UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * * * * * *

APRIL 26, 2021

* * * * * * * * *

AARON CRAMER, CHAIR

DESHANA COLLETT, VICE CHAIR

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

STEPHANIE WOOLERY, STAFF ASSISTANT

TRISHA B. MORLEY, STENOGRAPHER

* * * * * * * * *

1 *******

2	CRAMER:	Hello everyone, welcome to the Special
3	Univer	rsity Senate Meeting on Monday, April
4	26th. 1	This meeting was called at the request
5	of at le	east ten elected senators, presented to
6	the Se	nate Council. We're still having some
7	people	e filtering, this is not sort of not
8	regula	rly scheduled meeting, so if you're an
9	attend	lee, but you're supposed to be a voting
10	Senat	e member, perhaps use the "raise hand"
11	featu	re and if we see you, we'll move you

12	over into the panelist window to allow you to
13	vote. Stephanie, are you going to be able to
14	do that if you see their hands? Okay. Good.
15	All right. Melissa, Shannon, I see you
16	guys both as panelists here, you're both set.
17	It's only if you're an attendee, not a
18	panelist that I have to worry about you.
19	John, you're okay too.
19 20	John, you're okay too. I will start with a few technicalities:
20	I will start with a few technicalities:
20 21	I will start with a few technicalities: Senators, please type your name and
20 21 22	I will start with a few technicalities: Senators, please type your name and affiliation in the chat box to record your

1	it, for example, to get the Chair's attention
2	I don't see it very well during the meeting.
3	mute yourself when you're not speaking,
4	although Stephanie is empowered to mute you
5	if you accidentally leave yourself unmuted.
6	The meeting is being recorded for note-taking
7	purposes. If any member of the University
8	Senate is disconnected and can't reconnect,
9	please send an email to Sheila Brothers so
10	we're aware of the situation.
11	Senate meetings are open meetings. We

12	follow Robert's Rules of Order. No voting by
13	proxy. Be civil during the conversation. Be
14	a good citizen here, that particularly means
15	communicating, caring about the activities of
16	the Senate with your departmental and college
17	colleagues to make sure they're aware of your
18	activities on their behalf. And participate.
19	specifically, that means to discuss the
20	debate motions.
21	We have a large number of non-voting
22	senators participating in this meeting,
23	individuals that are either guests or non-
24	voting senators. You also can seek the
25	privilege of the floor by using the "raise

1	hand" feature, I will generally privilege in
2	calling voting senators first, but if I see
3	people and the flow of the conversation
4	permits it, I will certainly call and allow
5	people to speak that aren't voting senators.
6	During motions, if there's motions being
7	considered by the body, and they're being
8	debated, I will call primarily on voting
9	senators to debate those motions. If you've
10	already submitted motion you'd like to
11	introduce during this meeting to me, I'm in a

12	preferences over motions that they've not
13	been prepared ahead of time.
14	In Zoom participants are divided into
15	two categories, panelists and attendees.
16	Both can participate in the meeting, but
17	voting senators are classified as panelists.
18	Panelists would have received a specific
19	email from Stephanie Woolery with Zoom
20	information that they're eligible to vote.
21	Nonvoting senators and guests are attendees.
22	Attendees can get the Zoom link from the
23	Senate web page and do not vote, so that's
24	the distinction between those two categories.
25	To speak for any reason or otherwise be

1	recognized, including to make motions/seconds
2	or vote, use the "raise hand" button at the
3	bottom of the screen. If you cannot see this,
4	click on the three dots with "more" beneath
5	it, and then click the "raise hand" button.
6	The way that voting will go, how we've
7	done all year, I will call for votes in
8	favor, then I'll call separately for votes
9	opposed, and then for votes for people that
10	specifically want to abstain on the motion.
11	And when each of these calls are made, voting

12	members that is panelists in this Zoom
13	webinar will vote by clicking on the Zoom
14	button "raise hand" you got to leave your
15	hand up so we can count the votes, and then
16	Stephanie will clear the votes.
17	Then, once the votes have been cleared,
18	then I'll call for those who opposed the
19	motion, again, leave your hands up until
20	Stephanie clears them, then I'll call for
21	abstentions, leave your hands up until we
22	have recorded this, and Stephanie clears
23	them.
24	As we've done throughout the year, we'll
25	document the votes of those voting in the

1	minority and those abstaining. These are
2	smaller numbers and easier to record if
3	you're not in either of those sets and you're
4	assumed to vote with the majority. If the
5	vote's perceived to be close, then Stephanie
6	is prepared to assist with a roll call vote,
7	which we'll do if necessary.
8	As in all Senate Meetings, before
9	speaking, please remember to state your name
10	and college affiliation before your remarks.
11	The first item on the agenda is a review

12	of Senate Council's act	ions after the
13	announcement of a sin	gle finalist for the
14	position of Associate P	rovost for Graduate
15	and Professional Educa	tion and Dean of the
16	Graduate School. This i	tem will be presented
17	by Senate Council Vice	Chair, Deshana
18	Collett. Deshana, are y	ou ready?
19	COLLETT: I am. Thank you	u very much. Let me share
20	my screen.	
21	CRAMER: Deshana, I thir	ık you can.
22	COLLETT: Okay. Let's see. Ca	an you make sure it's up?
23	CRAMER: Yep.	
24	COLLETT: Perfect. Thank	you everyone for
25	attending today. Let m	e just give you a brief

1	overview of kind of where we are up to date
2	and some of the actions that Senate Council
3	has taken over the past several weeks.
4	So the UK Board of Trustees is
5	academically organized the university upon
6	the premise of shared governance. In shared
7	governance, the board expects of the quality
8	of the University decision-making will be
9	best when the faculty and administration each
10	solicit the input of each other before making
11	final decisions in their respective areas.

12	When the University Senate and the
13	Educational Unit Faculties decide educational
14	policies, the administration is always
15	transparently availed the opportunity for
16	impact by virtue of their ex-official
17	membership in these faculty bodies.
18	However, there is an increasing trend
19	that administrative decisions on academic
20	organization, leadership positions, and
21	implementation policies, all of which are
22	instrumental and formulated educational
23	policies, have neither the expected
24	transparency nor adequate design for
25	effective faculty input.

1	So this increasing trend can be seen
2	with Provost Blackwell's recent announcement
3	on April the 12th of a single sole-finalist
4	for the position of Associate Provost for
5	Graduate and Professional Education and Dean
6	of the Graduate School.
7	The process of this search was met with
8	frustration among the elected University
9	Senators and their faculty constituents. This
10	subsequently led to Senate Council Meeting on
11	the following day of April the 13th. During

12	the April 13th Meeting and recorded in the
13	minutes, Senate Council noted his concerns
14	related to the search process and not the
15	candidates themselves. While no special
16	invitations were extended, many attended that
17	meeting, including the two Search Committee
18	co-chairs.
19	One of the Search Committee cultures
19 20	One of the Search Committee cultures expressed concerned that the sole finalist
20	expressed concerned that the sole finalist
20 21	expressed concerned that the sole finalist could interpret Senate Council's actions, as
20 21 22	expressed concerned that the sole finalist could interpret Senate Council's actions, as a judgment on her capabilities. At the Search

1	finalist to indicate that this was not indeed
2	the case.
3	Both Search Committee Co-Chairs were
4	present at that Senate Council Meeting and
5	neither expressed concern that this
6	informational contact would negatively impact
7	our effective search. Similarly, the Vice-
8	Provost was present and also did not indicate
9	any concerns about such contact.
10	Senate Council drafted a letter to
11	encompass the concerns expressed by Senate

12	Council, and Senate Council also agreed that
13	the correspondence would only be addressed to
14	the university administrators and not the
15	Board of Trustees.
16	At the direction of Senate Council Chair
17	Aaron Cramer formally addressed the letter to
18	President Capilouto and copied it to Provost
19	Blackwell and members of the University
20	Senate.
21	It is important for me to clarify that
22	Chair Cramer is elected representative of
23	Senate Council, the Senate and, therefore,
24	the university faculty. Any modes or content
25	of communication by Chair Cramer are at the

1	direction and on the behalf of the Senate
2	Council and/or Senate. Chair Cramer's letter
3	to the President or Provost was on behalf as
4	representing the Student Council, Senate, and
5	University faculty.
6	On April the 16th, President Capilouto
7	and Provost Blackwell each emailed a formal
8	response to the letter. This correspondence
9	between the Senate Council, the President and
10	the Provost were all posted on the Senate
11	website. Senate Council has continued to

12	receive supportive messages from faculty and
13	groups of faculty. These messages conveyed a
14	valid concern that the insufficient provision
15	for faculty impact on administrative
16	decisions will cumulatively harm the
17	attainment of our University's educational
18	objectives.
19	At his regular meeting on Monday, April
20	the 19th, Senate Council received a petition
21	Pursuant to GR IV to be from elected senators
22	to call a special Senate meeting. At that
23	meeting, Senate Council scheduled the meeting
24	
24	and arranged its agenda. Out of their

1	exercised for the first time in 50 years, the
2	petition mechanism to cause a special meeting
3	of the University Senate, which is why we are
4	here today.
5	CRAMER: Are there any questions for Vice-Chair
6	Collett on the activities that have happened
7	so far and how we got here today?
8	Seeing none actually, Alan Brown.
9	BROWN: Just a question: Arts and Sciences
10	submitted a letter that was just on behalf of
11	Arts and Sciences faculty, so I assume that

12	didn't n	nake its way into this timeline, I'm
13	assumir	ng. Just want to clarify.
14	COLLETT:	We did receive that letter. I just
15	didn't a	dd all of the letters because we're
16	going to	o address that later in our next
17	several	discussions, but we have received
18	formal	contact from those groups of faculty
10		
19	and sen	ators.
20	and sen BROWN:	okay. So that letter was received by
	BROWN:	
20	BROWN: the Sen	Okay. So that letter was received by
20 21	BROWN: the Sen	Okay. So that letter was received by ate Council. Thank you.
20 21 22	BROWN: the Sen COLLETT: CRAMER:	Okay. So that letter was received by ate Council. Thank you. Yes. Thank you very much.

1	to turn it over to Senator Herman Farrell who
2	is going to speak on behalf of those that
3	petitioned the Senate Council to have this
4	special meeting today. Herman, are you ready?
5	FARRELL: Yes, I'm ready. Can you hear me?
6	CRAMER: Yes.
7	FARRELL: Herman Farrell, College of Fine Arts.
8	Hi, everyone. I'm glad that we're having
9	this meeting. I'm glad we're having an
10	opportunity to discuss with each other our
11	concerns about shared governance. I'll just

12	briefly note that where I and many other
13	concerned faculty came into this conversation
14	was pretty much after the Friday meeting two
15	weeks ago, a week from last Friday, are
16	commonly referred to it as "pushback Friday"
17	when the Provost and the President made their
18	written statements to Senate Council Chair
19	and the Senate Council.
20	And part of what concerned me and I
21	think concerned many other faculty members
22	was this suggestion that they did not speak
23	for the Senate, or in particular, for
23 24	for the Senate, or in particular, for faculty. And so there was a lot of concern

1	administration and we all felt that it was
2	completely false. And as Deshana has just
3	pointed out, the Senate Council Chair speaks
4	on behalf of the Senate Council.
5	So I refer to that as like "pushback
6	Friday", but also the, how that came after
7	that and the how came from not only the 35
8	co-signers of the written request, but from
9	A&S there were concerns that were expressed.
10	They have put together a very good strong
11	letter to the Board of Trustees that I think

12	they just finished taking signatures on. I
13	know it was last count to was over 400
14	faculty members.
15	On top of that, the union met on Friday
16	and they discussed this issue and they
17	weighed in with Aaron Cramer today with their
18	thoughts on how to proceed. The law faculty,
19	as well as just a variety of different other
20	faculty members, have all weighed in with
21	their concerns.
22	But essentially, what I'm asked here to
23	talk about is the written request. The
24	written request, as everyone will note, does
25	sort of go through our governance structure.

1	And for the sake of faculty members who are
2	listening in who may not be familiar with the
3	structure, I'll just briefly go over it
4	because it gives a real clear understanding
5	of what we mean by shared governance.
6	First of all, our governing regulations:
7	Let's think of simply as our constitution.
8	It's basically the constitution of the
9	University of Kentucky. It governs all the
10	rules and regulations that come thereunder.
11	It's promulgated and put together and

12	authorized by the Board of Trustees. It
13	creates an organizational structure within
14	our college, within our University and
15	basically delegates authority, it delegates
16	authority to the President. The president is
17	the Chief Administrative and Educational
18	Officer. And then the President has basically
19	two sort of sides to his administration,
20	which includes the educational part, and the
21	administrative part.
22	The administrative part is headed by a
23	variety of different members of his
24	administration, including the Executive Vice-
25	President for Finance and Administration, as

1	well as VPS, and then the Provost and the
2	University Senate are on the educational side
3	of the equation.
4	And basically, what the Board of
5	Trustees has established in the governing
6	regulations is I've literally written it
7	down a clear statement of what we mean by
8	shared governance. And it is very clearly
9	stated in the document that was shared with
10	you, but the key elements are that it's a
11	sharing of power and governance and expertise

12	among the four basic constituencies, and
13	that's the faculty, the administration, the
14	staff, and the students. And the idea here is
15	that there's value in all of our
16	contributions to the University's future, its
17	present, and its past, as well as not only
18	have those valuable resources, but the idea
19	of getting us to share together, there's a
20	purpose behind it. It's not just a rote idea
21	that what stated very clearly in the GR rules
22	or the GR section on the principle. It
23	basically says that the purpose of this is to
24	lead to maximum effectiveness, and more
25	importantly, better decision-making. And

1	with regard to the decision-making on the
2	academic side, the faculty feels like they
3	want to ensure that that shared governance
4	takes place.
5	So we're at an impasse right now, simply
6	because of the idea that the administration
7	has its own understanding of what shared
8	governance on particular faculty involvement
9	in that shared governance is and the
10	faculty's understanding of what their own
11	involvement in the shared governance scheme

12	needs. And basically that's the impasse that
13	we're at right now, and we hope that at the
14	end of this meeting, that we'll move a little
15	bit forward in terms of getting the
16	administration to understand very clearly
17	what our concerns are. So basically what has
18	been put together is it all right, Aaron,
19	for me, now just to mention the five
20	proposals?
21	CRAMER: Briefly. The one is the one that's on
22	the agenda. The other four you'll be
23	introducing from the floor, so just briefly,
24	please.
25	FARRELL: Just briefly. But, basically, if

1	there's any sort of summary goal of this
2	afternoon's work, it's to very clearly state
3	from the faculty's perspective what their
4	expectations are with regard to shared
5	governance, and these five proposals are ways
6	of articulating, expressing, and creating a
7	record of what we believe are those
8	principles in those ideas and actual
9	practical solutions.
10	And so we've come forward with five
11	proposals: The first one is already on the

12	agenda, and that one's a broad-based proposal
13	that reaffirms the Senate's commitment to
14	shared governance; asks for the President and
15	the Administration to also affirm their
16	commitment to it as well as to call for
17	affirmative steps. And it's a very broad-
18	based resolution that we think everybody
19	hopefully will be able to sign on to.
20	There's two more resolutions that are
21	very specific: One, dealing with the A&S dean
22	search, and the other one dealing with the
23	Grad School dean search. And we believe that
24	a lot of feedback about coming up with very

1	specific responses to what is going on right
2	now.
3	And then the fourth and the fifth ones
4	are a little more long-term because they're
5	really addressing the GRs and what we feel
6	maybe needs some reform and some amendment,
7	and we have a vehicle for doing that. We can
8	make recommendations to the Board of Trustees
9	from the Senate for such revisions.
10	And then the fifth and last one is very
11	specific notions of what we consider to be

12	best practices when you're dealing with
13	Search Committees. So those are the five, and
14	that gives you an outline of where things are
15	going as we're making our way through the
16	different proposals. And Aaron Cramer has
17	already noted that there are other proposals
18	that can come from the floor. Thank you all
19	very much for your time.
20	CRAMER: Are there any sort of factual questions
21	for Herman at this point? Otherwise, we can
22	move on to sort of more debate discussion
23	items.
23 24	items. The next item is a resolution on shared

1	that Herman mentioned. And, Herman, I'll let
2	you move this motion.
3	FARRELL: Is it going to come up, because I don't
4	see it and I don't have it on my screen.
5	CRAMER: No, it's not in the PowerPoint.
6	FARRELL: Well, it basically is what I just said.
7	I think I just gave a quick outline of what
8	it involves. It basically has aware of
9	sections sort of describing exactly where we
10	are at this moment, and then it just
11	basically calls upon the Senate to reaffirm

12	its con	nmitment to the spirit and letter of
13	shared	d governance, requests, the provost, and
14	the ad	ministration to reaffirm their
15	comm	itment and their requests for affirmative
16	steps l	by administrators to demonstrate such
17	comm	itment. And that's I'm sorry, I don't
18	have i	t in front of me right now, but
19	BROWN:	l can read it if you want, Herman.
20	FARRELL:	Yeah, please.
21	BROWN:	This is Alan Brown, Arts and Sciences. I
22	can ju	st read it if you want.
23	CRAMER:	Alan, please. You can make the motion if
24	you'd	like.

1	BROWN:	I'll make a motion to what motion are
2	we m	aking exactly? To have this accepted by
3	the Se	enate?
4	CRAMER:	If it's a resolution you're moving I
5	think	for the Senate to adopt the resolution.
6	BROWN:	Resolution, okay. This is from the PDF I
7	receiv	red. It says, "Whereas the University of
8	Kentu	cky University Senate serves as the
9	officia	Il representative of the University of
10	Kenti	ucky Faculty;
11	W	hereas the University Senate must

n	Δ
Z	υ

12	respond to the concerns and demands of the
13	University of Kentucky faculty;
14	Whereas the Board of Trustees in its
15	adoption of the Governing Regulations of the
16	University of Kentucky has clearly defined
17	shared governance principles as follows; the
18	diverse expertise collectively available to
19	the University in its faculty,
19 20	the University in its faculty, administration, staff employees, and students
20	administration, staff employees, and students
20 21	administration, staff employees, and students is a valuable resource. The university as a
20 21 22	administration, staff employees, and students is a valuable resource. The university as a whole will be able to function at maximum

1	shared, it will enable policy-makers at every
2	level of the organization to make better
3	decisions. To achieve this objective in an
4	environment of shared governance, faculty
5	bodies and administrators will reciprocally
6	solicit and utilize the expertise of the
7	other as each makes decisions in their
8	respective areas of policy-making authority.
9	Through these empowering processes of shared
10	governance, the administration, faculty
11	members, staff employees, and students all

12	share the responsibility of attainment of the
13	university's goals. That's GR I.E.
14	And whereas the University of Kentucky
15	faculty have expressed serious concerns
16	regarding a number of administrative
17	decisions over the past several years that
18	violate either the letter or the spirit of
19	the shared governance principles at the
20	University of Kentucky now, therefore be it
21	Resolved, that, the University Senate:
22	1. Reaffirms its commitment to the
23	principles of shared governance as
24	established by the Board of Trustees, that
25	provides for the sharing of expertise among

1	faculty, administrators, students, and staff,
2	in order to enable policy-makers at every
3	level of the university to make better
4	decisions.
5	2. Request that President Capilouto
6	similarly reaffirm the administration's
7	commitment to principles of shared
8	governance, both in spirit and in letter.
9	3. Requests that president Capilouto and
10	the administration, at all levels, take
11	affirmative steps to solicit and utilize the

12	experience of the faculty to attain academic
13	objectives."
14	CRAMER: That's a motion from Alan Brown. The
15	text of that resolution is on the screen. I
16	think Deshana has shared there. Is there a
17	second for that motion? Gail?
18	BRION: Second the motion.
19	CRAMER: So we have a motion and a second for the
20	Senate to adopt this resolution. Is there a
21	debate on this motion? Stefan?
22	BIRD-POLLAN: Sorry. I was Stefan Bird-Pollan, A&S.
23	I was actually just trying to second the
24	motion, but I would like to say that I think
25	we need to affirm as a body shared

1	governance. This is what the Senate is based
2	on. I mean, we wouldn't really be able to do
3	our work without shared governance. So I
4	think this is axiomatic to our nation.
5	Thanks.
6	CRAMER: Is there any further debate on this
7	motion? Rudy Bucheit?
8	BUCHEIT: Hi, Rudy Bucheit, Engineering. I think
9	it's important that we draw a distinction
10	between policy-making and implementation in
11	shared governance. Generally, it's the

12	faculty body and the Senate that is
13	responsible for policy-making or leading
14	policy-making and it's the administration's
15	role to lead implementation. And then there
16	is a reciprocal responsibility for each to
17	share with the other.
18	I haven't been fully satisfied with the
19	distinction drawn between policy-making
20	responsibilities and implementation
21	responsibilities in what I've heard. So I
22	just ask for some clarification. I wish I
23	could have brought it to a specific

1	CRAMER:	I was hoping you might have an amendment
2	to of	fer there.
3	BUCHEIT:	I didn't get this one before the
4	meet	ing, so I'm just seeing it now, so I
5	apolo	ogize for that. And if I can't give you a
6	speci	fic one, I won't be able to even make an
7	amer	ndment. I apologize.
8	CRAMER:	Doug Michael?
9	MICHAEL:	Yes, I just wanted to nitpick a little
10	bit. I	t talks about the University Senate
11	bein	g the voice of the faculty, and actually

12	their students and administrators, and it's a
13	University Senate, and I just wonder if we
14	need to do any tweaking in light of that
15	fact.
16	CRAMER: Bob?
17	GROSSMAN: Yeah. Two things: First of all, in
18	spirit of nitpicking, I just when Alan
19	read the text, the last sentence was,
20	"utilize the expertise of the faculty" not
21	the experience of the faculty. So for those
22	of you who are just listening and not
23	reading.
24	In response to Rudy Bucheit's comments,
25	the language about the policy-making and

1	such, it comes from the GRs directly, and we
2	don't have any authority over those. The
3	only people who can change those are the
4	Board of Trustees, so it doesn't really have
5	much to do with what we should say or refer.
6	So I just wanted to make those two comments.
7	CRAMER: Herman?
8	FARRELL: Yes. In response to Dean Bucheit's
9	question, I'll note that in Section 1 of the
10	"be it resolved" that does specify enabling
11	policy-makers and it's not referencing

12	implementation. So I feel like that kind of
13	satisfies the concern that he might have in -
14	- he can correct me if I'm wrong on that.
15	CRAMER: Rudy?
16	BUCHEIT: Rudy Bucheit, Engineering. Yeah, Bob and
17	Herman, thanks. I want to clarify the group's
18	thinking on implementation and policy-making.
19	I totally agree Bob, with what you say about
20	policy-making in the way it's referred to in
21	the GRs. Drawing this distinction may not be
22	so important in this particular resolution. I
23	think it's quite germane to the other ones
24	that I think we're going to be taking a look
25	at.

1	
2	CRAMER: Is there any further debate on this
3	motion? If not, then we have a motion to
4	adopt this resolution.
5	Voting senators, if you'd like to vote
6	in favor of this motion, please use the
7	"raise hand" feature now.
8	All right. If you'd like to vote against
9	this motion, please use the "raise hand"
10	feature now.
11	If you'd like to abstain on this motion,

12	please use the "raise hand" feature now.
13	That motion passes, so the Senate adopts
14	that resolution.
15	The next item on the agenda is further
16	discussion. Any next steps on this number of
17	proposed resolutions have been sent in
18	advance of those items. I'll allow those to
19	be introduced first. If you have motions that
20	you'd like to introduce at the time when
21	there's not another item being considered,
22	those would be an order, but I would go ahead
23	and call on Herman Farrell.
24	FARRELL: Well, for this A&S dean search proposal
25	I'd call upon my colleagues, Stefan Bird-

Pollan and Akiko Takenaka []to make the 1 2 motion. 3 CRAMER: Stefan, are you prepared to make this 4 motion? I think this is Deshana sharing this 5 resolution. 6 BIRD-POLLAN: Thank you, Deshana. Yeah. So I'd like to 7 make this motion on behalf of a number of us 8 in Arts and Sciences and also other members from the University Senate at large drafting 9 10 this resolution. So I'd like to represent this motion on behalf of all of us. Should I 11

12 just read it?

13	CRAMER:	Sure. There are some people listening in
14	withou	ut video.
15	BIRD-POLLAN:	Okay. "Whereas, in the Fall of 2020, the
16	appoir	ntment of the Acting Dean of the College
17	of Arts	and Sciences occurred without faculty
18	consul	tation:
19	Wh	ereas the College of Arts and Sciences
20	requir	ed a regular leadership appointment in
21	order	to attain academic objectives; and
22	Wh	ereas a search process for the Regular
23	Арроіі	ntment of the Dean of the College of
24	Arts a	nd Sciences has been paused;
25	Be i	t resolved that:

1	The University Senate requests that the
2	President and the Provost adhere to the
3	process for regular appointment of a new dean
4	of the College of Arts and Sciences, and
5	resume the paused search by the beginning of
6	the Fall semester, 2021 pursuant of GR VIII,
7	and our shared governance principles,
8	pursuant of GR I.E.
9	And can I just say in general, I mean,
10	the thought is here that this falls within
11	the issue of shared governance, we're calling

12	upon the administration to pursue a shared
13	governance in the usual manner? I think some
14	members of Arts and Sciences, perhaps the
15	university at large perceive the stopping of
16	the search to have been unexplained
17	fundamentally and we're calling upon the
18	administration to take up the search again,
19	as it was originally planned in the Fall of
20	2020. Thank you.
21	CRAMER: Is there a second for this motion?
22	Akiko?
23	TAKENAKA: I second.
24	CRAMER: So we have a motion and a second. Is
25	there debate on the motion to adopt this

1	reso	lution?
2	PEFFER:	Can I ask you a question? Sean Peffer,
3	Gatte	on College.
4	CRAMER:	Sure.
5	PEFFER:	Did this come out of the faculty of the
6	Colle	ege of Arts and Sciences? And, if so, is
7	there	e a vote on it from the faculty of
8	Colle	ege of Arts and Sciences? So we can get
9	an id	lea of what percentage what's behind this
10	in tł	ne college. Thanks.
11	CRAMER:	Stephan, do you want to respond to that

12	question?
----	-----------

13	BIRD-POLLAN: Yeah, I do. There's a nonofficial vote,
14	that there was a sort of a large group of the
15	senators involved in this, also in the
16	drafting of this proposal. So I think that it
17	has the support of the senators from Arts and
18	Sciences.
19	CRAMER: Rudy?
20	BUCHEIT: Rudy Bucheit, Engineering. Question for
21	you Chair Cramer. So the resolution
22	appropriately points to GR VIII and GR 1. I'm
23	curious if there was conversation in Senate
24	Council about the part of GR IV that
25	specifies the scope of University Senate

1	functions.
2	CRAMER: So Senate Council has not considered
3	this motion, right? This was introduced
4	today, but I would say generally the Senate
5	has authority to make recommendations to the
6	President on matters that involve the
7	University. There's a pretty broad ability
8	for the Senate to express its concerns about
9	things that involve the university. It's
10	advice, right? It's not this is a request

11 to the President. There's no authority that

12	the Sena	ate has to order this to be true,
13	right? Th	nis is not a matter for which the
14	Senate e	enjoys direct authority, right? It's
15	the abili	ty to speak.
16	BUCHEIT:	Great. I would urge consideration that
17	we also	point to GR IV, just to make that
18	point cle	ear.
19	CRAMER:	Rudy, can I ask you just a quick
20	questior	n? So it sounds like you're close
20 21		n? So it sounds like you're close to an amendment here on where this
-	enough	
21	enough would go	to an amendment here on where this
21 22	enough would go making a	to an amendment here on where this o. Where would you put that if you are

1	is no	t assigned any management or
2	admi	nistrative functions. So my amendment
3	woul	d be along the lines of the Senate in
4	maki	ng this resolution: The Senate does not
5	seek	to act or exert undue influence outside
6	the r	esponsibilities assigned to it in GR IV.
7	CRAMER:	And you would move to add that where in
8	the t	ext?
9	BUCHEIT:	At the very end.
10	CRAMER:	Okay. So we have a motion on an
11	ame	ndment from Dean Bucheit. Is there a

12	second for that motion? Lee? Trustee Blonder,
13	seconds that amendment.
14	All right. So is there a debate on this
15	amendment to the motion, which is to insert
16	the Senate at the end. Dean Bucheit, can I
17	get you to repeat that sentence one more
18	time?
19	BUCHEIT: Yes. In making this resolution, the
20	Senate does not seek to act or exert undue
21	influence outside the responsibilities
22	ascribed to it in GR IV.
23	CRAMER: We have a motion to amend this
24	resolution along those lines. Is there debate
25	on that motion? Herman?

1	
2	FARRELL: I'm a little concerned about the idea
3	behind the amendment. The GR IV talks about
4	shared governance, not only shared governance
5	in the best decision-making and that sharing
6	of expertise does cross lines between the
7	Senate sort of realm, which is an educational
8	policy-making, as well as the
9	administration's role in as Dean Bucheit
10	just said, implementation.
11	But I'm a little concerned that it's

12	suggesting that we might be stepping out of
13	our bounds, by sharing that expertise with
14	the administration and just as the
15	administration shares its expertise with us.
16	Let's just note the fact that Dean Bucheit is
17	a voting member of the University Senate, so
18	even within our structure, we have sharing of
19	expertise among Deans as members of the
20	Provost office, administrators, staff,
21	students, as well as faculty representatives.
22	On the administrative side, there are
23	Advisory Committees from the Senate that go
24	over and provide advice on an advisory level
25	to the Administration. We have no voting

1	rights over there. So all we're suggesting
2	here is that when we do have input in a
3	decision as we do in any dean or any provost
4	search or any chair or any of those
5	educational unit administrators who are both
6	administrators and educational officers, that
7	we still have the authority to weigh in and
8	do what we're doing right now is making a
9	recommendation that regular order be followed
10	here that a regular appointment be made.
11	So I would oppose this amendment. I

12	would amend it if it would be friendly to
13	Dean Bucheit to just include GR IV, to say
14	pursuant to GR IV, GR VIII in our shared
15	governance principles and then I feel like
16	maybe that would cover his concerns about us
17	leaving out a very particular section which
18	deals with the Senate power. But I would have
19	a problem with any language that kind of puts
20	the Senate in a box. I don't think that's
21	what the shared governance principles are all
22	about.
23	CRAMER: Bob?
24	GROSSMAN: Yes. I also oppose this amendment, and
25	mostly due to the terms "undue influence." I

1	don't know what undue influence is. I think
2	we're just asking for a particular process to
3	be taken off pause and resumed. I don't think
4	that's undue influence. Undue influence is a
5	way of telling people to be quiet and stay in
6	their place, and I don't think that's
7	appropriate at a university. Acting is
8	different I don't mind, you know, acting
9	outside of our authority is something that we
10	should not do, but simply speaking our minds
11	I think is something we should do and we are

12	expected to do. And I don't think the
13	administration would want a faculty where we
14	just sit in our offices and didn't say
15	anything.
16	CRAMER: Gail?
17	BRION: I would like to suggest a friendly
18	amendment with Dean Bucheit. I would like to
19	suggest that instead of making this
20	resolution "The Senate does not seek to act
21	or exert undue influence outside the
22	responsibility to ascribe to GR 1.E and GR
23	IV.C that we just say pursuant to GR IV and
24	GR VIII.
25	CRAMER: I think compartmentally there's no such

1	thing as a friendly amendment. I think we're
2	going to have to actually amend amendments,
3	and we can only get about one more level deep
4	on these. So maybe if you don't like that
5	language, strike it down. But, yeah. Alan?
6	BROWN: Yeah, I was going to say I agree that
7	the exerting undue influence, we do have the
8	right to exert influence. That's our job.
9	And so I think that that word is problematic.
10	I like and again, we're bouncing around
11	language here. I don't know where we'll

12	land, but something along the lines of
13	pursuant to GR 1.E within the strictures
14	outlined in GR IV.C or something that we're
15	aware of.
16	I think it's important to show that we
17	are aware of the fact that we know our
18	limitations, but we don't have to spell those
19	out, within the strictures that are, or the
20	powers or the responsibilities ascribed to
21	the Senate found in GR IV.C and call it at
22	that, something along those lines. I don't
23	know how we massage the language together as
24	a hundred people, but some thoughts there.
25	CRAMER: Right. Rudy, I'm going to thank you in

1	advance because you're the one that's
2	consistently said your name and your college
3	every time you've spoken. Thank you and,
4	Rudy, go ahead.
5	BUCHEIT: Rudy Bucheit, Engineering. Appreciate
6	the comments of my Senate colleagues. I put
7	the word "undue" in that on purpose because I
8	do believe it is appropriate for the Senate
9	to try to exert influence. We're in a game of
10	persuasion with one another. That's part of
11	shared governance, but I think there's an

12	opportunity to latch on to this, to try to
13	push inappropriate way to influence it in an
14	appropriate way so the modifier undue
15	influence represents a boundary. Influence,
16	yes. Undue influence, no. That was on my
17	mind when I crafted that. Thank you.
18	CRAMER: All right. Is there any further debate
19	on what our parliamentarian has described the
20	proposed amendment to at the end of the
21	resolution add, "In making this resolution,
22	the Senate does not seek to act or exert
23	undue influence outside the responsibility
24	ascribed to it in GR IV.C." Is there any
25	further debate on that amendment? Lee?

1 **BLONDER:** Yeah. I'd like to speak in favor of it 2 for the reasons that Rudy just mentioned. I 3 think it's important that we express that we fully understand the boundaries so that we 4 5 can have influence. And that I think makes it 6 more powerful, not less powerful. 7 CRAMER: Bob? 8 **GROSSMAN**: Yeah. I guess I'd like to just take up 9 what some other people have said and offer an 10 amendment to Dr. Bucheit's amendment, which 11 is to strike the language that he suggests

12	and ju	st insert GR. So is it GR IV.C after
13	the me	ention of GR VIII in the last sentence.
14	So it w	ould read "pursuant to GR VIII, GR
15	IV.C in	our shared governance principles. I'm
16	offerin	g that amendment to Dr. Bucheit's
17	amenc	lment.
18	CRAMER:	This is as deep as we can go on amending
19	amenc	lment. So Bob has offered a substitute
20	motior	٦.
21	GROSSMAN:	Bob Grossman, A&S.
22	CRAMER:	Thank you, Bob. Is there a second for
23	Bob?	
24	BARRON:	I'll second. Susan Barron, A&S.

1	CRAME	R: So now we have a motion to change Dean
2		Bucheit's text to strike the language he
3		said, but to add GR IV.C after GR VIII to
4		accomplish that effect. Is there debate on
5		that motion, which is to essentially change
6		Rudy's motion? Scott?
7		
8	YOST:	Sorry. I had two things I had to turn
9		off here. When you look at the structure of
10		the original motion here and then the
11		amendment and the second amendment, I believe

12	that the second amendment put forward by Bob
13	was clearly consistent with how this is run
14	together, and that was, we don't go into
15	qualifications pursuant to GR VIII. We don't
16	go into qualifications pursuant to GR I.E.
17	So I think it's totally appropriate to keep
18	the parallel structure, but yet reference
19	where we draw our authority and where we draw
20	our limitations from. So I'm in favor of this
21	second amendment put forth by Bob.
22	CRAMER: Herman?
23	FARRELL: Yeah. I would just echo the comments of
24	Scott. I'm in favor of this amendment to the
25	amendment. I think it's just clear in terms

1	of what's within our authority. I don't think
2	any of these resolutions go beyond our
3	authority. We're just trying to reaffirm and
4	reassert our authority within the shared
5	governance structure. So I would have issues
6	with the notions of even suggesting that we'd
7	be doing anything that has to do with undue
8	influence, so that's why I'm in favor of this
9	amendment, to the amendment.
10	CRAMER: Any further debate on the motion to
11	change the amendment to add GR IV after GR

12	VIII?
13	All right. Then we're voting now to
14	change Rudy Bucheit's motion, by striking out
15	the words he added and inserting GR VIII
16	before or after GR VIII, I think, in the
17	text. Any further debate on this, are you
18	guys debating or voting? If you're not
19	debating, put your hands down.
20	So we have this motion, then. Senators,
21	if you like to vote in favor of this motion,
22	please use the "raise hand" feature now.
23	If you'd like to vote against that
24	motion, please use the "raise hand" feature
25	now.

1	And if you'd like to abstain on that
2	motion, please use the "raise hand" feature
3	now.
4	That motion passes.
5	So now, we're voting on a or we're
6	considering a modified amendment now. The
7	amendment originally proposed by Rudy Bucheit
8	to change this text has now been modified to
9	add GR IV.C in that place, that's what we're
10	considering is whether we want to actually
11	make that amendment to the resolution.

12	We voted just now to accept that as a
13	change. Now we have to decide whether we
14	want to actually make this change to the
15	resolution; is there any further debate on
16	that question? Herman?
17	FARRELL: I'm in favor of voting for this amended
18	version.
19	CRAMER: Any further debate on this? This is a
20	motion to accept a modified amendment to the
21	resolution.
21 22	
	resolution.
22	resolution. Senators, if you'd like to vote yes on

1	resolution. Please, use the "raise hand"
2	feature now.
3	If you'd like to vote against the
4	amendment, please use the "raise hand"
5	feature now.
6	If you'd like to abstain on the
7	amendment, please use the "raise hand"
8	feature now.
9	That motion passes.
10	So now we're debating the amended motion
11	to opt the resolution that Stefan presented

12	that it was amended ultimately by Bob. Is
13	there a debate on that motion? Bob?
14	GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. I am an A&S Senator
15	and I don't recall, and it's possible we've
16	had a hellacious week in chemistry this week,
17	but I don't recall being asked about whether
18	I favor this amendment before it got
19	submitted. So I guess I would like to
20	respectfully dispute Stefan's
21	characterization of this proposal as one
22	that's supported by the A&S Senators. He's
23	shaking his head, but it's possible it went
24	by email at one point, but I don't recall.
25	Actually, I don't think we've had a

1	chance to debate the reasons why the Provost
2	decided to postpone the search for a
3	permanent dean of A&S. He did offer reasons
4	when he announced that he was going to
5	propose it. I think those reasons were
6	reasonable reasons, and I guess I am not
7	willing to substitute my judgment for his on
8	this particular matter. So unless someone can
9	persuade me otherwise, I'm inclined to vote
10	against this motion.

11 CRAMER: Herman?

12	FARRELL:	I asked the question of the Provost at
13	our	regular meeting two weeks ago on Monday
14	and	d did ask about what was happening with the
15	dea	an's search and his response for me was
16	uns	satisfactory. What was interesting about it
17	wa	s the first thing he brought up when saying
18	tha	t there may be some continued delay. He
19	did	honestly say that there would be an
20	act	ing dean put in for the next year and then
21	a re	edetermination at the end of next year,
22	wh	ich again was suggesting that this would go
23	on	a little bit further. But, Bob, you can
24	cor	rect me if I'm wrong in terms of what he
25	said	d on the record.

1	First thing he said was the \$6.4 million
2	deficit, that was part of the reason why he
3	had fired Mark Kornbluh. I thought it was
4	interesting that when the question was really
5	and all of these questions and issues are
6	about our educational aspect of leadership,
7	academic leadership that he talked about the
8	money instead of, I have to say, a lot of the
9	great accomplishments of Dean Kornbluh.
10	But getting to that specific point about
11	his justification, for me, I find that very

12	interesting that that is the reason why that
13	should continue on into a third year, in
14	terms of not having a permanent dean in
15	place, when interestingly enough, there was
16	an audit, I remember him telling us that
17	there was an audit that was conducted this
18	past year.
19	And so the issues of the economics of
20	the college suggests that there's room for at
21	least at the beginning of that, or return to
22	that search process next year, and then that
23	person would be coming in, in the third year,
24	in 2021 in the fall anyway 2022 in the

1	support of this resolution.
2	CRAMER: Stefan?
3	BIRD-POLLAN: Yeah. Stefan Bird-Pollan, A&S. So the
4	point of the resolution is to call on the
5	administration, to call on the provost,
6	specifically, to adhere to normal principles
7	of shared governance. That's what we're
8	asking for. We are the college's states is
9	the way it is, but the colleges require
10	leadership and they require permanent
11	leadership, and that's what we're asking,

12	that's what we're asking for. I'm sure that
13	an administration which was willing to find
14	an appropriate permanent replacement would be
15	able to do so. And so that's what we're
16	encouraging. There may be reasons why this is
17	difficult, there are always reasons why it's
18	difficult to do so but I don't think that
19	those reasons prevail. I think that the
20	process is what's important here, and that's
21	what we're asking for.
22	CRAMER: Akiko?
23	TAKENAKA: Akiko Takenaka, Arts & Sciences. I just
24	want to add that the reason that Herman just
25	gave about not doing the search yet doesn't

1	really hold because the search had been
2	started already last fall, last winter, and
3	it was paused. But when the search started
4	and we had a search committee, we hired, we
5	interviewed, and selected a search firm. So
6	we went through the initial processes while
7	knowing that there was the deficit. So I
8	don't think that's a legitimate reason.
9	CRAMER: Is there any further debate on this?
10	Rudy?

11 BUCHEIT: Yeah. I think you could launch a search

12	immediately, resume the search. You could
13	find candidates and you could make an offer,
14	but given the current prevailing financial
15	circumstances in Arts & Sciences, you will
16	not attract the best candidates to this
17	search. You just simply won't. I don't know
18	the details of what happened, but it would
19	not surprise me if they began to shop the
20	position around in this issue came to the
21	fore and it became clear that you could not
22	put together the quality in the candidate
23	pool, given the current fiscal circumstances.
24	So under those situations, I do think it is

1	essential to further the interests of
2	administration in this particular case.
3	Implementation: This is about
4	implementation. Implementation has serious
5	accountability attached to it. That's part of
6	what has brought us to this situation, to
7	begin with. If you don't implement
8	effectively, administrators are separated
9	from their positions. So we have to be
10	cognizant of these issues. I'm all for
11	getting this back on process, but I think

12	you've got to do it under conditions where
13	you can get an exceptionally qualified
14	candidate pool. And I just don't think those
15	conditions exist right now.
16	CRAMER: Stefan?
17	BIRD-POLLAN: Stefan Bird-Pollan, Arts & Sciences.
18	With all due respect to Dean Bucheit, I don't
19	think that we know in advance who will apply.
20	And I think that the Arts & Sciences requires
21	needs, wants, permanent leadership. I mean,
22	it's possible that the applications will come
23	in and they will be very weak and then
24	administration will it seems to me on very
25	reasonable grounds, say, look, we couldn't

1	find anyone, but I don't think we should
2	think in advance that that's going to be the
3	case. And I think that that's not a reason
4	that it's sufficient to disrupt ordinary
5	procedure, that comes to filling these
6	vacancies. That's what the resolution I
7	asked for normal process to be adhered to, if
8	there are reasons to halt the normal process,
9	then so be it. But currently we don't see
10	those reasons, many of us who bring this, and
11	that's not all of us, but those who bring

12	this res	olution, I believe that it's
13	necessa	ary. Thank you.
14	CRAMER:	Susan.
15	BARRON:	Yeah. I'm just going to strongly agree
16	with St	efan, we're not saying someone has to
17	be hire	d, but we have to go the process. And
18	there's	no way to predict who will or won't
19	apply. S	So I strongly support this resolution.
20	CRAMER:	Herman?
21	FARRELL:	I will just echo what Susan said. Thank
22	you, Su	isan.
23	CRAMER:	Is there any for Akiko?
24	TAKENAKA:	Akiko Takenaka, Arts & Sciences. I just
25	want to	o add that I was on the Search

1	Comm	ittee and that concern came up from the
2	comm	ittee members and it was the search firm
3	that to	ld us do not worry. It is our job
4	by our	I mean the search firm's job to
5	preser	at the position as attractively as
6	possib	le. And they repeatedly told us do not
7	worry	about it.
8	CRAMER:	Julia?
9	JOHNSON:	I just want to also express my support
10	of Ste	fan's comment. Thanks.

11 CRAMER: Phoebe?

12	GLAZER:	Yeah. I just wanted to say looking at
13	t	his from a different angle, having an
14	iı	nterim dean in place for a long period of
15	t	ime might be the way to identify the very
16	b	best dean candidate, but the damage it would
17	d	lo to the faculty and staff, I think is
18	S	ignificant. We need to consider, what will
19	e	existing faculty and staff feel if we can't
20	g	et leadership that we can count on in our
21	с	ollege. What will new hires think about
22	с	coming to an institution that has two and a
23	h	alf years of limbo in front of them? So, you
24	k	now, this is more than just about the person
25	а	It the top of the food chain, it affects

1	everyone going down the line to graduate
2	students. How do we tell graduate students to
3	come to UK that this is a great institution
4	when we don't have a leader?
5	CRAMER: Marc? Marc, can you
6	KIVINIEMI: Yeah. Oh, my apologies. Marc Kiviniemi
7	from the College of Public Health. I just
8	wanted to put a thought on the table for the
9	senators to consider in this amendment, which
10	is I would disagree with Senator Farrell's
11	assertion that administration primarily

12	should focus on the academic and not the
13	financial, because the central part of being
14	an administrator, is handling the financial
15	side of the operation and in support of the
16	amendment, you might consider making the
17	point that the level of the financial
18	situation in Arts & Sciences is going to
19	require long-term structural measures to
20	address it. And that those kinds of long-term
21	structural measures are better put in place
22	by permanent leadership than they are by an
23	interim whose time is limited often, if not
24	formal authority, at least feeling of
25	authority and power is limited. So I would

1	assert that you might consider including
2	language that says that you feel that the
3	financial situation in and of itself is a
4	reason to go with a permanent search rather
5	than an interim.
6	CRAMER: Herman?
7	FARRELL: I guess I just wanted to respond. I
8	wasn't suggesting that the administration
9	should only focus on administration. We
10	should only focus on educational policies.
11	Their shared governance scheme does allow for

12	some sort of connection in exchange of ideas
13	between both.
14	Interestingly enough, deans, provosts,
15	and the President have dual roles in terms of
16	financial responsibility, as well as
17	educational policy and they're ethical
18	they're educational officers. The Senate has
19	a role, certainly in terms of the educational
20	policy and academic policy decision-making,
21	but we also have the authority to make
22	recommendations with regard to even
23	administrative side. So I just wanted to make
24	that clear.

1	I'm still in favor of leaving this as is
2	and going forward with the vote because I'm
3	getting a sense from many of the A&S,
4	senators and maybe that's
5	mischaracterization, but there's a lot of
6	strong support on the academic side of this
7	conversation to have a leader in place going
8	forward. Not only in terms of hiring faculty
9	members, but maybe even in perhaps a way to
10	attract good candidates for this position. So
11	l support it as is.

12	CRAMER:	Marilyn?
13	DUNCAN:	Yes. Just an additional point to
14	consid	der: I think that when the search was
15	stopp	ed, we still had a provost in place.
16	Wasn	I't that the case? But since then, we know
17	that t	he provost is stepping down, and then
18	we wi	ill soon have an interim provost who has
19	not ye	et been appointed, and that means that
20	candio	dates that would be identified by the
21	Searc	h Committee and possibly brought in for
22	interv	views, would not know who was going to
23	be in t	the provost position. And I guess, I
24	wond	ler if that might impair the search or
25	discou	urage candidates in some way.

1	And I thought I would also share one
2	other point that the President raised that he
3	said, applications for higher-level
4	administrative positions are down about 30%
5	this past year during the pandemic. So those
6	might be reasons why we wouldn't get as many
7	or as many good candidates as we might at
8	another time. Thank you.
9	CRAMER: Beth?
10	GUITON: Yes. Beth Guiton, A&S. I had a question
11	about Akiko's point about the search firm,

12	encouraging us to go ahead with the search.
13	And I was wondering if they have a financial
14	incentive for the search to go ahead, or if
15	that would be a conflict of interest or not.
16	CRAMER: Katherine?
17	COUNTS: Hello, my name is Katherine Counts. I am
18	the President of the Graduate Student
19	Congress that oversees graduate student's
20	post-docs and professional students and their
21	interests, that's about 8- to 9,000 people.
22	I just want to say, when it comes to the
23	Arts & Sciences issue, I think it is
24	important to consider having a permanent
25	person. Students want to feel safe. Students

1	want to know that they have tangible people
2	in leadership that they can count on. Not
3	saying that the person currently there is not
4	doing that, but there is a distinct
5	difference in having someone as an interim
6	position, then having someone somewhere who
7	is a permanent person.
8	I would also like to say, this goes into
9	the point of the graduate school because it
10	does kind of connect in the sense of, the
11	graduate schools Dean has been interim for

12	almost eight years, now? The question I have
13	to the entire body of University Senate, do
14	you really want to wait eight years? Do you
15	really want to wait a long period of time for
16	graduate students, for professional students,
17	for those who work within the graduate
18	school? It is frustrating to have someone in
19	a position that's interim for almost eight
20	years.
21	I don't know if Arts & Sciences really
22	wants to do that as big as they are, as much
23	as they have to use their resources for, is
24	that really what we're saying? I know that
25	there's some hesitancy to make the decision

1	of fully supporting this, but I would just
2	like to make sure you understand from a
3	student's perspective. I don't know how
4	you're going to get more people to come into
5	the university knowing that there's nobody
6	permanent in those positions, knowing that
7	that person can't make new hires, there's
8	been a hold on a lot of things that the Arts
9	and Sciences College is doing right now, so I
10	just want the student perspective also to be
11	really thought through, and really considered

12	during this time. Thank you.		
13	CRAMER:	All right. Last one maybe, Tom?	
14	TROLAND:	Tom Troland, College of Arts & Sciences.	
15	l would	l like to say as an A&S Senator, I	
16	suppor	t this resolution, I think it's a good	
17	idea to	move forward. And with regard to	
18	studen	ts, I can't speak for students, I'm not	
19	a stude	ent. All I can say is when I applied to	
20	Gradua	ate School eight years ago, the concern	
21	about	who was dean or wasn't dean or what the	
22	dean w	vas doing was the very last thing on my	
23	mind. I	t never even crossed my mind. So I	
24	dealt w	vith this issue that affects many	
25	studen	t's applications or decisions to help	

1	me here. Anyway, that whole big step as an	
2	A&S Senator, I support this resolution	
3	favorably.	
4	CRAMER: All right. Senators will take up the	
5	question now of adopting the resolution as	
6	amended. If you'd like to vote in favor of	
7	that motion, please use the "raise hand"	
8	feature now.	
9	If you'd like to vote against the	
10	motion, please use the "raise hand" feature	
11	2014	

11 now.

12	If you'd like to abstain on this motion,
13	please use the "raise hand" feature now.
14	That motion passes.
15	I'm looking for Herman. Herman, there
16	you are.
17	FARRELL: Yeah. So the next proposal that was put
18	forward by the group of senators yesterday is
19	on the Graduate School. And I'd call upon my
20	colleagues; is somebody within that group
21	would care to make the motion? I'll do it if
22	nobody else is ready and prepared to do it.
23	CRAMER: Looks like it might be you, Herman.

1	FARRELL:	Okay. So I make this motion on the
2	Gradu	ate School associate provost/dean
3	search	n. Should I just read it out, Aaron?
4	CRAMER:	Sure.
5	FARRELL:	Okay. "Whereas the search process for
6	the as	sociate provost/dean of Graduate School
7	result	ed in one finalist candidate, who was
8	chose	n by the outgoing Provost without
9	adequ	ate consultation with the Associate
10	Provo	ost Graduate/Dean Search Committee about
11	finalis	st candidates;

12	Whereas the Senate Council recently
13	called upon the President to refrain from
14	making the final decision on the appointment
15	of an Associate Provost/Dean of the Graduate
16	School, until additional candidates have been
17	invited to participate publicly in the final
18	round of the search; and
19	Whereas the Senate Council recently
20	called upon the President to share all
21	feedback on finalist candidates obtained
22	through public forum with the Search
23	Committee, so that the committee is given an
24	opportunity to share its responses to the

1	feedback, before a decision about the
2	finalists is made.
3	Be it resolved that:
4	The University Senate requests that the
5	Provost not make a decision on the
6	appointment of an Associate Provost/Dean of
7	the Graduate School until additional
8	candidates have participated publicly in the
9	final round of the search; and
10	The university requests that the Provost
11	share all feedback on finalist candidates

12	obtained through public forum with the Search	
13	Committee so that the committee is given an	
14	opportunity to share its responses to the	
15	feedback with the Provost before a decision	
16	about the finalist is made."	
17	And I make this motion.	
18	CRAMER: Is there a second for that motion?	
19	Roger?	
20		
	ROGER: Second.	
21	ROGER: Second. CRAMER: Roger Brown from the CAFÉ. Is there	
21 22		
	CRAMER: Roger Brown from the CAFÉ. Is there	
22	CRAMER: Roger Brown from the CAFÉ. Is there debate on this motion? Bob?	

1	think it would have hurt anyone or anything
2	to have invited more finalists. And I think
3	the faculty need to be able to compare the
4	finalists to make adequate contribution to
5	who they would like to see filling the
6	position.
7	And honestly, it's in the benefit of
8	whoever is the person who is named to have
9	the benefit of having the faculty's
10	confidence that they were the best candidate.
11	Not that they were just the ones who the

12	provost thought was the best candidate, so
13	that they were the ones that the faculty
14	thought was the best candidate, and it would
15	help that person do their job in the future.
16	So I thought I think this is actually
17	handicaps. If this process goes through and
18	the provost appoints the only finalists, we
19	were able to see, I think it will hurt that
20	person's attempts to gain the faculty's
21	trust. So I support this motion.
22	CRAMER: Alan?
23	BROWN: Yeah. Alan Brown, Arts & Sciences. I
24	support this motion as well. I think it's
25	also important to realize I liked what the

1	Graduate Students said, and I'm sorry, I
2	don't remember her name. You know, eight
3	years of an interim and then one finalist for
4	the position, it doesn't the optics are
5	bad of course.
6	I do have a question or a point of
7	debate. The Provost's letter in response or
8	the Provost's response to your letter, Chair
9	Cramer, was heavily dependent on precedent
10	and that this has happened before and in
11	conversations I've had with others, there has

12	been referenced to precedent and I'm
13	wondering, meaning that this has happened
14	before, this shouldn't be surprising to the
15	Senate.
16	I don't know that we need to amend this
17	resolution, but I feel like precedent is a
18	tool that's going to be used. You know, you
19	can use precedent for just about anything it
20	seems. So I didn't know if any senators have
21	any information on how we counter the
22	argument of precedent because evidently this
23	has been done before, and specific cases were
24	given in his response. And so I invite my

1	colleagues to clarify for me how we brought
2	that issue.
3	CRAMER: Herman?
4	FARRELL: Well, I guess we're not really
5	responding to what they said, we're just
6	going forward with what we believe should
7	take place here. What this resolution does is
8	backs up our Senate Council. Our Senate
9	Council already made this request that's
10	where and, whereas, and we're just continuing
11	on to back them up and to say we, as

12	University Senate, completely agree with what
13	their simple request was a week ago for more
14	finalists, as well as more transparency in
15	the feedback loop. And so we're just making
16	that point.\
17	I do think this notion about precedent
18	is problematic as a factual matter, they
19	referenced three dean searches that in terms
20	of the affected faculty and students is a
21	much smaller cohort those three colleges that
22	were referenced, as compared to a Graduate
23	School dean, whereas we just pointed out with
24	the A&S dean, who impact I don't know if
25	someone can correct me on the numbers, I

1	think G	raduate School students represent a
2	quarte	r of our students, as well as our
3	majori	ry of our faculty, as well as the A&S,
4	has hu	ge impact on our undergraduate students
5	and ou	r graduate students. So for those
6	reason	s, the notion of the precedent of these
7	three c	ther searches where I guess we weren't
8	even a	erted to the problems, I don't think
9	is a fair	analogy.
10	CRAMER:	Shannon?
11	OLTMANN:	Shannon Oltmann, College of

12	Communication and Information. Furthermore,
13	to Herman's comments, my understanding is
14	that Provost Blackwell reference three
15	previous searches in which there was one
16	finalist. In two of those searches, there was
17	only one applicant. And in the third search,
18	the interim Dean was invited to apply. So I
19	think those are I think it's quite
20	disingenuous to reference those as comparable
21	to the current search for the dean of
22	Graduate School.
23	CRAMER: Marilyn?
24	DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, College of Medicine. I
25	don't think this should go in the resolution,

1	but ju	ust to deal with this issue of
2	prece	edent, I brought this up at a meeting
3	that t	he center
4	CRAMER:	Sorry, Marilyn. We lost you. We had a
5	little	audio trouble for a second.
6	DUNCAN:	Okay.
7	CRAMER:	You were saying I don't think this
8	goes	in the resolution.
9	DUNCAN:	Well, to address this issue of
10	prec	edent, we had a in a faculty meeting,
11	a Sei	nate Council meeting with the President

12	on Friday, I reminded the President that the
13	search for the dean of the College of
14	Medicine about five or six years ago, had
15	brought in four candidates. And I discussed
16	how valuable I thought that was in
17	identifying the one best candidate who was
18	eventually hired.
19	CRAMER: Susan?
19 20	CRAMER: Susan? SEGARSTROM: Susan Segarstrom, Arts & Sciences and
20	SEGARSTROM: Susan Segarstrom, Arts & Sciences and
20 21	SEGARSTROM: Susan Segarstrom, Arts & Sciences and member of the A&S Executive Committee. In
20 21 22	SEGARSTROM: Susan Segarstrom, Arts & Sciences and member of the A&S Executive Committee. In looking at the Provost's response to the

1	result in sole finalists. And I want to
2	emphasize under my leadership because it's
3	exactly that leadership that is being pointed
4	out as problematic."
5	So the fact that he has done this
6	before, I don't think should be taken in
7	mitigation as the problem.
8	CRAMER: Gail?
9	BRION: I also want to point out that having
10	gone through a long time where we've had
11	several interim Deans for a long time, and

12	we've had interim candidates that have ended
13	up being, or only a single candidate, this
14	might impact our ability as Dean Bucheit was
15	saying earlier to actually get good
16	candidates. We don't want to become known as
17	a University, where only a single candidate
18	is invited, and that single candidate happens
19	to be an internal candidate. We want to make
20	sure that we're open to getting the best
21	candidates that we can from everywhere.
22	CRAMER: Rudy Bucheit?
23	BUCHEIT: Rudy Bucheit, Engineering. I just want
24	to put a marker in Aaron. I'd like to amend
25	the motion just in the same way that we did

1	the last c	ne. Sorry. I didn't want to
2	interrupt	the debate.
3	CRAMER:	hink about where—
4	BUCHEIT: I	will. I will. I'll be ready for you
5	when de	bate is done.
6	CRAMER:	lollie?
7	SWANSON:	I just wanted to point out to back the
8	previous	conversation. I've been talking to
9	other pe	ople involved with those previous
10	searches	s that the provost mentioned, this is
11	not th	is is an "apples and oranges" issue,

12	because from what I understand, the previous
13	committees put forth one candidate. In this
14	case that that was not the point.
15	CRAMER: Katherine?
16	COUNTS: Again, hello everyone. My name is
17	Katherine Counts, the President of the
18	Graduate Student Congress. I have a couple of
19	things to mention. Number one, the Graduate
20	School oversees graduate and professional
21	students, which is around 8- to 9,000
22	students, they also are a part of the post-
23	docs.
24	So any post-docs that anybody might
25	have, there are things that the Graduate

1	School does for those scholars, is what we
2	call them and I don't know what everyone else
3	does, but we call them "scholars". So that's
4	also on the table.
5	To the point someone made about the
6	decisions that graduate and professional
7	students make, is it determined by the Dean?
8	It actually does matter. And let me explain
9	to you why. That Dean does decide the
10	financial status of that college. They decide
11	the policies of that college. So if that

12	particular dean has certain inclinations
13	about how they want to move forward, it does
14	impact a student. Honestly, in some ways, it
15	impacts a student before it impacts a faculty
16	member because we have direct ties to what
17	happens from that Graduate School and how our
18	money, so if you have an associate I mean,
19	assistantship of any type, that goes through
20	the Graduate School as well. So financially
21	this is a problem, and from the Graduate
22	School's perspective, we are disappointed
23	from the Congress's perspective. We are
24	disappointed that there's only one single
25	candidate.

1	I also think that there was not enough
2	time to actually talk with that one single
3	candidate. I don't know if that's also
4	mentioned as this as well, they were very
5	short and very brief conversations, not
6	enough time to actually ask in-depth
7	questions and in-depth concerns. I don't know
8	if anybody's thinking about our International
9	Student Community, there is a large
10	population of International Student Graduate
11	and professional students. And I don't know

12	if it's been mentioned yet, but that's also
13	very important. And if you don't have anybody
14	who has a tie to international students, as
15	well as a part of other things, I think
16	that's also going to be a concern, and I just
17	don't know how we could move forward because
18	honestly, and you all helped me to understand
19	this because I need to graduate education, so
20	help me. But if you add a second person and
21	helped me to understand this, if I say, okay,
22	he adds another person, they've already made
23	the decision kind of.
24	So adding that other part like how
25	would that other person feel coming into a

1	situation, and they kind of already know
2	who's going to get the cupcake. Like we
3	already know who's getting it. I'm just
4	trying to understand how we fix this, cause
5	like the Provost already made the cupcake
6	with the President, put the sprinkles on it,
7	and said, here you go, you ain't get nothing
8	else." And then everybody else is saying,
9	wait a minute, how could one person get this
10	and when we haven't even had a conversation
11	about this? And so since you already have

12	this one single candidate, I don't know how
13	you say, okay, let's add Sarah and Paul into
14	the conversation to have two new candidates
15	added for these interviews when we know that
16	the Provost and the President already want
17	Michael. Like that's what I'm seeing, that's
18	what a lot of graduate students and
19	professional students and post-docs have
20	talked to me about, like what is adding that
21	other person doing in this situation?
22	And graduate students kind of feel
23	vulnerable because this person can affect
24	decisions within the Graduate Student
25	Congress. So funding for students and the

1	things that we do for students are in
2	jeopardy. That's all I have to say, but thank
3	you.
4	CRAMER: Herman?
5	FARRELL: I just wanted to quickly respond to
6	Katherine's great comments about this. I
7	think that's a real concern about potential
8	problems with other finalists coming forward.
9	But having said that part of what we're
10	trying to do here is really get us back to
11	regular order, to put a line in the sand and

12	say that this action of only one finalist is
13	hugely problematic and we would like to at
14	least go back to the Search Committee and
15	have an opportunity to have more than one
16	finalist reviewed by all of us. And again,
17	then graduate students and faculty and a
18	whole bunch of other folks would get to come
19	forward to the forums and weigh in with what
20	they think. And if there's transparent
21	feedback, we know exactly what all the
22	responses were with regard to X candidate
23	versus Y candidate, and X candidate being the
24	one that's already there, and Y being the
25	additional, and Z, maybe being one more.

1	Then because of this request, we would
2	at least be able to see what the response
3	was, and if there's more favor towards Y and
4	Z, that will hopefully factor into the
5	decision-making from the administration on
6	this very important and long-awaited change
7	in academic leadership.
8	CRAMER: Is there any further debate on this
9	motion? Rudy, where are going to add a
10	have you found a place to put it?
11	BUCHEIT: Yeah. I think in the spirit of being

12	consiste	nt since this is also an appointment
13	action, I	think you can add the clause
14	pursuan	t to GR VIII, in our shared sorry.
15	Yeah, pu	irsuant to GR VIII, GR I.E, and GR
16	IV.C. I be	elieve that can be a clause after a
17	comma	at the very end of the resolution.
18	CRAMER:	So is there a second for that amendment?
19	Herman	, are you seconding? Sorry. You're
20	muted,	Herman.
21	FARRELL: I	was just going to ask a question about
22	if it's sec	conded, can it be adopted by me as
23	the mot	ion maker, or does it still have to go
24	through	a separate
25	CRAMER:	I think because the motions in front of

1	the a	assembly, I think we start the debate
2	there	e and vote on the
3	FARRELL:	I'm only talking about the interest of
4	time	, speed
5	CRAMER:	I know. We'll go fast if we can.
6	FARRELL:	Thank you.
7	CRAMER:	So are you seconding that, then, Herman?
8	FARRELL:	Yes, I will.
9	CRAMER:	Okay. So we have adding pursuant to
10	GR	VIII, GR I.E, and GR IV.C after a comment
11	at tl	he end of the resolution. We have a

12	motion	and a second. Is there any debate on
13	that mo	tion? Lee?
14	BLONDER:	I just want to make sure that we've
15	carefully	y reviewed the wording of those GRs
16	to make	e sure this applies in this case.
17	CRAMER:	So are you speaking against the motion
18	then, or	
19	BLONDER:	No, I'm not.
20	CRAMER:	Herman?
21	FARRELL:	And I think they all three apply. So
22	(I), is the	e shared governance, (IV), is the
23	Senate's	s Authority, and GR VIII is about
24	appoint	ments at this level. So they all three
25	apply.	

1	CRAMER:	Any further debate on the motion to
2	ame	nd the resolution?
3	S	enators if you'd like to vote in favor
4	of th	e amendment, please raise your hand now.
5	The	"raise hand" feature.
6	If	you'd like to vote against the
7	mot	on, please use the "raise hand" feature
8	now	
9	If	you'd like to abstain on the motion
10	to a	mend the resolution, please use the
11	"rai	se hand" feature now.

12	The motion to amend the resolution
13	passes.
14	Now, we're finalizing debate on the
15	amended motion then with the amendment
16	offered by Dean Bucheit. Shannon?
17	OLTMANN: Sorry. I know we're but I'm just
18	going to speak to reiterate what Katherine
19	the graduate students said. I have a lot of
20	concerns with the process behind the search
21	for the dean of the Graduate School, but I'm
22	not sure this motion is the best way to
23	rectify those concerns. I don't know that
24	having another candidate put forward at this
25	juncture will be a meaningful action. So I'm

really hesitant about this motion. 1 Any last debate on adopting the amended 2 CRAMER: resolution? All right. Senators, if you'd 3 like to vote in favor of adopting the amended 4 resolution, use the "raise hand" feature now. 5 If you'd like to vote against adopting 6 7 the amended resolution, please use the "raise hand" feature now. 8 If you'd like to abstain on adopting the 9 amended resolution, please use the "raise 10

11 hand" feature now.

12	That motion passes.
13	Herman, do you have someone that's going
14	to introduce
15	FARRELL: This one I'd like to make the motion.
16	Are you going to bring it up or should I?
17	CRAMER: Deshana. Yeah, there she is. Oh, maybe.
18	Deshana, we can only see like an inch of the
19	 1
15	screen. There it is.
20	Screen. There it is. FARRELL: Okay. Thank you. "Whereas Governing
-	
20	FARRELL: Okay. Thank you. "Whereas Governing
20 21	FARRELL: Okay. Thank you. "Whereas Governing Regulation Part VIII on University
20 21 22	FARRELL: Okay. Thank you. "Whereas Governing Regulation Part VIII on University Appointments provides the governing

1	Whereas the subsection on Search
2	Committees is silent or insufficient on key
3	elements for the Search Committee process,
4	that would ensure the shared governance
5	intended and meaningful and effective
6	involvement of faculty expertise, in order to
7	attain academic objectives;
8	And whereas Governing Regulation Part
9	XIII on University Regulations, Section C.
10	"Amendments of these Governing Regulations"
11	provides for University Senate

12	recommendations of amendments to Governing
13	Regulations, through the President, to the
14	Board of Trustees;
15	Be it resolved:
16	The University Senate requests that the
17	Senate Council, with all deliberate speed,
18	and earnest consultation with the President
19	and the administration, discuss, draft, and
20	introduce to the University Senate a
21	recommendation of amendments to the
22	Administrative Regulations and/or Governing
23	Regulations, as it relates to Search
24	Committees (See GR VIII), in order to
25	articulate and clarify key elements of the

1	Search Committee processes that would ensure
2	effective and meaningful involvement of
3	faculty expertise in order to attain academic
4	objectives; and
5	Upon the University Senate
6	recommendations of amendments to the
7	Administrative Regulations and/or Governing
8	Regulations, as it relates to Search
9	Committees (See GR VIII), such AR amendment
10	recommendations shall be transmitted to the
11	President, and such GR amendment

12	recommendations shall be transmitted through
13	the President, to the Board of Trustees for
14	further action, pursuant to GR IV.C.10 and GR
15	XIII."
16	And I make this motion.
17	CRAMER: Second for that motion? Roger?
18	ROGER: Roger Brown, CAFÉ. Second.
19	CRAMER: We have a motion and a second to adopt
20	this resolution. Is there debate on this
21	motion? Herman?
22	FARRELL: Since I offered it, I'd just like to
23	just explain the rationale behind this. This
24	is one of the proposals coming out of today's
25	meeting, that has a long-term impact and long

1	long-term effect. What we're doing here is
2	what we're allowed to do under the governing
3	regulations. Anyone at the constituencies can
4	offer revisions or amendments to the GRs. And
5	so we as the Senate are doing that.
6	And the reason why we're doing that is,
7	again, getting back to the thing I said,
8	colloquially in my introduction, is that
9	there's a kind of a disconnect between the
10	understanding of a shared governance and
11	faculty involvement from their perspective,

12	the administration's perspective, and the
13	faculty's perspective.
14	There has been all these questions about
15	the spirit and the letter, there's been some
16	suggestions by administrators that they are
17	following the letter of the law, and letter
18	of the shared governance principles. And so
19	this is an effort to go back and revisit the
20	GRs to amend them so that they can
21	incorporate into their language at the GR
22	level, and then maybe even subsequently at
23	the administrative regulation level
24	particular insight and ideas and concepts
25	about what we mean by our involvement in

1	especially the Search Committee process.
2	The next amendment, if we get to it,
3	we'll have more specific language on what we
4	consider to be those best practices. But just
5	in terms of just a game plan going forward,
6	this vehicle is the Senate basically charging
7	the Senate Council to work with the President
8	to come up with GR and AR revisions along the
9	lines of everything that's just been said,
10	they will then report back to the Senate and
11	Senate will vote on those recommendations or

12	not, and then the recommendations go to the
13	President as full stop, if it's AR revision,
14	suggestions, recommendations, and they go
15	through the President, to the Board of
16	Trustees and all of that's in GR XIII in
17	terms of the transmittal of such a
18	recommendation.
19	CRAMER: Is there any further debate on this
19 20	CRAMER: Is there any further debate on this motion?
20	motion?
20 21	motion? All right. Seeing none, if you'd like to
20 21 22	motion? All right. Seeing none, if you'd like to vote in favor of this motion, please use the

1	the "raise hand" feature now.
2	If you'd like to abstain on adopting
3	this resolution, please use the "raise hand"
4	feature now.
5	All right. That motion passes.
6	That's a motion of the Senate asking the
7	Senate counselor to do something. I suspect
8	we might do that by establishing an ad hoc
9	committee. So send me names, if you are
10	interested in working on that particular
11	task. Otherwise, we'll come find you. Herman,

12	are you?
----	----------

13	FARRELL: I asked for the resolution number 5,
14	which is on Senate Committee on specific
15	language to defer to any one of the 11 people
16	I met with yesterday to help me with this.
17	I'll do it if nobody else will, but maybe
18	somebody else can do the reading and the
19	motion.
20	BARRON: I'll do it if no one else will, Herman.
21	FARRELL: Susan?
22	BARRON: Yeah. So I'll just read the motion, I
23	guess. "Whereas there has been a long
24	tradition of meaningful and effective faculty
25	engagement in the shared governance structure

1	of the University of Kentucky;
2	Whereas such meaningful and effective
3	faculty engagement historically, has involved
4	the following best practices for
5	administrative appointments, practices that
6	are valued because they effectively utilize
7	the expertise of the faculty to attain
8	academic objectives and ensure stable
9	university, college, and education unit
10	leadership, in furtherance of our education
11	mission;

12	The Search Committee for administrators
13	overseeing academic activities in
14	instruction, research, and/or social service
15	are composed of majorities sorry, there's
16	noise going on here or pluralities of
17	faculty members and such faculty members are
18	full-time faculty, not faculty with
19	substantial percentage of their DOE in
20	Administration, for example, associate
21	deans/chairs and such faculty members are
22	chosen by or from this provided by the
23	University Senate and/or relevant faculty
24	units;
25	Search Committee members, meeting at a

1	collegial body, participate in the review of
2	candidate, identify qualified candidates,
3	rank or provide values, strengths or
4	challenges for each candidate, leading to
5	recommendations that identify at least 2 or 3
6	finalists candidates;
7	On-Campus interviews, forums and/or
8	presentations are made by the finalist
9	candidates to all affected constituencies,
10	students, staff, faculty, administrators.
11	Feedback mechanism involve the review of

12	all input from all effective constituencies;
13	Transparency as to the decision-makers
14	deliberative process, specifically,
15	communication of factors considered, input
16	received, an overall rationale for the choice
17	to all affected constituencies;
18	Be it resolved that:
19	Until such time that the GRs/ARs are
20	changed to ensure meaningful and effective
21	faculty involvement in shared governance, it
22	is the expectation of the University Senate
23	that the President and the Administration
24	adhere to the best practices referenced
25	above, as a President/Administration carries

1	out their duties and responsibilities under
2	GR VIII and as the President and the
3	Administration solicit and utilize the
4	expertise of the faculty to attain academic
5	objectives."
6	CRAMER: Is there a second for that motion?
7	Michelle? Michelle? Roger?
8	ROGER: Roger Brown, CAFÉ. Second.
9	CRAMER: We have a motion and a second to adopt
10	this resolution. Is there a debate on this
11	motion? Roger, are you debating, or are you

12	still seconding? Michelle? Herman?
13	FARRELL: I'm speaking on behalf of this motion; I
14	think it's probably one of the most effective
15	ones of all of them because it's very
16	specific as to what we mean on the faculty
17	side of the equation about our participation
18	in shared governance structure. It contains a
19	variety of best practices that many of us on
20	the committee and many folks over the years
21	have kind of experienced, and so it's kind of
22	a call to that kind of regular order.
23	One thing I want to clarify is that the
24	issue about faculty representation on any of
25	these Search Committees and their DOE, it's

1	not to say that chairs and associate deans
2	can't be represented on those committees,
3	that's not the point. It's just that if
4	they're going to be considered the "faculty"
5	representatives that are either chosen by the
6	Senate Council or by the particular
7	educational unit, then they should not be
8	counted as faculty representatives in that
9	sort of makeup of the entire Search
10	Committee. They would be considered to be on
11	the administrative side.

12	And this is not to suggest that our
13	colleagues who are associate deans and chairs
14	are not faculty members, they most certainly
15	are, but because of the if they have a
16	high percentage of administrative duties,
17	there is a bit of a conflict of interest
18	between their interests that may be coming to
19	them from administrative desires versus their
20	faculty members desires and so we want to
21	clear that up because there actually has been
22	a lot of experiences by many faculty members
23	over the last couple of years from Search
24	Committees, not just at the high level, but
25	even at the micro-level where we have seen

1	folks who have those higher administrative
2	DOE percentages being designated as faculty
3	representatives, and a lot of us just feel
4	like that's a problematic notion and so we're
5	specifically dealing with that.
6	And then the collegial body thing, I
7	think is just a critical notion there when
8	these meetings take place, these Search
9	Committees that are done as a group where
10	there's sharing of conversations among
11	members of the committee or faculty members,

12	administrators, and students, and all the
13	representatives, in that conversation, that's
14	where we'll get the best ideas coming
15	forward. If they're siloed off, if it's just
16	the lead decision-maker, making conversations
17	individually with the various groups, we
18	don't have that shared communication and you
19	don't have that achievement of a better
20	decision-making, and that's why that's there.
21	CRAMER: Rudy?
22	BUCHEIT: Hi, Rudy Bucheit, Engineering. Question
23	here, this resolution is formed differently
24	than the other ones we've looked at. Here in
25	the second line, it says, "After the comment,

1	it is the expectation of the University
2	Senate that the President and the
3	Administration adhere to best practices. The
4	other resolutions were requests of President
5	and Administration by the University Senate."
6	So my question is, is that just a
7	difference in phraseology or is there a
8	substantive difference implied in the phrase,
9	"it is the expectation of the University
10	Senate."

11 CRAMER: Herman?

12	FARRELL:	Quickly the first resolution that we
13	passe	d it's a good point. The first
14	resolu	ution that was passed very specifically
15	asked	for a requested action and basically
16	actior	n taking further steps to adhere to the
17	share	d governance.
18	Не	re since we're drilling down with the
19	specif	ics of what we think goes into Search
20	Comn	nittees in that faculty involvement, we're
21	just ra	aising this as an expectation. And
22	intere	estingly enough, passing this resolution
23	will a	so telegraph to the Senate Council, as
24	they a	are considering those GRs, that this is
25	the ki	nd of standard that the University

1	Senate believes maybe should be incorporated
2	into those GR changes. So the notion of using
3	the word "expectations" is basically to say,
4	this is what we expect and hope. And it's
5	really aligned with the strong requirement in
6	the first resolution.
7	And so it was a little softer, and we
8	did that deliberately in order to say that
9	these are the best practices that we know are
10	out there and we are just expecting that
11	there'll be an application of them, as we go

12	forward before there was any more revisions
13	to the GR.
14	CRAMER: Gail?
15	BRION: These are also best practices that have
16	precedent here, and best practices that have
17	been raised to the administration in their
18	bi-weekly administrative leadership meetings.
19	Specifically, that all feedback be provided,
20	not predestined feedback or only positive
21	feedback, which has been crept into the
22	practice of the presidential review, as well
23	as the practice of the review of candidates.
24	In fact, there was a question asked,
25	would all feedback be provided to the Search

1	Committee on candidates, and I think this is
2	important. People need to be judged on all
3	information available so we can fulfill our
4	responsibility as faculty, and as senators,
5	to further our education mission, to achieve
6	our academic objectives.
7	CRAMER: Is there any other debate on this motion
8	to adopt this resolution? Marc?
9	KIVINIEMI: Yeah. Marc Kiviniemi from Public Health.
10	I don't know the parliamentary procedure well
11	enough to know if a non-member can make a

12	friendly amendment or if I can suggest that a
13	Senator make a friendly amendment, but
14	whichever those two things is appropriate, I
15	think the resolution does a really good job
16	in bullet points three and four of
17	representing the entirety of the
18	constituencies of the University Senate, in
19	addition to faculty, students, staff, and
20	administrators. I would suggest that the
21	first bullet point could be modified such
22	that it recommends that the Search Committees
23	for administrators and so on, include
24	representatives from each of the affected
25	constituencies. The first bullet point very

1	specifically focuses on faculty, whereas many
2	of the others, I think very appropriately
3	call for broader representation. And so I
4	would suggest that that amendment to the
5	first bullet point.
6	CRAMER: So Marc can't make that motion, but
7	somebody can on his behalf if you'd like to.
8	Shannon?
9	OLTMANN: I just have a couple points of
10	clarification for Herman or someone else
11	maybe Susan, since she made the motion

12	formally in the I take Marc's point, but
13	since that's not why I raised my hand, I'm
14	not going to make that amendment.
15	So my questions of clarification have to
16	do with the first bullet point: The Search
17	Committees for administrators overseeing
18	academic activities. What level is
19	administrators meant to be? Dean, associate
20	dean, chair, director, I think we might need
21	a little clarification there. And then also
22	later in that paragraph, "Faculty with a
23	substantial percentage." What does
24	substantial mean?
25	CRAMER: Bob?

1 GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. Yeah. I'm trying to 2 formulate an amendment that reflects what 3 Marc has suggested, rather than appending it to the first indented paragraph, I guess I 4 5 would like to add a new indented paragraph 6 after the first indented paragraph that says, 7 "The aforementioned Search Committee, shall also include representation from other 8 9 constituencies, such as students, staff, 10 and"... Was there another one? Another group 11 or just students and staff? Oh, let's just

12	leave it at students and staff.
13	Representation from students and staff. So I
14	typed it into the chat, so people could see
15	it, what I wrote.
16	CRAMER: Is there a second for Bob's motion to
17	amend the resolution? Herman, are you
18	seconding or?
19	FARRELL: I will, yeah.
20	CRAMER: Oh, okay. So Herman seconds.
21	All right. So this is to introduce the
22	texts, "The aforementioned Search Committees
23	also include representation from students and
24	staff" in between the first and second
25	indented paragraphs in the resolution. Is

1	there any debate on that amendment?
2	Senators, please use the "raise hand"
3	feature to vote yes, on the amendment.
4	If you'd like to vote against the
5	amendment, please use the "raise hand"
6	feature now.
7	If you'd like to abstain on the
8	amendment, please use the "raise hand"
9	feature now.
10	That motion passes. So the resolution's
11	amended as indicated by Bob Grossman.

12	Further debate on now the amended motion
13	to adopt this resolution as amendment. Susan?
14	BARRON: Susan Barron. I'm actually just, I'm
15	filling in for Deshana. People noticed in the
16	chat said that "Substantial generally means
17	over 50 percent DOE in Administration." So
18	for people that didn't see the chat, I
19	thought I just clarify that for us.
20	COLLETT: Thank you.
21	CRAMER: Jennifer, hang on. There you go.
22	BIRD-POLLAN: Thanks. This is Jennifer Bird-Pollan
23	from the College of Law. I think I'm still ex
24	officio on the Senate as well, so I think I
25	can propose an amendment to this language,

1	which I'd like to do. I'd like to propose in
2	the second paragraph, in the second "Whereas"
3	clause after the language "Best practices for
4	administrative appointments" I'd like to
5	propose adding, "Including appointments in
6	newly created administrative positions." The
7	rationale for that is that I think sometimes
8	we've seen the creation of new high-level
9	administrative positions that have been
10	filled without searches that have included a
11	Search Committee, and I think that's an

12	unfort	unate practice that we should see at
13	the en	d of. So I would propose that amendment
14	to this	resolution.
15	CRAMER:	Jennifer is an ex officio member of the
16	body a	nd is in order to make that motion. But
17	l would	d ask her to restate it one more time.
18	JENNIFER:	Oh, okay.
19	CRAMER:	Oh, actually yes. Doug's making his
20	money	r today. Jennifer, does that agree
21	JENNIFER:	It is. Yes, thank you.
22	CRAMER:	Is there a second for that? Herman?
23	FARRELL:	I'll second it.
24	CRAMER:	Is there any debate on this motion to
25	amend	I the resolution text? Herman, are you

1	debatin	g, are you Bob?
2	GROSSMAN:	Bob Grossman, A&S. Sorry. I need to put
3	my peda	ant hat on. Newly created is not
4	hyphena	ated, there's a space there. Yeah,
5	sorry, D	oug, but can we please be
6	gramma	tically correct when we send these
7	resolutio	ons? Thank you.
8	CRAMER:	We'll call that just a typo then. Susan?
9	BARRON:	I'm just the sharer of other people's
10	comme	nts at the moment, but it suggests that
11	there's	language in GR VIII, that identifies

12	what's called "other interested constituents
13	or stakeholders." And that might be good when
14	we're trying to come up with grad students
15	and staff, it's kind of broadens it a little
16	bit in case, you know, there's something
17	we're not thinking of at the moment, but yet
18	it's really relevant for a particular search.
19	CRAMER: So that's probably, let's say out of
20	order for this debate on the amendment to
21	deal with newly created positions.
22	BARRON: Sorry.
23	CRAMER: No problem. Is there any further debate
24	on the amendment to apply to newly created
25	administrative positions?

1	Senators, please indicate, sorry if
2	you'd like to vote yes in the motion, please
3	use the "raise hand" feature now.
4	If you'd like to vote against the
5	amendment, please use the "raise hand"
6	feature now.
7	If you'd like to abstain on the
8	amendment, please use the "raise hand"
9	feature now.
10	That motion passes. So now the
11	resolution has been amended to wants to

12	insert the language, and then a second time
13	to insert the bit about newly created
14	administrative positions.
15	Is there further debate on the motion to
16	adopt now the amended resolution? Herman?
17	FARRELL: No, I'm sorry. I was going to speak to
18	the motion, so I withdraw.
19	CRAMER: Seeing no further debate, if you'd like
20	to vote in favor of the adopting the amended
20 21	to vote in favor of the adopting the amended resolution, please use the "raise hand"
-	
21	resolution, please use the "raise hand"
21 22	resolution, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

1	If you'd like to abstain on the question
2	of adopting the amended resolution, please
3	use the "raise hand" feature now.
4	That motion passes.
5	That is the entirety of the motions that
6	I've received ahead of time. This item is up
7	for discussion in the next steps, mindful
8	that it's 5:01; is there other discussion in
9	next steps that need to be heard by the body
10	now? Herman?
11	FARRELL: I just want to be clear. Did we just

12	vote on the	amended motion, or did we vote on
13	the amendn	nents to the motion? I'm confused as
14	to where we	e are.
15	CRAMER: We	voted to adopt the amended
16	resolution.	
17	FARRELL: Okay	y. Just want to be clear. Okay.
18	CRAMER: Is th	ere any further Shannon?
19	OLTMANN: Ye	ah. I know that Senate staff is taking
20	notes. I just	wanted to ask what will be the
21	feed out fro	m this meeting, not to be
22	circulated to	senators, to faculty as a whole
23	and what le	vel of detail will the notes get
24	with regard	to resolutions? Thank you.
25	CRAMER: So I	was asked this question actually by

1	one of the Senate Council office staff just a
2	minute ago. First of all, the meeting will
3	have its minutes, right? Which the Senate, I
4	don't know if there'll be a ready for
5	approval next week, because we get to meet as
6	the Senate next week also, but there will be
7	minutes for the meeting.
8	The resolutions all address specific
9	people and I will sort of communicate
10	directly to those people. I heard the Senate
11	adopted this resolution, you know, to each

12	person that the resolutions are addressed to.
13	So that's how I will intend to implement
14	the Senate action on these issues.
15	OLTMANN: But will the language of the resolution
16	be shared with the senators and, or broader
17	with faculty?
18	CRAMER: Oh, like the adopted resolutions?
19	OLTMANN: Yes.
20	CRAMER: Yeah, I mean, because I'm going to send
21	them to the people that they're addressed to
22	essentially as amended. And so that's right.
23	I'll certainly how are we going to
24	distribute this? I'll figure it out. Yes,

1	adopte	ed by the Senate, so, yeah.
2	OLTMANN:	I just want to make sure that all
3	senato	ors see them and that all faculty have a
4	chance	e to access them, you know, very broad
5	distrib	ution. Thank you.
6	CRAMER:	Any further discussion or next steps?
7	Patrick	? Hang on. Okay, Patrick. Sorry,
8	Patrick	x, can you I think you're able to
9	unmut	e yourself now.
10	WALKER:	That was a bad mistake. My bad.
11	CRAMER:	No problem. Deshana?

12	COLLETT: I just want to note that I put something
13	in the chat. I had several people ask about
14	this substantial amount of time, so I
15	actually put the URL to the Senate website of
16	what we use as far as the HR policy, the GR
17	3,A, and what we use for college election
18	eligibility. So you can go there and read in
19	more detail of how that 50 percent count
20	saying. Someone said they have people at 10%,
21	but it's not just 50 percent, it's also
22	having the title at the level of the cheer or
23	above. So there are several eligibility
24	criteria that we actually use.
25	CRAMER: Gail?

1	BRION:	I just want to thank Carmen bell for
2		taking the lead for concern senators who
3		wanted to bring this to the Senate. And I
4		want to thank all of the Senators for their
5		time in considering this carefully. Thank
6		you.
7	CRAME	R: I see no further hands at this time.
8		Unless I hear objections now, we will
9		adjourn.
10		We are adjourned. I will see you all
11		next week for the regularly scheduled Senate

12	meeting.
13	* * * * * * * *
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, TRISHA B. MORLEY, the undersigned Notary Public

96

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 31st day of May, 2021.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

Notary Public

My commission expires: 4/23/22