Office of the Provost

Meeting Specifics		
Purpose	**Frequency**	
Retreat	Once	
Date	**Time**	**Location**
January 12, 2026	3:00-5:00 p.m.	B-108C William T. Young Library

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:** VACANT	☒ **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:** Voogt, Ryan	☐ **Visitor:**	☐ **Visitor:**
☐ **Visitor:**	☐ **Visitor:**	☐ **Visitor:**

Agenda Item	Presenter/Facilitator
Opening Remarks | Updates | Announcements 10 min	C. Crawford
Working Groups 90 min	Faculty Senate
Working Groups Report 20 min	Faculty Senate
Next Meeting January 26, 2026 | 3:00-5:00 p.m. | Ralph G. Anderson Rm. 207	

Minutes	
Agenda Item: Opening Remarks | Updates | Announcements	**Presenter: C. Crawford**

- C. Crawford opened the Faculty Senate Summit at 3:00p.m.
- C. Crawford provided opening remarks to the Faculty Senate that included the purpose and flow of the Faculty Senate Summit.

- o The Faculty Senate will rotate through three working groups allowing senators to brainstorm and set the Faculty Senate up with a strong footing going into the spring semester. C. Crawford stated that two of the working groups are tied to charges from the Office of the Provost.
    - UK Core
    - Faculty Title Series
    - Faculty Senate Communication
- B. DiPaola addressed the Faculty Senate emphasizing the importance of continuing the work culture and building trust as we navigate institutional dynamics.

Agenda Item: Working Groups	**Presenter: Faculty Senate**

- The Faculty Senate rotated through the three working groups every 30 minutes. Each working group was chaired by Faculty Senators.
    - o UK Core: M. Stein
    - o Faculty Title Series: L. Vincent and H. Hoch
    - o Faculty Senate Communication: B. Alley and O. Thibault

Agenda Item: Working Groups Report	**Presenter: Faculty Senate**

- The chair of each working group provided a synopsis of what was discussed during the Faculty Senate Summit.
    - o M. Stein provided a summary of what was discussed in the UK Core working group.
        - The Faculty Senate ad hoc committee for UK Core has faculty representation for all UK Core areas except for arts and creativity. M. Stein asked the Faculty Senate to send the names of individuals who could represent the arts and creativity area to her and emphasized that the faculty do not have to be on Faculty Senate.
        - The discussion around primacy over UK Core focused on whether primacy was given to the Faculty Senate or to all faculty within the University, and who has final authority if there is a disagreement over UK Core.
        - The conversation around the potential for new UK Core competency areas indicated that the Faculty Senate agreed that the potential areas were important. The work group discussed whether there should be new UK Core areas, if creating new areas would add credit hours to UK Core, and if there were ways to incorporate new competencies in other areas of the curriculum.
        - M. Stein stated that there is a need for additional clarification around the following as it pertains to UK Core.
            - UK Core Hierarchy: A visual representation of the UK Core hierarchy represented in a flow chart that includes what is an accreditation requirement and what is an internal process.
            - Process and Authority: Additional information is needed on the process for reviewing UK Core courses and who has authority over UK Core.
            - Communication and Transparency: There is a need for communication and transparency around UK Core and access to historic documentation.
        - Please see Appendix A for the UK Core working group summary.
    - o L. Vincent provided a summary of what was discussed in the faculty title series working group.
        - The strengths of the current system include alignment and acknowledgement of the different types of work that occur at the University.
        - The vulnerability of the current system is that it comes with tension. The current system is perceived as unflexible with the buckets not capturing career progression over time, though the criteria for progression in tenure track positions to obtain tenure and promotion is clear. There is an inequity in hierarchy across the title series with some title series being viewed as more prestigious than others while some title series are seen as having higher workloads. There is a consensus that the lecture title series is particularly strained with limited opportunities for promotion, restrictions on teaching upper-level classes, and graduate faculty status. There

appears to be a lack of consistency across colleges and titles series with misalignment between title series, distribution of effort, and faculty evaluation.
- There is a desire for a more flexible mission aligned model that would take away some of the misalignment that comes from strict definitions of title series and distributions of effort.
- Please see Appendix B for the faculty title series working group summary.
  - B. Alley and O. Thibault provided a summary of what was discussed in the Faculty Senate communication working group.
    - There is a need for the Faculty Senate to establish regular, routine communication with constituents in colleges. That communication should represent the Faculty Senate and come from the Faculty Senate chair through the Office of the Provost.
    - Please see Appendix C for the Faculty Senate communication working group summary.
- C. Crawford closed the Faculty Senate Summit by reminding the Faculty Senate of the new meeting location for Spring 2026 (RGAN 207) and the following deadlines for nominations.
  - CATS AI: Nominations are due to C. Crawford by January 16.
  - Honorary Degree Council: Nominations are due to C. Crawford by January 16.
  - Faculty Senate Chair: Nominations are due to C. Harper by 5:00pm on January 21.

Other Information	
Adjournment	
• Summit adjourned at 5:000p.m.	
• Monday, January 26, 2026 3:00-5:00p.m., Ralph G. Anderson Rm. 207	

Faculty Senate Advisement on UK Core and Course Recertification Process

Initial Thoughts and Feedback from Senators

Talking Points for Summit Discussion Groups

- Populating the UK Core Ad-hoc Senate Committee

- Process and Faculty Primacy Over Core

- Charge 1: Two New Competency Areas Under Consideration (interpersonal/human skills and digital/technical literacy)

- Charge 2: Process for Regular Review of Existing Core Classes (for quality, learning outcome alignment, and preventing drift)

- General Feedback on UK Core

UK Core Ad-hoc Senate Committee Members

Quantitative Foundations
- Nicholas Nguyen

Citizenship: Community, Culture and Citizenship in the USA
- Steve Voss*

Int. Inq: Natural/Physical Sciences
- Nick Teets*

Global Dynamics
- Matt Wilson

Int. Inq: Humanities
- Mel Stein*

*Current Member of Senate

Areas seeking volunteers: (all slots covered by the end of the summit!)

- ❏ *Intellectual Inquiry: Social Sciences: Aubrey Jones*
- ❏ *Intellectual Inquiry: Arts and Creativity: Brandon Smith*
- ❏ *Composition and Communication: Joe Martin*
- ❏ *Statistical Inferential Reasoning: JS Butler*

Process and Faculty Primacy Over Core

- Numerous Senators have expressed concern over the following language in the recent "Charge" for Senate feedback:

  "While **Faculty maintain primacy over Core** in many ways from beginning to end (i.e., course development, Faculty reviewers of Core and Undergraduate Council, delivery, and assessment), there are two areas of interest where we would like to seek input from Faculty Senate."

- Discuss suggestions for better ensuring faculty primacy over Core
  - Request a meeting with Brandi Frisby
  - Communication transparency across silos
  - What is the structure and who is making the decisions?
  - We need a flowchart from the assessment office
  - Where did the work the previous Committee did on assessment go?
  - Where does the UK Core Faculty Director idea stand?
  - What does the word "primacy" mean here? Who has the final authority in the event of disagreement?
  - Faculty Senate and Provost's Office need to agree on what primacy means (and who) before proceeding with the work?

Charge 1: Potential New Competency Areas

- Proposed Area 1: Interpersonal/human skills

- Proposed Area 2: digital/technical literacy

Specific Considerations from the Charge:

• How many hours, if any, should students earn in each area?

• Where does the expertise already exist in these areas on campus?

• How do the options work with transfer students, pathway students, and dual credit

students?

• How does this affect programs on campus (e.g., total credit hours, accrediting

expectations)?

• What is the timeline and process for implementing new core areas if adopted?

Comments:

- Not feasible to add additional hours

- Maybe build into existing areas?

- Integrate with UK 101, and our committee should take up the continuance of UK 101 as a charge

- Build into department/college level pslos

Charge 2: Review Process for Existing Courses

The Charge asks that we: "Develop a process to create a streamlined and up to date course inventory to ensure the courses a) still meet the intended UK Core learning outcomes, b) have avoided curricular drift over time, and c) are reviewed regularly for quality and fit into UK Core."

Specific Considerations from the Charge:

• How do we ensure courses meet the student learning outcome in Core?

• What is a process that is mindful of faculty (who would go through recertification) and curricular council workload (who conducts the reviews)?

• What does the timeline for implementation look like to ensure courses are aligned with UK Core learning outcomes and regular schedule for recertification?

• What is the process for a course that is determined to no longer meet UK Core standards?

• How often should courses be recertified?

General Feedback on UK Core

- Other issues to address in our report?

Faculty Title Series Work Group Summary
Theme 1: Clarity and Structure vs. Lived Reality of Faculty Work
(Strength with significant tension)
What works
- The current title series provides **clear expectations**, especially for tenure eligibility.
- Committees benefit from having a structured lens when reviewing dossiers.
- The system reinforces a traditional understanding of the **faculty role and tenure pathway**.

Where it breaks down
- Title series often **do not reflect actual faculty responsibilities**, especially as roles evolve over time.
- There is **no feedback loop** to update title series when duties shift.
- The coexistence of **title series and DOE** creates redundancy and confusion—effectively two job descriptions for one role.

Core tension
A system designed for clarity at hire becomes misaligned with faculty work across a career.

Theme 2: Inflexibility and "Bucketization" of Faculty Careers
(Dominant challenge across all sessions)
- Faculty are placed into **rigid categories at hire** with little opportunity to move, even when responsibilities change.
- Transitioning across title series is difficult or impossible due to regulations, especially:
  - From regular to special title series
  - When tenure is no longer a viable path
- Colleges apply rules differently, leading to **inconsistent experiences** and inequities.

FRAME relevance
- Participants consistently flagged that **FRAME will magnify these issues** if flexibility is not addressed.

Theme 3: Inequity and Hierarchy Across Title Series
(Cultural and structural challenge)
- A clear **class system** exists across title series, affecting:
  - Prestige
  - Voice in governance
  - Access to resources
  - Morale and engagement
- Clinical and special title series are often viewed as "less than," despite high workloads and institutional reliance.
- Lecturers in some colleges are **not even referred to as faculty**, reinforcing marginalization.

Impact

Inequitable rewards and recognition lead to disengagement and undermine institutional mission alignment.

Theme 4: Lecturer Title Series as Particularly Constrained (Consistent and urgent concern)

Key limitations raised repeatedly:

- Limited promotion opportunities (only two levels vs. three in other series)
- Restrictions on:
    - Teaching upper-level courses
    - Graduate faculty status
    - Governance and voting rights (inconsistent across colleges)
- High teaching demands without proportional recognition or advancement pathways

Emerging consensus

- The lecturer series needs:
    - An additional promotion level
    - Revised titles
    - Expanded roles consistent with actual contributions

Theme 5: Misalignment Between Title Series, DOE, and Evaluation (Structural inefficiency)

- Title series often dictate expectations that conflict with negotiated DOE.
    - Example: Lecturers expected to have no research, yet DOE includes research.
- Faculty evaluation becomes problematic when:
    - Work performed ≠ work recognized
    - Responsibilities are added informally due to staffing changes
- More title series mean **more statements of evidence**, increasing administrative burden without added clarity.

Theme 6: Lack of Consistency Across Colleges (Equity and governance issue)

- Special title series vary widely in definition and use.
- Lecturer roles, rights, and expectations differ significantly by college.
- Movement across title series is handled inconsistently.
- Some colleges operate outside stated regulations regarding title series composition.

Result

Faculty experience the title system as arbitrary rather than principled.

Theme 7: Desire for a More Flexible, Mission-Aligned Model (Forward-looking aspiration)

Participants expressed interest in alternative approaches that:

- Separate **tenure eligibility** from **pathways to excellence**
- Allow faculty to focus on strengths in:

- o Teaching
- o Research
- o Service/clinical work
- Reduce hierarchy and stigma between roles
- Better align with FRAME and modern evaluation systems

Examples cited:
- Tenure vs. non-tenure frameworks with multiple excellence pathways
- Clinical faculty having rank progression without tenure
- Faculty choosing areas of excellence rather than being locked into a single model

---

Theme 8: Governance, Communication, and Change Management (Process concern)
- Strong desire to:
  - o Engage all title series in discussions
  - o Work through faculty councils
  - o Clarify roles of deans, associate deans, and committees
- Preference for **clear communication channels** rather than additional layers of meetings.

Summary Insight
The current title series system succeeds at defining traditional tenure pathways but struggles to support a modern, diverse, and evolving faculty workforce. Inflexibility, inequity, and misalignment—especially for lecturers, clinical, and special title series—pose growing risks as FRAME and new productivity models are implemented.

Faculty Senate Communication Work Group Summary

Overview: Across three roundtable discussions, faculty senators identified persistent challenges and opportunities related to communication between the Faculty Senate and the wider faculty body. Participants consistently emphasized the need for clearer structures, more consistent practices, and improved visibility of Senate work.

1. Need for Consistent and Standardized Communication Current communication practices vary significantly by college, department, and individual senator. Faculty expressed frustration with inconsistent messaging, unclear expectations, and uneven frequency of updates. A shared desire emerged for:

- Standardized communication procedures and expectations
- Templates for Senate summaries and "asks"
- Predictable timing tied to Senate meeting cycles

2. Improving Visibility and Legitimacy of Senators Many faculty do not know who their senators are or understand the Senate's role. Senators need clearer public identification and institutional support to communicate effectively. Suggestions included:

- Senator email signature badges or identifiers
- A public, accessible directory of senators by college and department
- Increased senator presence at faculty and department meetings (i.e., Faculty Council or Faculty Affairs meetings)
- Use of a special email (userameSenator@uky.edu) to collect input from constituents

3. Strengthening Two-Way Communication Senators identified barriers to meaningful feedback:

- Faculty often feel unclear about how and where to give input
- Senators report low response rates or difficulty reaching their constituents
- Department chairs are inconsistent communication intermediaries

Participants recommended:

- Including explicit instructions for providing feedback in every Senate message
- Using short, digestible summaries to encourage faculty engagement
- Offering multiple communication modes (email, office hours, announcements at faculty meetings, brief in-person updates, etc)
- All program Deans should support senator communications with the faculty using a single strategy

4. Access and Infrastructure Barriers Senators in several colleges lack access to listservs or official message channels, creating bottlenecks and reliance on chairs or deans. This reduces the clarity and authority of Senate communications. Roundtable participants noted:

- Need for senators to have direct access to college-level communication systems
- Desire for communications to be clearly marked as *official Senate messages*

5. Handling Urgent or Time-Sensitive Issues Faculty expressed frustration with "emergencies" generated by rapid administrative action (e.g., AR revisions, committee nominations). There is no clear process for:

- Rapid Senate response
- Timely faculty notification
- Gathering expedited faculty feedback

Participants recommended developing a **formal emergency communication protocol** for these situations.

6. Building a Stronger Governance Culture A broader cultural issue was noted: communication norms are inconsistent across colleges, departments, and administrative units. Faculty want structures that reinforce the Senate's role in shared governance, such as:

- College-level councils involving senators and faculty leaders
- Clearer pathways for information flow between Senate, Provost, deans, and faculty (this may effectively address issues #3 and #4)