

Meeting Specifics		
Purpose	Frequency	
Special Meeting	Once	
Date	Time	Location
November 12, 2025	1:30-2:30 p.m.	Zoom: https://uky.zoom.us/j/85064157724
Faculty Senate		
☒ Chair: Crawford, Christopher	☐ Design: Fugate, Jeff	☐ Honors: Martin, Joe
☒ Provost Liaison: Harper, Christine	☐ Design: O'Bryan, Mark	☐ Honors: Roberts, Sherelle
☐ Trustee: Petrone, Karen	☐ Education: Bennett, Stephanie	☒ Libraries: Weig, Eric
☒ Trustee: Swanson, Hollie	☒ Education: Hammer, Joe	☐ Libraries: McDonnell, Andrew
☒ Agriculture, Food & Environment: Rentfrow, Gregg	☐ Engineering: Anderson, Kimberly	☐ Medicine: Bacon, Matt
☐ Agriculture, Food & Environment: Teets, Nicholas	☒ Engineering: Tagavi, Kaveh	☒ Medicine: Thibault, Olivier
☒ Arts & Sciences: Voss, Steve	☒ Fine Arts: Alley, Becky	☐ Nursing: Biddle, Martha
☒ Arts & Sciences: Stein, Melissa	☐ Fine Arts: Kerns, Bradley	☒ Nursing: Falls, Candace
☒ Business & Economics: Hapke, Holly	☐ Graduate School: Butler, John "J.S."	☐ Pharmacy: Freeman, Trish
☐ Business & Economics: Vincent, Leslie	☒ Graduate School: Montgomery, Kathleen	☒ Pharmacy: Bauer, Bjoern
☒ Communication & Information: Tai, Zixue	☐ Health Sciences: Hoch, Johanna	☐ Public Health: Haynes, Erin
☐ Communication & Information: Vallade, Jessalyn	☐ Health Sciences: Metzler-Wilson, Kristen	☒ Public Health: Ingram, Richard
☐ Dentistry: Dominguez Fernandez, Enif	☐ Law: Henke, Melissa	☒ Social Work: Jones, Aubrey
☒ Dentistry: Wiemann, Alfred	☐ Law: Murray, Michael	☒ Social Work: Ratliff, Stephanie
Standing Guests and Visitors		
☐ DiPaola, Bob	☒ Harmon, Camille	☐ Thomas, Rebecca
☒ Jasinski, Jana	☐ Frisby, Brandi	☐ Benton, Julie
☐ Visitor:	☐ Visitor:	☐ Visitor:

Agenda Item	Presenter/Facilitator
Discussion Regarding Feedback Collected on the Administrative Regulations - University Retirement Plans - Policies and Procedures for the Approval of Capital Projects - Minors Involved in University Sponsored Programs or Programs Held at the University	C. Crawford
Next Meeting November 17, 2025 3:00-5:00 p.m. B&E Room 183	

Minutes	
Agenda Item: Discussion Regarding Feedback Collected on the Administrative Regulations	Presenter: Faculty Senate
- The Faculty Senate discussed the feedback collected on the Administrative Regulations. - University Retirement Plans - Policies and Procedures for the Approval of Capital Projects	

○ Minors Involved in University Sponsored Programs or Programs Held at the University • Please see appendix A for final summary report. • The vote for the Faculty Senate to accept the final summary of the Administrative Regulation feedback provided by the Shared Governance Committee and submit it to the Office of the Provost passed with 20 votes in favor and 1 vote against via a Qualtrics survey that ended at 2:00pm Friday, November 14, 2025.	
Other Information	
Adjournment	
• Meeting adjourned at 2:16p.m.	
Next Meeting	
• Monday, November 17, 2025 3:00-5:00p.m., B&E Room 183	

Summary of Faculty Feedback on Draft Administrative Regulations released November 7, 2025

General Statement on Procedure

The faculty provided less feedback on this round of draft ARs than on previous drafts, expressing fewer concerns with the substance. However, several faculty members expressed a desire for greater transparency and engagement in the review process. While the Faculty Senate appreciates the opportunity to provide input, we reiterate the importance of meaningful shared governance—specifically, that the Faculty Senate (as representative of the faculty at large) be consulted before draft ARs and GRs are released. At a minimum, a longer review period would enable broader and more substantive participation. There is continued concern about the lack of rationale accompanying proposed AR changes. When revisions are presented without explanation, it is difficult to assess and communicate to faculty about the necessity or impact of those changes.

The Senate has previously discussed the need to “close the loop” on faculty feedback by ensuring that responses from the administration—particularly regarding AR changes—are shared with the Senate. Faculty have also requested access to the results of the Presidential Survey related to AR revisions, which would support transparency and understanding of campus-wide perspectives.

University Retirement Plans

Faculty expressed both appreciation and concern regarding proposed changes to the retirement plan regulations. Specifically, because faculty value the University’s strong retirement benefits, they expressed concern that the new AR might make it easier to alter these benefits in the future.

Clarification is requested for the following:

- **Authority for Changes:**

The Draft AR specifies that the President authorizes the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration (EVPFA) to amend plan documents and the Investment Policy Statement. The faculty would like clarification on whether this change makes it easier for the administration to modify the University’s contribution rate or other key aspects of the plan, and if so, under what conditions and with what notice to employees.

- **Rationale and Process:**

Has the rationale for the proposed changes been discussed in the Faculty Senate or other shared governance bodies? Faculty would like to understand how the new regulation differs from the current AR, and what problems or goals motivated these revisions.

- **Participation Requirements:**

The Draft AR simplifies mandatory participation rules for future hires and standardizes vesting. Faculty seek clarification on whether this affects employees hired before July 1, 2024. Some recall being required to participate when hired and want to confirm whether participation was, or remains, voluntary for certain groups.

- **Definition of “Agency”:**

The sentence, “Upon approval of the Board of Trustees, employees of an agency for which the University serves as fiscal and payroll agent may also participate,” needs clarification. Does this definition include staff being centralized under Integrate Blue?

Policies and Procedures for the Approval of Capital Projects

The faculty noted that the Draft AR expands the definition of capital projects and changes the review process for the University Capital Project Plan before presidential submission.

- Terms such as “project scope” and “scope increase” are unclear and could benefit from plain-language definitions.
- Faculty recommend adding **environmental and local community impact** to the list of required considerations in University Capital Project Plans.
- The phrase “could reasonably be expected to result from an impending disaster” is overly broad and may need clarification to prevent unintended interpretations.

Minors Involved in University Sponsored Programs or Programs Held at the University

Faculty observed that the new Draft AR is substantially more concise than AR 6:12, omitting many definitions, policy guidelines, and reporting requirements. The new draft focuses primarily on authority and delegation rather than actual policy content.

- The Draft AR delegates significant authority to the EVPFA without outlining substantive regulations. Faculty question why this office is the appropriate administrative authority for this policy area.
- The statement, “This regulation applies to all members of the University community and any third-party entities operating any programs in which a minor is a participant,” requires clarification. Who qualifies as a “third-party entity”? Are there existing examples in other ARs?

- Faculty are concerned that the brevity of the draft may result in insufficient protection for minors and lack of clarity for program administrators.

A brief comparison of old/new ARs generated by a senator and circulated to the senate for reference

Policies and Procedures for the Approval of Capital Project (2025) to AR 8:2 Approval of University Capital Projects (2016)

- Draft AR introduces a new, defined term for leases and expands the definition of a capital project. Also, the procedure for reviewing the University Capital Project Plan before it goes to the President is described differently.

Minors involved in university sponsored programs or programs at the University (2025) to AR 6:12 Minors Involved in University-Sponsored Programs or Programs Held at the University (2015)

- The most significant difference is the comprehensiveness and structure of the content. DRAFT is extremely brief, containing only a general introductory statement, the scope of application, and a section on Oversight and Delegation. It does not include any specific definitions, policy guidelines, or reporting requirements found in AR 6:12.
- The two differ in whether they contain actual policies or delegate their creation.
- While both ARs name the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration (EVPFA) as central to oversight, the phrasing differs slightly.

University Retirement Plan (2025) to AR 3:1 University of Kentucky Retirement Plan (Approved by the Board of Trustees 2023)

- Mandatory Participation Requirements, AR 3:1 outlines a phased timeline for mandatory participation for University Participants, but the Draft streamlines the mandatory participation rules for future hires:
- Vesting Period for Employer Contributions, AR 3:1 maintains several historical tiers for vesting based on employment commencement date, but the Draft simplifies the requirement to a single standard for employer contributions.
- Contribution Schedules and Exceptional Periods, AR 3:1 includes a specific schedule for FERS participants, but the DRAFT only lists the Standard Schedule for "all eligible participants other than FERS". AR 3:1 provides a record of a specific past exceptional contribution period, but the Draft states generally that the Board may set up different schedules during an exceptional contribution period.
- Authority for Revisions, AR 3:1 states the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration is authorized to amend the plan documents and execute/amend the Investment Policy Statement, but the Draft specifies that the President authorizes the EVPFA to amend the plan documents and execute/amend the Investment Policy Statement.