
10	and alcohol issues we have in society,
11	or obesity issues in society, it opens
12	up that why don't we have classes that
13	address those things with our students?
14	Why don't we make those a required

course, so while this -- we have,

16	certainly, a lot of current events and
17	current issues that deal with race and
18	ethnicity.
19	It's not the only issue we have in
20	society that affects our university,
21	that affects our students and so forth.
22	And so I just I guess I'm a little
23	bit concerned about just opening up the
24	can of worms. And I don't think
25	anybody's going to sit here and say

we're going to have a new class next

2	week by proposing this, but it's this
3	is a path that we're going down now.
4	Having said that, I mean, I still
5	commend Arts and Sciences for putting
6	this infrastructure in place to allow
7	programs to tap into this.
8	But I wish I could support this
9	proposal, and the reason I can't, two
10	reasons: The first reason is the fact
11	that, while the Arts and Sciences have

12	claimed such a widespread support. I'm
13	not exactly convinced that it's as
14	widespread as they would like to say,
15	given just what was voted at the number
16	of people participating.
17	But if it didn't have such a
18	widespread support, then I would say,
19	why don't you make put the
20	infrastructure in place, and you have
21	the committee to review the courses.
22	Why not take and make this optional
23	for programs that see this as a
24	necessary component for their students
25	to participate or students to have this

1	exposure with these classes. Then those
2	particular programs can sign on to this.
3	So the first thing is making it
4	mandatory, even though it's just for
5	Arts and Sciences. I think we all know
6	that what happens is Arts and Sciences,
7	before long, it starts migrating to the

8	university.
9	But again, having the
10	infrastructure in place, I would just
11	suggest to allow programs to buy into it
12	and make it for their students.
13	The second thing, which is to me
14	just a little bit more troubling, and
15	that is: To satisfy the requirements of
16	the course, it must address one or more
17	of the following components: If you look
18	in the proposal, there's four bulleted
19	lists there. The third bulleted list
20	and this is actually on page 3 the
21	overall 64-page proposal it talks

22	about there's an implied biased
23	statement, and I think it is borderline
24	a little bit on the offensive side.
25	And the statement specifically says how

1	race and ethnicity become the basis of
2	inequality, oppression, pressure and
3	privilege and so forth. I think if the

4		proposal I personally would feel more
5		comfort in supporting this proposal if
6		that particular implied bias was
7		removed.
8		For instance, input terminology
9		just related to, you know ,how does race
10		and ethnicity relate to inequality of
11		pressure and privilege and identities.
12		I'm a little bit concerned about putting
13		in place something that has an implied
14		bias that has a policy for approval of
15		courses. So that's my thing.
16	CRAMER:	Christina, I can't have you debate
17		as you're not a member of the hody but

18		if there's any factual element that you
19		want to add?
20	ALCALDE:	Thank you. So I'm not sure I think
21		everything I could add would be factual,
22		but it was presented more as debate. So
23		I'll wait for them to weigh in, and then
24		I can add to it. I can certainly have
25		lots of factual parts, so

1	CRAMER:	If there are questions that come up
2		that that you can add an answer to, we
3		can come back to you. Stefan?
4	S. BIRD-PC	DLLAN: Right. Yeah. Stefan Bird-Pollan,
5		College of Arts and Sciences. I want to
6		speak in favor of the of the proposal.
7		I think there's really I mean,
8		one, can well agree with Scott that
9		there are many social problems? And,
LO		you know, I think that as those rise to
l1		the attention of the university, you
12		know, we should have courses addressing
13		those

14	Two, I mean, you know, race and
15	ethnicity, that's a problem that has
16	been with us since the founding of the
17	country so, you know, it's been about
18	400 years.
19	And I don't see any particular
20	problem in addressing that. It seems
21	way too late, really, to be addressing
22	that. We should really be having gotter
23	on the bandwagon much earlier. So I
24	think that, you know, as other issues
25	come up in another hundred years, I

1		think we should face those, and we
2		should also adapt our teaching to that.
3		We can't just stay outside of the
4		political outside of the university.
5	CRAMER:	Susan?
6	BARRON:	Susan Barron from Arts and
7		Sciences. I'm going to agree with
8		Stefan. And, to be honest, I think that
9		this has been so pervasive for so long,

10		and if it goes to other colleges, will
11		be all the better. Because I don't
12		really know a field that could not
13		benefit from something like this, so I'm
14		a strong supporter.
15	CRAMER:	Mel?
16	STEIN:	Thank you. I just wanted to speak
17		in support of it as well. I agree with
18		both points that were just raised, and
19		also, that I can't imagine any issues
20		around any social issues that aren't
21		exacerbated by race and ethnicity in
22		this country, whether it's the opioid
23		crisis, obesity and so on.
24		So I have no problem with race and

1	understand and to think about social
2	issues, not to mention that I am hoping
3	it's a model for the rest of the
4	university, and I hope it does bleed
5	into the other colleges. I don't think

6		that we can, educationally speaking,
7		wait for different programs to decide
8		it's necessary to address something like
9		inequality. That's sort of the point of
10		having this be a requirement is that
11		students, even if reluctant to, thinking
12		about race and ethnicity, diversity and
13		inclusion are pushed to do so as part of
14		a liberal arts education. Thank you.
15	CRAMER:	Kim, I see you, but again I can
16		only members of the body can debate.
17		Bob?
18	GROSSMA	N: I do support this proposal as a
19		member of a department that some may
20		think this sort of requirement would be

21	superfluous. I think it's really
22	important that chemistry students do
23	take a course in race and ethnicity to
24	understand that.
25	

2	this science as a human endeavor, and as
3	such, it's subject to all the failings
4	of the humans who participate in it.
5	And we've had a lot of talk in the
6	sciences over the last year about how
7	we've been complicit in racism and other
8	equally unfortunate practices. And I
9	think it's really important for students
10	to be able to to wrestle with this.
11	In fact, I think this will be a
12	model, not just for the university, but
13	around the country for universities that
14	are also looking for ways to help
15	address some of the social problems that
16	our country and other countries face.

17	I would like to point out that the
18	race and ethnicity requirement does not
19	have to be about the United States in
20	particular. There are courses approved
21	that address race and ethnicity in other
22	countries as well. So there's a lot of
23	different ways that students can have
24	this requirement satisfied at the same
25	time.

1	I think that it's really important
2	for our students to understand some of
3	these things in terms one of the
4	points that Scott raised, I would
5	actually I do agree with Scott that
6	the language of that one bullet point is
7	a little bit strong in terms of its
8	connection of race and ethnicity with
9	negative subjects like prejudice and
10	inequality.
11	But I don't think that that one
12	word is really going to affect teaching

13		of the classes, the courses that are
14		approved, et cetera. So I would not
15		want to hold up this proposal over
16		choice of wording and that one bullet
17		point.
18	CRAMER:	Alan?
19	BROWN:	Alan brown, Arts and Sciences. I
20		just want to ask a question. I don't
21		know are we we can we ask
22		questions of each other?
23	CRAMER:	Not really, no.
24	BROWN:	Okay. Then I will but I feel

like that has already been addressed to

1	the concern about the proliferation of
2	courses. I guess that's not as much a
3	concern for me for the reasons that have
4	been stated in the sense that when
5	social issues arise and we as professors
6	and as the academy consider those to be
7	important to higher education, we need
8	to include those in our curriculum.

9	But I was gonna ask if that was the
10	primary concern he has is more the
11	proliferation of courses. That might be
12	that professors might gear things
13	toward their specific frameworks,
14	conceptual frameworks, political
15	frameworks, whatever. I don't know if
16	that was where he was going with that.
17	And then I also wanted to get some
18	clarity on the language, having not
19	actually seen the language myself. But
20	it sounds like I can't, kind of, ask
21	questions as my two cents.

Holly?

22

CRAMER:

23	SWANSON:	So in honor of International
24	Won	nen's Day, I have to ask the question
25	of w	nether or not we think that gender

1	inequities has also been a historically
2	important social issue, and whether tha
3	will similarly be addressed in this new
4	course or requirement?

5	CRAMER:	That sounds like a question that I
6		can direct to Christina, if she would
7		like to answer it.
8	ALCALDE:	Oh, I can't see myself, but can you
9		hear me?
10		So, yes, any course, whether it's
11		obesity or gender or anything, can be
12		submitted. Because these courses are 50
13		percent race and racialization, that
14		does not meet mean we can't focus on
15		everything else, including gender, in
16		fact.
17		A lot of the courses we have right
18		now are intersectional, meaning also

gender. Some of them are in within the 19 20 gender and women's studies program. So absolutely -- but this is specifically 21 22 focused on race and racialization. 23 CRAMER: Herman? Can you hear me? 24 FARRELL: 25 CRAMER: Yes, we can.

- 1 FARRELL: So, you know, my analysis of all
- 2 these proposals coming out of colleges,
- 3 that may be somewhat controversial from
- 4 the senate's perspective. How do we
- 5 honor what it is that the particular
- 6 college is considering, and do we want
- 7 to -- I think, more often than not, as
- 8 senators that are outside of that
- 9 college, to respect the internal wishes
- 10 of that body, it sounds to me like this
- 11 had widespread support within the
- 12 college. And it seems like the college
- has been grappling with the decision for
- 14 a very long time, going back to 2015 and

15	even beyond that.
16	Because of the course catalog, you
17	can see that that A&S in particular, not
18	only in terms of its teaching, but in
19	terms of Core curriculum, curriculum
20	development, but also in terms of its
21	hires is really interested in this
22	conversation.
23	So, as a member of the university
24	and College of Fine Arts, I'm all in
25	favor of, again, supporting this

1	college's effort to deal with a very
2	major issue.
3	As Stefan Bird-Pollan noted, it
4	goes back 400 years. It is a major
5	social issue in our country. So I'm in
6	favor of it for those reasons.
7	I also just think generally about
8	the notion of what a graduation
9	requirement is about. It's about
10	preparation for the "real world." We

11	are preparing our students with certain
12	skills and we summarize that in the
13	graduation requirement and on things
14	that may come out of their substantive
15	work, department by department,
16	discipline by discipline. But we also
17	should really think about what is the,
18	sort of, bottom line fundamental skills
19	that they need to have.
20	And it seems to me that what's
21	happening here, which I really love, is
22	this notion that understanding race and
23	understanding ethnicity and discourse
24	about racism in America or across the
25	globe is, I think, a really important

l	skill set for all of our graduates to
2	have in here in this humanities-based,
3	arts and science based college.
1	I think it's important as well for
5	their department so for, you know
5	for their graduate, so I think, just as

/	a graduate writing requirement,
8	communication requirement in terms of
9	skill sets that folks need to have when
10	they graduate from here is considered to
11	be something that we think is important
12	for all university graduates within each
13	college.
14	There's always, sort of, universal
15	fundamental principles that they feel
16	like they need to have their students
17	graduate with. And as I was saying, why
18	not race and ethnicity? I think this is
19	something I would want to take up with
20	my college as well, and I think it's a
21	really great proposal and I'm thoroughly

23 CRAMER: Just a reminder, as we continue,

24 names and college affiliations.

25 CRAMER: Jon, did you have your hand up?

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

66

1 CHAIT: Jon Chait. I found the list of

2 classes, and I must say, my concerns are

3	very much weighed by the wide range of
4	classes that are offered to meet this
5	requirement, but I continue to be
6	concerned how the number one concern
7	I have is the name of this proposed
8	requirement, which says race and
9	ethnicity, and my reason for that is
10	that I think there are many dimensions
11	of inequality.
12	I think it was mentioned, one that
13	I believe is very important, that
14	particularly affects finance, and that
15	is gender inequality, and I would
16	propose that this have a somewhat
17	broader title than race and ethnicity,

18	which reflects the diversity of classes.
19	And, particularly, gender. I would
20	leave open other dimensions of
21	inequality, because our students feel
22	those dimensions. You know, I can see
23	from the students that with gay students
24	and sexual preference, and I see that
25	so I say chance of being lesbian

1	students, I wish to feel that dimension,
2	and I think this is a good idea, but I
3	think it should be more broadly
4	constructing.
5	CRAMER: Alison?
6	GUSTAFSON: Hi. Alison Gustafson, College of
7	Agriculture, Food and Environment. I
8	had a question on the list of courses.
9	Were any of those courses developed
10	by people of color? And, then, when
11	those courses were being developed, were
12	they developed in collaboration with a
13	grounded theory from folks that are in

14		the community that are most affected by
15		race and ethnicity?
16	CRAMER:	Anna or Christina?
17	ALCALDE:	Thank you. So the courses were not
18		developed just for this requirement. We
19		have lots of faculty and, actually, we
20		have a whole web page of faculty experts
21		and expertise on race and ethnicity.
22		Most of us are people of color on
23		that page who develop these courses, but
24		not all, by any means. And many of us
25		I'm a professor in general women's

68

1	studies. There are professors in African
2	American studies, but they're also
3	professors in sociology and English.
4	So it really is across the whole
5	college. Many of us do us grounded
6	theory, but because there's such a
7	diversity of courses it really depends on
8	the discipline.

Akiko?

CRAMER:

TAKENAKA:	Akiko Takenaka, College of Arts and
-----------	-------------------------------------

11	Sciences. I was one of the members of
12	the Adrienne hoc committee that worked on
13	this requirement, and so I wanted to just
14	clarify one point that came up a couple
15	of times about the third bullet point
16	about what the content of the courses
17	will address.
18	And just because some of you don't
19	seem to have the document in front of
20	you, I'm just going to go ahead and read.
21	This bullet point is very short, how
22	race and ethnicity become the basis of
23	inequality, of pressing privilege

24	identities and agency, and so the people
25	who are criticizing this point seem to

1	have the impression that this is all
2	about the negative aspects of race and
3	ethnicity. And I just wanted to point
4	out, we grappled with this bullet point,
5	really worked on it over and over and

- 6 over again.
- 7 And the solution we came up with,
- 8 because we didn't want to present a
- 9 negative impression, we added terms like
- 10 identities and agencies. And so this is
- just to say that we're not -- this is not
- 12 about how people are just oppressed and
- and discriminated because of race and
- 14 ethnicity, and it deals with positives
- 15 and negatives.
- 16 CRAMER: Now -- oh, actually -- no hang on.
- 17 I'm sorry. Just to let other people
- speak if they want to speak. Martell?
- 19 JOHNSON: Good afternoon, everybody. Martell

20	Johnson, College of Law. As a student of
21	color, I support this course proposal. I
22	think that it's extremely important I
23	am a bit shocked by some of the pushback
24	from it by the title. I think that the
25	issues to be discussed are timely and

2	said.

3	Obesity has been brought up in the
4	black Community. Obesity is at higher
5	rates than any other community. You
6	know, gender, more women of color died
7	from having birth than any other woman of
8	any other rights, so I think that at the
9	end of the day, if the discussion is
10	negative or positive about the issue of
11	race, I think that it should be grounded
12	in the truth and, in fact, and I think
13	that now more than ever everyone could
14	use a dose of truth, in fact, in
15	education.

16		So I just wanted to express my
17		support for it and hope that everyone
18		else can see the value in it. And,
19		hopefully, this can be something that can
20		be implemented throughout campus as a
21		whole. Thank you.
22	STEIN:	I just wanted to say and as
23		somebody who is in women's studies and
24		also affiliated with Africana studies,
25		that I don't think any of my colleagues

1	would say race and ethnicity is in any
2	way separable from gender.
3	I think that I could speak all of my
4	colleagues in saying that we would see a
5	requirement on gender and race on race
6	and ethnicity being profoundly about
7	gender as well. I teach classes on LGBT
8	history, LGBT social movements, and it is
9	all about race. They're completely
10	inextricable, so I don't think we would
11	have any problem with that whatsoever.

12 And I apologize for the dogs. 13 CRAMER: Scott? 14 YOST: Oh, yeah. Thanks, again, Chairman 15 Cramer. I appreciate the great comments 16 and the perspectives. I especially 17 appreciate Akiko at least giving a little 18 bit of thought relative to the verbiage 19 that was chosen. 20 I will say that I still -- I'm not 21 worried about the proliferation. I am 22 saying that the two things I'm most 23 against is the mandate. If it's widespread support, then the programs 24

will automatically approve it and it'll

1	go forward, which is good. I think there
2	is some concern there, on my part just as
3	far as a mandate coming down, even if it
4	has widespread support.
5	But I'm really curious, and i'm
6	going to throw this out there for a
7	question. And I am giving an example,

8	but this implied bias that is in there,
9	I'm not saying it's negative or positive,
10	although it certainly could be read as
11	negative.
12	You know, why not change the wording
13	to "relates to" because and I'll give
14	you the example of the implied bias. And
15	excuse me, Chairman Cramer if I use you
16	as the example: If I were to say to
17	Chairman Kramer, say "When did you stop
18	beating your wife?" Okay. That has an
19	implied bias that he's already been
20	beating his wife. And it's a negative
21	thing. Don't get me wrong. But that's
22	what I mean by the terminology there,

23	whether it's interpreted by some as
24	neutral or some by negative, I think we
25	can do better in codifying this if we

1	were to use a little bit more just open-
2	ended "relates to," because I don't thinl
3	my "relates to" is taken away from the

4		proposal, because certainly I want to
5		support the proposal, but I also want it
6		taken and have terminology that is not
7		going to create angst, maybe, by some
8		people. So I'm just throwing it out
9		there. Thanks for the time.
10	CRAMER:	So, Scott, I think you asked a
11		question of fact about the proposal to
12		Christina. Christina, do you want to
13	ALCALDE:	I'd love to just answer the
14		question. Thank you. And I know some of
15		this we already wrote in the response to
16		the committee, but I want to just
17		reiterate: So this was developed by folks
18		who we have expertise in race and

19	racialization and racism, and this is not
20	just a like or a preference, but it's
21	based on scholarship, so this is why
22	we're using the term bias. It's those of
23	us who do scholarship on this and
24	understand this, so I think that's
25	important to understand that it's not an

1		ideology or an idea about what we want,
2		but, rather, based on the history and
3		scholarship of many, many people who work
4		in these areas. Hopefully, that clears
5		it up a little bit.
6	CRAMER:	Rudy?
7	BUCHEIT:	This is, I think, a question in fact
8		for Christina, but and I know you've
9		spent a little time benchmarking, I know.
10		I'm just wondering if you could summarize
11		for us some of the most important
12		strengths and some of the pitfalls that
13		have been experienced by our peers around
14		the country who've done something like

13		uns.
16	ALCALDE:	Sure. And I don't know that I have
17		all that information in front of me right
18		now. But I can say, for example,
19		University of Michigan, who was the first
20		to implement a requirement like this
21		since 1990. So let's just first say that
22		none of this is new. I think some of the
23		negative we can see that we the
24		pushback that it receives, that being the
25		idea that it's something that doesn't

this.

15

1	have to do with curriculum, but, rather,
2	that it's a political issue, so there's
3	been some pushback with that. Most of it
4	has been supportive. I was just reading,
5	something, I think, about the University
6	of Vermont recently about, you know, they
7	have a similar requirement or recently
8	started one, and it's that students that
9	have been asking for this, not just at
10	the University of Kentucky, which we

11		know, but nationwide for a very long
12		time.
13		And this is how we prepare our
14		students, so, you know as far as I'd
15		have to look at all the documents again
16		to see specifically what debates, but
17		mostly it's that it better prepares our
18		students, that students are more
19		satisfied with the education that they
20		receive as far as this.
21	CRAMER:	Michelle we've had some technical
22		issues with you bouncing back and forth
23		between panelist an attendee. I think we
24		have you over as a panelist now. I think

1	SIZEMORE	Thank you. Michelle Sizemore, Arts
2		and Sciences. Thank you. I was on the
3		SAASC Committee that looked over this
4		proposal, and I just have to say, you
5		know, as someone who really did go
6		through this proposal line by line

7	multiple times, I think it's it's a well-
8	put-together proposal. And as a topic
9	for study, I don't think that there is
10	any topic that could be more timely and
11	relevant then study of race and ethnicity
12	right now.
13	And so it's not just about 2021, as
14	others have pointed out very astutely,
15	this is a an issue that extends backward
16	400 years and more. So I just wanted to
17	add my enthusiastic support, emphatic
18	support for this proposal.
19	And also, just to add, maybe forming
20	it as a question, since this is my second

21	semester on the Senate, why can't this be
22	a college perogative?
23	Arts and Sciences has carefully
24	considered and embedded this proposal,
25	the courses. Why can't we trust the

77

expertise of the faculty members in that
 college who are well-qualified to make

3	these decisions?	

4	CRAMER:	So it was a question I would not
5		say it's a question of fact, except for,
6		of course, we can approve it. We can
7		allow a college to have a college-wide
8		requirement. And that's the question for
9		the Senate, is whether it's going to.
10		So I'd say that's maybe a rhetorical
11		question, not maybe one of fact. But
12		I've got Kevin and Kenneth, and then, I
13		guess, we should decide whether or not
14		we're sort of moving into a debate or
15		whether we're ready for the question.
16		Kevin?

17	SCHUER:	Yeah. Thanks so much. Really
18		quick, Kevin Schuer, College of Health
19		Sciences in the PA Department.
20		Just really quickly, I first of all
21		want to thank the original senate member
22		for bringing the question, and then all
23		of the discussion. I'm wildly supportive
24		of the proposal.
25		The reason is because I think for

1		me, the difficulty with, especially our
2		learners, and even adults, we don't have
3		we haven't had, sort of, the framework
4		to have these kind of conversations. So
5		that's why this proposal is so important,
6		at least in my mind, to give our learners
7		at least a starting point, potentially,
8		as we get out so we can actually see real
9		change. So wildly supportive
10	CRAMER:	Ken?
11	CALVERT:	Ken calvert, College of Engineering
12		And I just have a quick question. I'm

13		sorry. I'm going to go back to that
14		third bullet which says how race and
15		ethnicity become the basis of inequality
16		oppression, et cetera.
17		And I'm just wondering about the use
18		of the definite article there where if I
19		just focus on that, I could interpret
20		that as being the only basis, and I was
21		just wondering if that was the intent or
22		how that should be interpreted.
23	ALCALDE:	Well, we specifically others can
24		speak who are on the committee, but as a
25		question just we specifically put the

1	basis not the only basis. And in other
2	courses, as I think you have mentioned,
3	also include gender. It can also can
4	create all sorts of different identity so
5	far, we haven't had any issues whatsoever
6	with courses coming through and being
7	reviewed and anyone reviewing them and
8	thinking that they can only focus on

9	race.

10		And we're all this is based on
11		people who focus on this, and we know
12		we're intersectional beings, so we're
13		never just gendered. We're never just
14		race. And so this is it's the basis,
15		yes, and I think the way these courses
16		are taught, everyone reads it as the
17		basis, not the only basis that you can
18		only focus on.
19	CALVERT:	I meant to say that I intend to vote
20		for this because I think it's as
21		people have said, the college's
22		prerogative and it's also a time to have
23		this this conversation. Liust wondered

24	about the definite versus the indefinite

25 article, so thanks.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1	CRAMER:	We have a motion from the committee
2		We've had a lot of debate. No more hands
3		are up. I'm going to assume we've had
4		our fill of debate.

5	Senate members, if you'd like to
6	vote yes on the motion, please use the
7	"raise hand" feature now.
8	If you'd like to vote no on the
9	motion, please use the "raise hand"
10	feature now.
11	And if you'd like to abstain on the
12	motion, please use the "raise hand"
13	feature now.
14	And that motion passes.
15	Jennifer, are you still with us? I
16	think you have another one.
17	BIRD-POLLAN: Yes. I have one more proposal.
18	So this proposal comes from the
19	from Christine Harper, who is Associate

20	Vice President for Enrollment Management
21	and also the Undergraduate Admissions
22	Office, and Scott McDonald, the Dean of
23	Admissions.
24	Christine and Scott came to the
25	Senate Council over the summer. So I

1	have a cat crying in the background. I'm
2	sorry. So there's dogs and cats today.
3	My apologies.
4	So Christina and Scott came to the
5	Senate Council in the summer to ask for
6	approval for a one-year pilot to make
7	admissions to the undergraduate program
8	at the University of Kentucky what they
9	call "test optional," so standardized
10	tests. ACT, SAT would become an optional
11	part of the admissions criteria for the
12	undergraduate program at UK.
13	The reason this came in the summer
14	was because the admission cycle starts
15	early in the fall, so these are students

16	who are applying to enter in the fall of
17	2021. So in order for this to be part of
18	the admissions process, they needed to
19	have it approved over the summer. The
20	Senate Council debated and voted to
21	approve that that pilot on a one-year
22	basis.
23	That conversation, of course well
24	let's just say this: That the
25	conversation about test optional had

1	started on the basis of other grounds,
2	and many of you have probably heard some
3	of that nationwide conversation about
4	standardized testing. However, the
5	urgency with which Christine and Scott
6	came in the summer had to do with the
7	cancellation of many administrations of
8	tests, of standardized tests, for the
9	rising seniors, so they didn't have the
10	opportunity to take the ACT, the SAT, so
11	it wouldn't be part of their application.

12	So the admissions office, I think,
13	feels good about how this has gone,
14	although, of course, those students have
15	not come to campus yet. They are
16	interested in evaluating the test
17	optional status for undergraduate
18	admissions moving forward, but much more
19	data is needed before they can make a
20	proposal to make this change permanent.
21	Therefore, they've asked for the
22	test optional pilot be extended for
23	another three admissions cycles, so
24	another three years. This will allow the
25	admissions office to gather information

1	about students who are admitted under the
2	pilot program and hopefully get us far
3	enough past the pandemic, but some of the
4	entering students would have had a year,
5	their senior year of high school, fully
6	in-person, unaffected by, you know, Zoom
7	school. So that will also help them

8		analyze, help the Admissions Office
9		analyze the success of this test optional
10		pilot.
11		So our committee considered the
12		request and voted to approve the
13		extension for another three years, and
14		think Christine Harper is here to answer
15		questions people might have.
16	CRAMER:	So are there any questions for
17		either Jennifer or Christine?
18	CRAMER:	Scott?
19	YOST:	I have a just a quick question for
20		clarification: if this was not voted
21		how do I want to say this? When does

22	this, I guess, extension proposal start
23	affecting the incoming class for 2022?
24	Not this coming fall but, you know,
25	whereas if we were to take this up in the

1	fall, would it be too late and we would
2	be kind of up in the air for the incoming
3	class, those applying for the fall of

4		2022 or are we you know, i m just
5		looking at the timing relative to this
6		proposal, relative to incoming students.
7	HARPER:	Thank you. Christine harper,
8		Student Success Chief Enrollment Officer.
9		The answer to that is we've actually
10		started working with our who are
11		currently juniors, so we have a rolling
12		cycle. We minimally need to notify our
13		students by August 1 of each year of what
14		the requirements will be.
15		We prefer to be able to,
16		particularly in a situation like this
17		where we know that students are still

18	having access issues to the exam
19	administration dates and some are having
20	to travel upwards of three hours or more
21	to get access to an exam to take that
22	barrier off the table. We still have
23	students that are applying and we still
24	accept we have 62 percent of the
25	admitted class currently with test

1		scores. But the reason for having it
2		earlier is so that we can alert students
3		to be able to make their decisions,
4		because it has been even challenging
5		right now for juniors trying to access
6		exams that they would typically use when
7		they start applying August 1 of this
8		upcoming year. So summer, August 2021,
9		is the hard deadline for us.
10	CRAMER:	Susan?
11	BARRON:	Susan Barron, Arts and Sciences.
12		And this probably is a little bit off
13		topic, although not really. But I have a

14	hard time with the importance that's put
15	on standardized scores anyway. So I'd
16	love for us to have more data, because I
17	think things like GPA are so much better
18	a indicator of what students are capable
19	of doing, rather than the three-hour
20	window.
20	window. And that's from somebody the
21	And that's from somebody the
21	And that's from somebody the psychology department, so I know a little

1	CRAMER:	Al	l right, Jeff?	Remember, v	ve're
2		asking que	estions right	now if either	
3		Jennifer o	r Christine.		
4	LEHMKUH	LER:	Jeff Lehmk	uhler of CAFÉ.	We had
5		talked abo	out this in the	e past and in o	our
6		committee	e as well, bu	t could you jus	st
7		share how	this may im	pact scholarsh	nip if
8		students e	elect to not d	lo the test.	

10	HARPER:	Certainly, for all of the reasons
11		that we suggested: The pandemic, as well
12		as some of the bias and test construct
13		and the impact on on socioeconomic status
14		in terms of test scores and access to
15		support.
16		Philosophically, we made the
17		decision that if students couldn't access
18		and because there's other factors, it
19		shouldn't just be considered an
20		admission, but also merit aid award. So
21		we have merit aid award that are now also
22		test optional, so the student applies
23		with or without a test score. They are
24		given access, as long as they meet the

87

to both admissions consideration and
merit-based award consideration, just

like in admissions the consideration for
merit-based awards is different.

So we've done a whole analysis on if

6		it was a GPA and a test score, then what
7		would be the GPA only that we would be
8		looking at for those merit awards.
9	CRAMER:	Rudy.
10	BUCHEIT:	Rudy Bucheit, Engineering.
11		Christina, in this three-Year version,
12		can you just speak to what your view is
13		and how that would or would not obligate
14		admissions into the selective admissions
15		colleges.
16	HARPER:	We're asking for the three-year
17		window for a number of reasons: One, we
18		do think that it's really important for
19		our students to be and and parents and
20		families, as well as high school

21	counselors, to be able to prepare. Some
22	other institutions across the country
23	I've already announced this.
24	Two, we will be gathering data, so
25	the initial data that we're going to be

2	we're also going to be getting
3	information from our students, as they
4	come in, about how their senior year was
5	presented to them. So where they hybrid?
6	Were they fully remote? Were they in-
7	person? So then we can also stratify
8	their performance, based on what their
9	experience was within their high school.
10	We're also working with KYSTATS to get
11	more data across Kentucky de-identified
12	from other institutions to be able to
13	look at performance.
14	And then what we plan on doing is
15	taking that data and then having it and
16	the student success outcomes inform, and

17	then go back to the colleges to be able
18	to continually work on are there better
19	ways to try and make it better each time
20	as we go through this pilot so that when
21	we get to the end of the three years, we
22	have the students outcomes from each year
23	building as we get more information, not
24	only from them, but beyond throughout the
25	state of Kentucky. Is that helpful,

1		Rudy?
2	BUCHEIT:	I guess my question was if the
3		university moves forward with test
4		optional admissions, you can say can
5		selective colleges opt out?
6	HARPER:	Yes. so at any point when we have
7		any kind of admissions decisions that
8		colleges are the owners of, the kind of
9		admissions criteria, so at any time the
10		colleges could certainly opt out. And
11		some institutions' selective colleges
12		have chosen to do that.

13	CRAMER:	But I think Rudy is specifically
14		asking, like, who in the colleges this
15		is like a GR 7-type question of whether
16		or not this is a faculty of the College
17		question.
18	BUCHEIT:	I think it probably is a GR 7
19		question, yes, and I know that there are
20		people in our college who feel that way,
21		so that that's an issue in this for us.
22	CRAMER:	Herman?
23	FARRELL:	Herman Farrell, College of Fine
24		Arts. Aaron, you can hear me, I guess.

I have a question about the three-year

1	extension, it seems like a long time
2	period, and I just heard the response,
3	which is that this is kind of a benchmark
4	that others other institutions are doing
5	this.
6	I guess, my question is it has to
7	do with it the feedback loop that the
8	that the administration takes into

9	consideration and will be taken into
10	consideration as to the effect of, sort
11	of, the I guess the quality of the of
12	the students and their preparation for
13	college now that we remove this.
14	I understand the real, serious
15	issues that my colleague Susan Baron
16	pointed out with regard to SATs and ACTs
17	and their impact on a variety of
18	different communities and their own
19	fairness issue. I understand that, but
20	at the same time I am concerned as a
21	professor in the classroom about students
22	coming in at a level of preparedness

23	that's problematic for me if it requires
24	remediation or what have you. And that's
25	something that I think all faculty get

1	upset about if they have to be focused on
2	that because it takes away from the rest
3	of the attention to be paid from all the
4	students within a class.

5		So what is happening in terms of the
6		feedback loop, in terms of you in
7		administration, in getting a sense of how
8		this change already under COVID and as it
9		will go forward over the next three years
10		is impacting, again, student
11		preparedness.
12	HARPER:	Certainly. So, factually, the auto-
13		criteria, auto-admissions criteria,
14		historically has waited the GPA 10 times
15		against the ACT or SAT because of the
16		data that supports that GPA is a better
17		predictor of success.
18		In terms of the questions about

19	preparedness, we also have, by CPE, been
20	given a waiver and done the same analysis
21	on college readiness, so we have college
22	readiness standards based on the GPA.
23	When you're looking at the
24	feedback loop, my approach would be
25	that at the end of the year, we

2	would, an end of the year, analysis,
3	which would likely be I would say
4	end of May, beginning of June. as to
5	this first year and how it went how
6	many students applied with test
7	scores without test scores, without
8	test scores, the admissions. And
9	then by the end of the next year

would be presenting, just as we

data on students, like I said,
stratified by their high school
delivery of their curriculum and
whether they were admitted with or

we'll have our first year of outcome

15		without a test score.
16		And then continuing from there,
17		we will be reporting out annually
18		each year.
19	FARRELL:	Aaron, If I could just quick
20		follow-up. But the question is
21		about the feedback coming from
22		faculty themselves. You're talking
23		about data-driven responses. You're
24		looking at outcomes, but just on the
25		grounds in terms of how faculty are

1	reeling about, sort or, the quality
2	of students and some things can be
3	worked out, hopefully, by faculty to
4	make sure that students are
5	successful in their classes.
6	But that that feedback to you
7	about the impact upon their teaching
8	and their and their efforts what's
9	the again, what's the loop;
10	what's the avenue for us to provide

you with that input?

12	HARPER:	Certainly. So just as when we
13		came through, we worked very closely
14		with the departments and the
15		colleges, and we looked at
16		prerequisites, et cetera, and we
17		commonly are having conversations
18		I am currently having conversations
19		with college leadership, as well as
20		the associate deans, who I meet with
21		them every other week. So any
22		feedback can be directed towards me
23		or can go up through the
24		administrative ranks within the
25		college to come back. But I

1	commonly am having conversations
2	with both the associate deans and
3	deans about how the college
4	readiness standards are for our APP-
5	accepting colleges, of which we have
6	five right now, and that

/		conversation really, the holistic
8		review about whether who gets
9		admitted, that's all decided by the
10		colleges when we have students that
11		are on that lower range and they go
12		through a holistic review.
13		So the college's make the final
14		decisions on those and we don't make
15		the decisions on those, so it'll be
16		consistent with what it has been the
17		past in terms of feedback loop.
18	CRAMER:	Jennifer.
19	BIRD-POLLAN	N: So I wanted to answer Herman's
20		question a little bit from the
21		conversation that we had within our

22	committee. I will say I thought at
23	first I thought three years was a
24	long time, the extension for three
25	years rather than, say, only two

95

1 years.

2 And then I realized that it

3	takes a while to see the effects of
4	this. And, also, to Christine's
5	earlier point about when this
6	decision has to be made with respect
7	to affecting the, you know, test-
8	taking decisions of high school
9	juniors or high school seniors.
10	That notice needs to be, say, two or
11	three years ahead of when that class
12	will be entering, so in that regard,
13	I was persuaded.
14	And I think the conversation
15	among our committee indicated that
16	most people on the committee shared
17	the view that three years seems like

18	a reasonable amount of time. But I
19	also want to just reemphasize that
20	admissions is the Senate item as
21	well, so we have the Admissions and
22	Academic Standards Committee, Jeff
23	Lehmkuhler, who also who spoke
24	already today is the Chair of the
25	Admissions Advisory Committee. So

1	the other way that faculty can share
2	their feedback with Christine and
3	with respect to this pilot or any
4	issue that has to do with admissions
5	is through their senators and
6	through these two senate committees
7	that explicitly handle admissions
8	questions.
9	So, you know, Christine has
10	been responsive to the questions
11	raised by our committee, and I know
12	is in pretty regular contact with me
13	as the chair of this committee and

14	the people who chaired the Committe
15	in the past.
16	And with Jeff is the chair of
17	the other committee, and I think,
18	you know, that's a strong
19	relationship. And to the extent
20	that faculty want to have more of a
21	more input and more feedback on
22	the admissions questions the senate
23	is the opportunity to do that. So I
24	really strongly encourage all of us
25	as senators to solicit feedback from

1		our constituents and colleagues
2		about this question and the
3		admissions questions more broadly.
4	CRAMER:	Bob?
5	GROSSMAN:	Christine, can you talk a
6		little bit about to partly
7		address Herman's concerns talk about
8		your interaction with the chemistry
9		department in the math department,

10		because these two departments teach
11		the huge number of incoming
12		students, each year, and they do
13		have, or have had at least,
14		admissions policies based on SAT and
15		ACT scores.
16	HARPER:	Yes. So we have had a number
17		of we had a number of
18		conversations after we went through
19		with the college-based conversations
20		about their admissions requirements.
21		Clearly, the prerequisites are
22		critically important for placement
23		for our students. Math department,

24	for example, they	do have ALEKS-
25	based thresholds.	They also have An

1	ACT or SAT cut-off, but they
2	themselves found that cumulative
3	GPA, so the math index is heavily
4	based on the GPA, because they found
5	again students persistence was

6	better when looking at the GPA, in
7	combination with the test score.
8	So both with the chemistry and
9	the math department, we went through
10	a number of different iterations of
11	analysis to get to a comfortable
12	level for the departments to set
13	those prerequisites standards at a
14	test optional.
15	Environment, whereby we were
16	looking specifically at students
17	progression of courses within high
18	school and their grades, so all of
19	the math courses that they've had in

20	high school, what was the
21	culminating one and what was the
22	grade there and overall GPA. So
23	it's a pretty robust with a number
24	of different options that we went
25	through for that pre-reg requirement

2		faculty and department chairs in
3		particular were very involved in
4		helping with that and pushing back
5		and getting some additional data and
6		we kept working until we got to a
7		place that we felt that they were
8		very comfortable with the outcome
9		there.
9	CRAMER:	there. We're still asking questions
	CRAMER:	
10	CRAMER:	We're still asking questions
10		We're still asking questions right now. Scott?
10 11 12		We're still asking questions right now. Scott? Just a real quick question: If

16	CRAMER:	Right. Okay. I lost you,
17		Allison.
18	SOULT:	Wasn't a question.
19	CHISHTI:	So, how would it affect the
20		scholarships? Because certain
21		scholarships were based on cut-off
22		of ACTs, like presidential, and I
23		believe there is another higher
24		scholarship that goes with an ACT of
25		33, so I know they do take interview

1		for that, but is going to be all or
2		is there going to be a test?
3	HARPER:	So for all of our scholarships,
4		historically, they had test score
5		and GPA requirements. And so if it
6		was a test score, for example, of 32
7		with a 3.8 GPA, that test optional
8		requirement was a 4.0 GPA or above
9		For those level of scholarships, to
10		your point, they do already have
11		interview requirements there, and so

12	those held.
13	But the kind of level that you
14	have to get to there, to meet the
15	criteria to get to interview, would
16	also have a GPA only requirement.
17	Same thing with our Provost's
18	Scholarships of \$5,000 awards.
19	There's a basically, we analyze
20	the student's performance, and a
21	lot of the work that we did in the
22	in the colleges looking at
23	students' success outcomes was a
24	was a good foundational effort for
25	the merit-based awards. One of the

1	things that I will say is in the
2	test-optional approach, it does
3	increase the number of students
4	that are being that were modeled
5	if we looked at the five years -
6	- we have looked at five years of
7	cohorts of students' history to get

8	to this modeling. So it was five
9	years of the past five years of
10	students that matriculated.
11	By deploying this in a test-
12	optional way, particularly for a
13	merit-based awards, we saw an
14	increase in students of color being
15	eligible and awarded based on the
16	measure that we took in terms of
17	increasing the GPA.
18	So both students' success
19	outcomes and in the metrics that we
20	use for the merit-based awards, we
21	just looked at what were what were
22	the equivalent that would be there

23	at that level. So if it was a 3.5
24	GPA and a 26 ,it might be a 3.8 GPA
25	only, so that's how we approach

1		that.
2	CHISHTI:	And for single 30?
3	HARPER:	Same. If they don't have the

4		test score, it's a 4.0 and above to
5		be considered, and then the
6		interview process is the same as it
7		was historically.
8	CRAMER:	All right. We have a motion
9		from the committee. Is there any
10		debate on this motion? Scott?
11	YOST:	Yeah. I just want to I'm
12		probably going to make it a motion
13		to amend this for one reason.
14		Let me give you the historical
15		background, you know, in the era of
16		COVID last year we had to take and
17		do a lot of things on the fly, you
18		know. I remember our college

19	coming to us from SDUS just to talk
20	about this.
21	Because the university, given
22	all the issues we had with the ACT
23	test last year, it made sense. It
24	made perfect sense, and I think the
25	faculty will recognize that, hey,

1	we needed to take and be flexible
2	on this. And so we made it a test
3	optional.
4	But there is also and it
5	came before the committee here not
6	too long ago with the extension
7	and, of course, there was a little
8	bit confusion. But I want to
9	separate something here, folks.
10	Certainly, I can tell you, on
11	the committee, I voted for all the
12	reasons we discussed here, all the
13	clarifications that Christine gave
14	and Jennifer gave, you know, we

15	voted for it for all those reasons.
16	The issue that I have is that
17	admission to our programs, to our
18	colleges, are faculty decisions.
19	They're not administrator
20	decisions. It's not from the
21	university down. It's from the
22	faculties in the programs, and they
23	have not gone back and just weighed
24	into the entire faculty to say
25	or whoever they're approving body

1	is within the colleges, to get
2	their feedback.
3	And so when when this came to
4	our committee here not too long
5	ago, it was still from the
6	administration and it was still for
7	the reasons again, all the good
8	reasons and you heard of why we
9	wanted to do three years, but I
10	think that we should, quite

11	honestly, a little bit "force the
12	issue" that we need to make sure
13	faculty weigh in on this and not
14	just senate here, which we have the
15	final authority; don't get me
16	wrong. But I think it would be
17	wise for us to make sure that our
18	colleges have input.
19	And so with that and,
19 20	And so with that and, again, I support this, and when it
20	again, I support this, and when it
20	again, I support this, and when it comes when our dean and an

1	all the right reasons, but until
2	that point, I am going to make a
3	motion to amend. And I'm hoping
4	that from faculty governance
5	standpoint that we will at least
6	send them a slight message to the

7		administration.
8		And my amendment is this:
9		Starting in the fall of 2022, no
10		student shall be admitted to
11		sorry. No student shall be
12		admitted to the university under
13		the test-optional admission
14		criteria until all colleges report
15		the results of a college-level
16		faculty vote on this test-optional
17		three-year pilot extension.
18		So that is my and I can put
19		that in the chat if people want
20	CRAMER:	Please do, Scott, yes.

21	YOST:	I will post it in the chat,
22		because I did write it out. But
23		fundamentally it is it is just
24		making sure that all the faculty
25		who are in charge of admissions and

106

1 curriculum, that the Faculty away

2 in.

3		And that's all I'm asking that
4		we do this, and we have time. I
5		asked Christine the question to
6		when this has to be done, and she
7		said August of this year for 2022.
8		The colleges have time to get it
9		before the faculty.
10		So let me take and put it in
11		my chat.
12	CRAMER:	So this is a motion to amend
13		the approval of this waiver, but
14		also, add this text to that
15		approval of the waiver. Scott?
16	YOST:	Yes.

17		Is there a second for this
18		motion.
19	CALVERT:	Ken Calvert, College of
20		Engineering. I'll second.
21	CRAMER:	We have a motion and a second
22		on the language in the chat. I'm
23		going to read the language in case
24		you can't see it in the chat.
25		Starting in the fall of 2022

1		no student shall be admitted to the
2		university under the test-optional
3		admission criteria until all
4		colleges report the results of a
5		college-level faculty vote on this
6		test-optional three-year pilot
7		extension.
8		Is there debate on this motion
9		to amend the proposal? John? John
LO		Young? Zixue?
11	TAI:	Should we put a timeline
L2		there? Until what time? Sorry.

13		Zixue Tai from the College of
14		Communication and Information.
15		For Scott's amendment, I think
16		it makes sense to set a deadline.
17	CRAMER:	So there's a question of
18		setting a deadline.
19	TAI:	Until all faculty members from
20		different colleges submit the
21		feedback until what time?
22	CRAMER:	Okay.
23	TAI:	Like March 2022? What
24	CRAMER:	Well, I guess under this
25		timeline we're talking about this

1		would have to be accomplished in
2		time for August 1st, which I think
3		is what Christine said is the
4		deadline for this next admission
5		cycle.
6	TAI:	Yes. We should set a deadline
7		for all colleges to gather their
8		faculty feedback by a certain time,

9		right?
10	CRAMER:	Okay. So maybe you want to
11		amend the amendment? Or, I guess,
12		that's the question
13		
14	TAI:	Yeah. I would say by March
15		2022 so that we have enough time to
16		act at that point and can vote.
17	CRAMER:	I think the point is it would
18		have to be effective by August 1st,
19		right, or am I missing the
20	TAI:	Yes.
21	CRAMER:	Right. Yeah.
22	YOST:	Christine, I think, she can

maybe answer the question. Is

24	there a time and you would need
25	this, you know, just the feedback

1		for to actually kick into place?
2	HARPER:	Yes, and it would be well
3		before August 1. Always of our
4		publications will go to print, and

5		so the editing process for our
6		publications, most of our
7		information no later than April, 1
8		would be the latest that we would
9		need that to be able to get all of
10		that, because it goes into a lot of
11		updates and websites and the
12		publications then have to go to
13		print and then mailed by August 1.
14	TAI:	And that would amend the
15		amendment. We'll just add the
16		timeline, the deadline of April 1st
17		so all colleges have to submit
18		feedback by that time. Then we'll
19		have time to act at that point.

20	CRAMER:	Is there a second for that?
21		Sorry, I see three of you that have
22		your hands up. Maybe put them down
23		for a minute and somebody tell me
24		if they have a second for that.
25		Kathryn?

1		Okay. I don't hear a second
2		for adding a deadline. Rudy?
3	BUCHEIT:	Yeah. I just wanted to check
4		intent with Scott.
5		So the way that this amendment
6		reads is that no one gets into the
7		university under test-optional
8		criteria until all colleges vote,
9		which has the implication that a
10		vote in one college has an effect
11		that spreads over the rest of the
12		university. I wanted to check and
13		make sure that was really what was
14		intended there.
15	YOST:	That it's not about support of

16	the proposal, it's about the fact
17	that faculty have actually weighed
18	in formally.
19	So I didn't say the colleges
20	have to support in favor of. They
21	just have to take and vote to let
22	it be known. And so I was very
23	clear I mean, I think most
24	people will, in fact, for all the
25	right reasons, will support it, you

1		know, in the majority. But I think
2		we need to make sure that it gets
3		put to the faculty because they are
4		the ones responsible for admissions
5		and curriculum.
6	CRAMER:	So, Scott, can I ask you a
7		question? I mean, the senate can
8		exercise that function as a
9		representative body. Are you
10		trying to address the university as
11		a whole on whether or not to have

12		the test-optional admissions pilot
13		extended or are you trying to talk
14		about selective-admissions
15		colleges? I guess, what's the
16	YOST:	I believe that selective-
17		admission colleges can opt out if
18		they want to. So I'll give the
19		example: If it comes to the College
20		of Engineering and the faculty say,
21		no, we don't want to go with not
22		using the ACT, I think, Christine
23		clarified that earlier that we
24		could do that, unless I
25		misunderstood? So it is more of

1	the fact and part of this stems
2	from the fact that the
3	administration should have jumped a
4	little bit sooner, you know, once
5	they made the exception last year,
6	knowing that they're going to ask
7	for an exception.

8		It should have got the faculty
9		involved a little more quickly.
10		That's all that's part of what's
11		going on here as faculty governance
12		and wanting the faculty to weigh
13		in.
14		Because right now it's just
15		associate deans reporting back
16		based on what information they may
17		have ever got.
18	CRAMER:	Herman?
19	FARRELL:	Yeah. I don't know where we
20		are in the debate.
21	CRAMER:	We're debating on Scott's

22		motion.
23	FARRELL:	Oh, we are debating Scott's
24		his amendment.
25		

1	Well, I agree with the
2	sentiment of what's Scott's putting
3	forward here. I think his it's

4	sort of what I was getting at, sort
5	of another way.
6	This notion of the feedback
7	loop and the response from all of
8	our colleagues, 2000, I am
9	definitely representative of the
10	College of Fine Arts, but I haven't
11	polled them on this, and this is a
12	major decision that's going to
13	impact our student body for the
14	next three years.
15	And I think that's where Scott
16	is going with this is, like, can we
17	just get everybody on board with

18	whether or not this is acceptable
19	or not. And, again, how do they
20	feel about its impact upon them?
21	And, again, just from straight up
22	faculty governance, you know, a
23	political notion, but pro faculties
24	governance over major decisions. I
25	agree with Scott that this is big

1	enough that beyond our
2	representative capacity, this
3	really needs to go out to to the
4	faculty.
5	And it just gets back to the
6	other issue that I was raising with
7	Christine Harper, which was this
8	notion of what is the feedback
9	loop, and she was saying it sounds
10	like it's deans and associate
11	deans. Well that's good, but not
12	effective enough in terms of really
13	reaching out to on the ground

14	and hearing how this impacting
15	faculty.
16	So I think that's a really
17	critical element of this. Having
18	said all of that, I'm all in favor
19	of, again, the diminishing of the
20	ACTs and SATs, especially because
21	of its impact on people of color
22	and a variety of other communities.
23	But I do want to, at least, ensure
24	that such a major decision is
25	has the real full, sort of, support

1		and input of our college faculty,
2		and that's why I agree with what
3		Scott's trying to do here.
4	CRAMER:	Bob.
5	GROSSMAN:	Bob Grossman, A&S. I oppose
6		this amendment for a few reasons:
7		First of all, the way the senate is
8		supposed to work, I know it doesn't
9		always work this way, but the way

10	it's supposed to work is when we
11	see the agenda, we're supposed to
12	communicate with our constituents
13	about what is on the agenda and
14	seek their input as to what
15	different issues that are involved
16	and find out if anyone feels
17	particularly strongly one way or
18	the other about them.
19	And if we didn't do that, well
20	that's on us, and I don't think we
21	should delay this proposal just
22	because we weren't doing our jobs
23	properly.
24	Second of all, I think the

1	long overdue. Christine mentioned
2	that the predictive value of those
3	is pretty limited anyway, and as
4	Herman acknowledged, these tests
5	are essentially biased against

6	people of color. And I think
7	yesterday is the time to get rid of
8	these tests, not waiting to see.
9	And, furthermore, Herman
10	sorry Scott's amendment doesn't
11	actually have any concrete effects,
12	whether colleges vote for it or
13	against it. It just says they
14	shall report it and there's no
15	provision for what to do if a
16	college objects or not.
17	So I'm not sure what it's
18	supposed to accomplish, and that's
19	why I would vote against that.

Leslie?

20

CRAMER:

21	VINCENT:	Leslie Vincent, Gatton B&E.
22		One thought I have with this is to
23		make this amendment, a requirement
24		puts a lot of pressure, I think, on
25		getting all the information out

2		possible to amend it to you
3		know, approve one more year of this
4		pilot, and then give time in years,
5		two and three to have the input
6		from the colleges?
7	CRAMER:	Allison?
8	SOULT:	I also oppose this amendment.
9		I think this amendment is being
10		made based on the principle of the
11		matter about whether or not this
12		should have come to the senate
13		sooner. And like Bob said, it's
14		our responsibility to reach out to
15		our constituents.
16		But I think we're forgetting

17	about a very important group of
18	people here, which is the students.
19	And the students don't start
20	preparing to apply to college when
21	they're a senior. They don't start
22	preparing with our junior. Many
23	students are taking the ACT or SAT
24	as freshmen and sophomores because
25	the anxiety and the level of stress

1	that comes along with that and
2	preparing for college. And the
3	sooner they can know a decision
4	that knowing that they don't have
5	to take this test 16 times and
6	coming up with the money.
7	So if we just extend this for
8	a year and there's a student who
9	decides, okay, I did poorly and
10	I've had to come you know, I've
11	got to come up with the money to
12	take this four more times to get my

13		score up.
14		And then it turns out they
15		didn't need to and they've wasted
16		hundreds of dollars that they
17		didn't have to begin with I think
18		it's going to, one, not reflect
19		well on the university to begin
20		with, but I think we're forgetting
21		that we need to focus on what is
22		best for the students, not what's
23		best for the faculty, but what is
24		best for our potential students.
25	CRAMER:	Marilyn?

1	DUNCAN:	Yes. I thought we were
2		debating the amendment?
3	CRAMER:	We are. That's right.
4	DUNCAN:	Well, my comment was, you
5		know, April 1st doesn't give us
6		very long to do this, and I can't
7		imagine all the colleges being able
8		to do that in this time frame.

9	So it seems like any one
10	college could hang this up or throw
11	this out simply by not reporting in
12	that time frame. And, certainly,
13	it seems like this affects
14	undergraduate admissions much more
15	than admissions to professional
16	colleges.
16	colleges. So the professional colleges
17	So the professional colleges
17 18	So the professional colleges may not put this very high on their
17 18 19	So the professional colleges may not put this very high on their list of you know, things to do or

23	data over three years, and then we
24	can analyze it and we can look at
25	it. We can make it a comparison of

1	whether having these standardized
2	test scores seems to be important
3	or not.
4	And the way to do that is to

5		get data over three years. And I
6		agree with the idea that if we make
7		this decision in advance, then
8		students know how to prepare and
9		they know whether to plan for
10		whether they have to travel to take
11		the test, so whether they have to
12		spend the money, so making the
13		decision ahead of time I think is a
14		good idea.
15	CRAMER:	Richard?
16	CHARNIGO:	I offer a substitute
17		amendment.
18	CRAMER:	Please.

19	CHARNIGO:	this actually is inspired
20		somewhat by what Leslie Vincent
21		said. My substitute amendment
22		would be to have a two-year
23		extension of the test-optional
24		admissions with the intention that
25		we could get feedback from faculty

1		at the various colleges at a later
2		time and decide whether to further
3		extend beyond two years.
4	CRAMER:	Is there a second for
5		Richard's substitute amendment.
6		Gail?
7	BRION:	I would second Richard's
8		amendment and the spirit of Leslie
9		Vincent's.
10	CRAMER:	We have now a substitute
11		amendment. Richard, let me make
12		sure we have this amendment right.
13		You're saying replace Scott's
14		language with just approve a

15		two-year extension?
16	CHARNIGO:	Yes.
17	CRAMER:	Is there debate on that
18		substitute amendment to replace the
19		amendment Scott wrote in the chat
20		with approving a two year
21		extension? Bob?
22	BARRON:	Can I ask a question? Sorry.
23		Susan Barron. So if we don't want
24		to go with either amendment and are
25		happier with the original, how do

1		we even begin how do we vote?
2	CRAMER:	Well, either the substitute
3		has to succeed or fail, and then
4		there has to be action on either
5		the original amendment or the
6		substituted amendment.
7	BRION:	Oh, my gosh.
8	CRAMER:	So, yeah, we're down a little
9		parliamentary rabbit hole here.
10		Richard, do you want to speak more?

11	CHARNIGO:	No. I'm good.
12	CRAMER:	Herman?
13	FARRELL:	I'm all in favor of Richard's
14		substitute motion. I think that
15		that solves the issues and concerns
16		that I have about our feedback and
17		our and our ability to participate
18		in this conversation about
19		admission, so I'm all in favor.
20	CRAMER:	We have a motion for a
21		substitute amendment to replace
22		Scott's amendment to approve a two-
23		year pilot.
24		If you'd like to vote yes on
25		that substitute amendment, which

1	would substitute that amendment for
2	the Scott's language, use the
3	"raise hand" feature now.
4	If you'd like to vote no on
5	the substitute amendment, use the
6	"raise hand" feature now.

7	If you'd like to abstain on
8	the substitute amendment, use the
9	"raise hand" feature now.
10	that motion passes, which
11	means that now what we're debating
12	is only an amendment to the
13	original proposal to change it to a
14	two-year approval.
15	So we're debating that as an
16	amended motion, or that's that's
17	the amendment that was substituted.
18	Now we're debating whether or not
19	to amend the three-year extension
20	to a two-year extension.
21	Is there debate on that?

22		Rudy?
23	BUCHEIT	Can I hear from Christine on
24		the pros and cons of the two versus
25		a three-year approach?

124

1 CRAMER: Christine?

2 HARPER: For our students -- as

3	mentioned also, we start recruiting
4	students as early as their freshman
5	year and are working with them
6	through this time.
7	While the testing agencies
8	have said that they're back up and
9	running and offering exams, it's
10	still not accessible to every
11	student. Not only that, but for
12	some students, even if they can
13	register, it's not feasible
14	financially for them to drive three
15	hours to get an exam.
16	So there are a lot of factors
17	you just look at; the disasters in

18	Texas and other things. Students
19	and families are dealing with a
20	lot.
21	And I don't see this going
22	away anytime soon. State by state,
23	there are substantial differences,
24	not only in access to vaccines and
25	access to education, but access to

1	testing. So the reason for the
2	three years, not only to collect
3	data, to continue to get data and
4	report out and inform that cycle,
5	but also so that it isn't one more
6	thing that adds a stress to an
7	already stressful situation,
8	particularly when we were coming
9	from an automatic-admissions
10	criteria that historically, up
11	until this past cycle. weighted the
12	GPA 10 times more than the test
13	score.

14	So in terms of your specific
15	question, the three years is really
16	beneficial for us because we're
17	already working with these students
18	in the cycle.
19	And it will take off one less
20	thing that they have to worry about
21	families and students financially,
22	emotionally, in terms of having a
23	set standard. And I think will
24	help not only with our recruitment
25	efforts, but also with us being

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

126

1		able to be able to collect the
2		data, the robust data that we need
3		to make this move forward if we get
4		the data supports it to consider it
5		as a permanent suggestion and in
6		the admissions changes in the
7		future.
8	CRAMER:	Jeff?

LEHMKUHLER: Jeff Lehmkuhler, CAFÉ. Just

10		for a point of clarification, then
11		it will be advertised as a test
12		optional for the years if this is
13		approved, correct?
14	CRAMER:	If the two-year extension of
15		test optional if that's the
16		motion we're considering, then it
17		would be for 2022-2023 admission
18		and 2023-2024 admission. Yes,
19		that's right.
20	HARPER:	Yes. That's correct.
21	CRAMER:	Courtney?
22	WHEELER:	Courtney wheeler, Student Body
23		President. I would like to comment

24	on this, because I would like for
25	this to also be a three-year

1	extension. As a result, our
2	students that will be enrolled at
3	it or coming to college and 2024
4	2025 are currently freshman in high
5	school.

6	And as many of us know
7	students haven't been in school for
8	over a year, and in Fayette county
9	they went back today for the first
10	time. So they're going to be
11	wrestling with what they're behind
12	on, what they're ahead in, what are
13	their peers in, and so the
14	challenge, as Allison said earlier,
15	with now having to worry about
16	taking an exam, and I know from
17	personal experience I started
18	taking the ACT and SATS as a
19	sophomore. And so as a sophomore

20	going into your summer and there's
21	still so many unknowns, how can
22	these freshman in high school
23	understand where they are in their
24	learning and where they are taking
25	an exam or preparing for an ACT,

2		or kentucky that's extremely
3		struggling right now with the
4		flooding and the power outages.
5	\	And all the other things all
6		across the country and COVID, let
7		alone this pandemic, our students
8		are not able to be 1,000 percent
9		focused on their academics.
10		They're focused on many other
11		challenges, so I think it's it
12		would be kind of an equity problem
13		if we don't approve this for three
14		years, especially because many of
15		the peer institutions that we have

16		are also going with this test
17		optional, and so we would be at a
18		disadvantage.
19		Because if I was a student at
20		trying to go to UK or a school that
21		was test optional, I'm going to go
22		to the school that's test optional
23		if I don't have access to the SAT
24		or ACT due to financial reasons.
25	CRAMER:	Herman?

1	FAKKELL:	i appreciate that the concerns
2		that have been raised by Susan
3		Barron and then our representative
4		from student body about the impact
5		upon high school students. I think
6		that's a really fair point. I
7		don't think that a two or three-
8		year extension set now precludes us
9		extending it also to three years,
10		eventually, if, after we've
11		reviewed this we feel like this is

12	the best thing for our students.
13	And, again, going back to
14	Scott, your point about faculty
15	input in all of this, and even going
16	back to my first query to Christine
17	Harper about the feedback loop, I do
18	think that it's important that it
19	seems like this the second part
20	of this is not just reducing down
21	from three to two does provide for
22	feedback from faculty upon their
23	assessment on how this is impacting
24	not only their teaching. It's not
25	just to be seen from the perspective

1	of faculty as if it's our interests
2	in mind here, but again, what we're
3	dealing with the interest of
4	students as well, thinking about how
5	their best prepare and how they're
6	ready to go going into in our
7	classes.

8	So that feedback loop, I think,
9	is really important. And I just
10	jump back to the issue of whether or
11	not the senate, as a representative
12	body, can do this. It certainly
13	can, and it certainly does, but this
14	notion that the senate committees,
15	the Admissions Committee, which I
16	chaired for about two years, is sort
17	of a venue for this kind of
18	commentary and feedback from
19	faculty. That's just not true.
20	They're not.
21	Reach out to faculty on the
22	ground to say this is the place for

23	you to provide your input, and i
24	really do believe that we need to
25	now reach out, because it's such a

1	major change. We need to be
2	reaching out to faculty directly as
3	a senate and asking for their input

4	college by college. But, nonestly,
5	I think that this this alternative
6	proposal of limiting this to two,
7	providing for that feedback that we
8	in the senate now are demanding and
9	finding a view and creating a
10	vehicle for it.
11	I think it's really important
12	that we do that, because I was not
13	satisfied with it initially with the
14	notion of our faculty input, and now
15	I feel this would be a real good
16	vehicle for all of that.
17	BIRD-POLLAN: I'd like to speak against the
18	amendment. I think three years

19	if we think about what will happen
20	if this is extended for two years,
21	then two years from now the
22	admissions office will be back in
23	front of the senate asking for the
24	either of this to be made permanent
25	or for the pilot to be extended for

1	a year. If they asked for it to be
2	made permanent after two years, then
3	I'm thinking about what students
4	will have arrived under the pilot.
5	It will be the current senior
6	class, who, as I think Courtney
7	already noted, just went in
8	Fayette County anyway went back
9	to school today, who had the last 12
10	months of their education on Zoom,
11	and I wouldn't really want to make
12	decisions about whether or not test
13	optional was a success on the basis
14	of students who might have I just

15	heard on NPR again today worries
16	about their ability you know,
17	this is measuring aptitude using
18	standardized testing, even within
19	the school. And these are the
20	reasons to think that Zoom hasn't
21	sufficiently educated them the way
22	we wanted, then see this test
23	optional pilot fail because the
24	students who arrived had suffered
25	through the senior year that was

1	entirely on Zoom. So that's one
2	class of students. And then the
3	class after that will have also come
4	in on pilot, but they will have just
5	finished one semester by the time.
6	we're going to be asking the
7	admissions office to put together a
8	proposal to extend this.
9	So we will have had one
10	semester, and as a parent that has a

11	current high school junior, she's
12	had three quarters of her junior
13	year entirely online and who knows
14	what the fall will bring.
15	So I think three years is not
16	unreasonable to get us past this.
17	And, frankly, from the perspective
18	of the faculty actually doing the
19	evaluating, we will have at that
20	point as a significant amount of
21	data to to evaluate it and it is our
22	responsibility as the senate, we are
23	the faculty. We are in fact defined
24	as the faculty and various places

1	representatives who are making this
2	decision. We absolutely should be
3	talking to our colleagues about
4	this, both within the committees and
5	in our roles as senators, but I just
6	generally think that three years is

7		when you give us the ability to make
8		informed decisions about this this,
9		you know, in a more permanent way.
10	BARRON:	And this will be quick. I also
11		oppose this, and there's been a lot
12		of important reasons and also
13		thinking about the students. And we
14		can say, well, two years is good,
15		because those students that are
16		starting to think about the test now
17		and know that they may have to have
18		it, they may not have to have it. I
19		think it's just you know, there's
20		enough stress for everybody. I

21	don't think they need that as an
22	additional stress.
23	So if we do three years, it
24	gives us a longer range of time
25	gather more information and forum

135

1 faculty and see how the students do.

2 CRAMER: Scott?

3	YOST:	Chair Cramer, I don't know if I
4		can ask this question. Chair Bird-
5		Pollan, when the administration
6		started, I guess, having
7		conversations about when they wanted
8		to extend the pilot to the test
9		optional pilot, do you have a
10		timeline on when they were starting
11		to have that conversation, because I
12		know it didn't come to our committee
13		until recently, and I'm just curious
14		because if it was a while ago, my
15		first thought was why didn't they
16		take and go to the grassroots

17	through the associate deans and
18	immediately solicit feedback?
19	Because it is a faculty governance
20	issue and I'm a little bit concerned
21	that maybe they played it to the end
22	and said, okay, we'll just run this
23	out there, because we have to worry
24	about the faculty say. That's the
25	unfortunate thing with saying three

1		years. I agree with Chair Bird-
2		Pollan for all the right reasons.
3		We approved three years, but for all
4		the wrong reasons. The
5		administration seems to be not
6		operating the way they should.
7	CRAMER:	Christine, only if you're not
8		debating.
9	HARPER:	I'm not adding factual points.
10		The reason it came to the committee
11		so late, because we have been
12		working tirelessly to implement a

13	new admissions platform so that we
14	could do the test optional and do
15	all of the coding on the back end
16	based on these decisions. We have
17	been running 100,000 miles a minute
18	to make sure that we are meeting the
19	requirements and the and the
20	obligation that we have to serve the
21	colleges. In good faith, based on
22	the conversations, the robust
23	conversations that we have had to
24	make sure this is a successful as
25	possible. We're having to collect a

1	lot more data, which is good on the
2	outcome because we're going to have
3	data that probably benefits long
4	term. We've not always captured
5	grades of every single course that a
6	student has taken in a system that
7	now we can analyze. We have a
8	system that now deploys a robust

9		holistic review process that the
10		colleges are benefitting from, so it
11		has been a substantial wait to get
12		this, but we wanted to make sure
13		that we were doing it to the best
14		ability that we could, and also
15		capture data that will benefit us
16		moving forward so that we could use
17		that to inform future decisions.
18		But that's why the just the proposal
19		itself came at a later date.
20	CRAMER:	DeShana Collett?
21	COLLETT:	I'm going to ask that we call
22		the question.
23	CRAMER:	Actually, I don't see any other

24	hand, so I think we're ready to
25	Scott, your hand was up from before.

1	I think we're ready for the question
2	anyway.
3	So this is a question on the
4	substituted amendment, which is to

5		say we're going to if this motion
6		succeeds, approve a two-year
7		extension. That's what we're voting
8		on now is to is to change this to a
9		two-year extension.
10		If you're in favor of that
11		motion to change from a three-year
12		extension to a two-year extension,
13		use the yes feature now.
14	FARRELL:	Could I raise a point of
15		information, Aaron?
16	CRAMER:	Not while we're voting.
17	FARRELL:	But it has to do with what was
18		just put on the table. Isn't it two
19		parts, three-year extension down to

two, as well as this feedback loop?
Wasn't that part of Richard's
amendment?
CRAMER: That's not how I read his
amendment.
FARRELL: Maybe he could -- Richard could kind

1		of clarity?
2	CRAMER:	That question I read is the one we
3		voted on to substitute. So at this point
4		it is somewhat immaterial, if I misheard
5		Richard's motion, for example, because
6		that was the one we voted to substitute.
7		Is the one I stated right, Herman?
8	FARRELL:	Yeah, but did Richard is that is
9		that aligned with what is originally
10		proposed?
11	CHARNIG	O: I can explain more if you want, but
12		suffice it to say that the motion that
13		you're voting on is
14	CRAMER:	So we are still voting here now.

The yeses are done. You've lowered the

16	hands on the yeses?
17	If you'd like to vote no on the
18	amendment, use the "raise hand" feature
19	now.
20	If you'd like to abstain on the
21	amendment, please use the "raise hand"
22	feature now.
23	That motion fails. So we're back to
24	this original motion from the committee
25	to approve a waiver of the part of SR

1		4.2.1 related to standardized tests for
2		at least three years.
3		Is there any further debate on the
4		original motion? Scott?
5	YOST:	I will say that I will support the
6		three-year extension, but I do want the
7		record to reflect that I think the
8		administration did not do what they
9		should have done to come to the faculty
10		who are in charge of this. They should
11		have come to us in a much more timely

12		fashion. I want the record to reflect
13		that if we could, please.
14	CRAMER:	So double check when are the minutes
15		get sent out that that's in there the way
16		you liked it.
17		Seeing no further debate on this
18		motion, if you would like to vote in
19		favor of this motion, please use the
20		"raise hand" feature now.
21		If you'd like to vote no, use the
22		"raise hand" feature now.
23		If you'd like to abstain, use the
24		"raise hand" feature now.
25		That motion passes.

1	I haven't talked to Susan yet, but
2	with the Susan's, but mostly with all of
3	your permission, I would like to postpone
4	this next item until our next agenda. I
5	guess, Susan, being a member of the body,
6	can object now. Otherwise, I'm going to
7	ask for this by lack of objection. I see

8	no objections, so we'll move this on to
9	our next agenda.
10	Items from the floor, time-
11	permitting my daughter is stuck at
12	track practice, so time is not
13	permitting. I'm going to move on now,
14	and unless there's objections to
15	adjournment heard now, we are going to
16	adjourn for the evening.
17	We're adjourned thanks everyone.
18	
19	* * * * * * *
20	

22

23

24

25

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

142

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, TRISHA B. MORLEY, the undersigned Notary Public

in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that at

the time and place stated, the proceedings were conducted via

teleconference; that the proceedings were taken in stenotype,

later reduced to computer-aided transcription under my

direction, and that the foregoing is a true and accurate

record of said proceedings.

My commission expires: April 23, 2022.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunder set my hand and

seal of office on the 28th day of March, 2021.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

Notary Public

My commission expires: 4/23/22

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.