

Meeting Specifics		
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	
Regularly Scheduled	Bi-weekly	
<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
February 23, 2026	3:00-5:00 p.m.	Ralph G. Anderson Room 207
Faculty Senate		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Chair:</b> Crawford, Christopher	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Design:</b> Fugate, Jeff	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Honors:</b> Martin, Joe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Provost Liaison:</b> Harper, Christine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Design:</b> O'Bryan, Mark	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Honors:</b> Roberts, Sherelle
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Trustee:</b> Petrone, Karen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Education:</b> Bennett, Stephanie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Libraries:</b> Weig, Eric
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Trustee:</b> Swanson, Hollie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Education:</b> Hammer, Joe	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Libraries:</b> McDonnell, Andrew
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Agriculture, Food &amp; Environment:</b> Rentfrow, Gregg	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Engineering:</b> Anderson, Kimberly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Medicine:</b> Akpunonu, Peter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Agriculture, Food &amp; Environment:</b> Teets, Nicholas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Engineering:</b> Poovathingal, Savio	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Medicine:</b> Thibault, Olivier
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Arts &amp; Sciences:</b> Voss, Steve	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Fine Arts:</b> Alley, Becky	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Nursing:</b> Biddle, Martha
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Arts &amp; Sciences:</b> Stein, Melissa	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Fine Arts:</b> Kerns, Bradley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Nursing:</b> Falls, Candace
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Business &amp; Economics:</b> Hapke, Holly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Graduate School:</b> Butler, John "J.S."	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Pharmacy:</b> Freeman, Trish
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Business &amp; Economics:</b> Vincent, Leslie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Graduate School:</b> Montgomery, Kathleen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Pharmacy:</b> Bauer, Bjoern
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Communication &amp; Information:</b> Tai, Zixue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Health Sciences:</b> Hoch, Johanna	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Public Health:</b> Haynes, Erin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Communication &amp; Information:</b> Vallade, Jessalyn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Health Sciences:</b> Metzler-Wilson, Kristen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Public Health:</b> Ingram, Richard
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Dentistry:</b> Dominguez Fernandez, Enif	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Law:</b> Henke, Melissa	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Social Work:</b> Jones, Aubrey
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Dentistry:</b> Wiemann, Alfred	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Law:</b> Murray, Michael	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Social Work:</b> Ratliff, Stephanie
Standing Guests and Visitors		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DiPaola, Bob	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harmon, Camille	<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas, Rebecca
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jasinski, Jana	<input type="checkbox"/> Frisby, Brandi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Benton, Julie
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Visitor:</b> Jones, Davy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Visitor:</b> Miller, Sidney	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Visitor:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Visitor:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Visitor:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Visitor:</b>

Agenda Item	Presenter/Facilitator
Roll Call   Approval of the Minutes 5 min	C. Crawford
Opening Remarks   Updates   Announcements 15 min	C. Crawford
Provost Updates and Consultation 15 min	C. Harper
Faculty Senate Chair Candidate 10 min	J. Hoch
AR Feedback Discussion 30 min	Faculty Senate
UK Core Ad Hoc Committee Updates 5 min	M. Stein
Senate Curriculum Committee Updates 5 min	J. Hammer
Faculty Affairs Committee Updates 5 min	L. Vincent
Shared Governance Committee Updates 5 min	B. Alley
Faculty Trustee Updates 5 min	H. Swanson/ K. Petrone
Call for Agenda Items	C. Crawford

Next Meeting  
March 9, 2026 | 3:00-5:00 p.m. | Ralph G. Anderson Rm. 207

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:** Roll Call | Approval of the Minutes

**Presenter:** C. Crawford

- C. Crawford called the meeting to order at 3:00p.m.
- Faculty Senate went through roll call.
  - C. Crawford welcomed the new senator from the College of Medicine, P. Akpunonu.
- February 9 minutes were approved.

**Agenda Item:** Opening Remarks | Updates | Announcements

**Presenter:** C. Crawford

- C. Crawford gave opening remarks to the Faculty Senate.
  - C. Crawford indicated that things are starting to pick up in the Faculty Senate with the election for a new Faculty Senate chair and the ad hoc committees beginning their deliberations.
  - C. Crawford stated that he will be traveling during the next President's Council meeting and will be unable to attend. C. Crawford asked B. DiPaola if he would work with the President's Office to allow a substitute to attend the President's Council meeting in his absence.
    - B. DiPaola will see if sending a delegate is possible.
  - C. Crawford shared that the Faculty Senate will go over the feedback from the Administrative Regulations, and that the Faculty Senate is happy that the feedback cycle was extended to two weeks.

**Agenda Item:** Provost Updates and Consultation

**Presenter:** C. Harper/B. DiPaola

- C. Harper provided updates to the Faculty Senate.
  - The Office of the Provost has been working diligently on the Faculty Senate newsletter. The newsletter will be discussed at the dean's meeting next week to ensure that the deans are aware that the newsletter will be vetted by the Office of the Provost before it is sent out.
  - C. Harper addressed the topic of nine-month faculty appointments and requested that the Faculty Senate share specific questions that they would like R. Thomas to address at the next Faculty Senate meeting. She emphasized that if someone comes to a senator about a specific situation, they need to go directly to their college dean.
    - C. Crawford clarified that the Faculty Senate would like to know the official policy on what the college/department can ask of nine- and ten-month faculty when they are off contract. Specifically, can the department/college ask faculty that are off contract to teach?
  - C. Harper stated that the Vice President for Research (VPR) will attend the March 23 Faculty Senate meeting and that she will likely bring other associates with her to make sure questions are answered appropriately.
  - C. Crawford brought up the topic of HB 490.
    - The Faculty Senate discussed how quickly the bill is moving through the process, what the next steps are for the bill, and if the University has an official position or statement on HB 490.
      - B. DiPaola stated that the University approaches things in a careful way and that they didn't know about the bill before it was filed. The bill is moving quickly and has momentum. This is all happening against a backdrop where sister institutions in Kentucky are dealing with financial issues. Like proposals that are moving through in other states, we have sister institutions that may be interested in this bill. The University of Kentucky has been fortunate in how we have grown to be financially secure and stable. That data was shared at the Board of Trustees meeting last week. There are a number of institutions in Kentucky that are growing, which requires thoughtful management. Senior leadership

worked well with the Faculty Senate on UK FRAME through a collaborative process. If anything comes forward regarding HB 490, senior leadership will figure out a way to work through that process with the Faculty Senate. The University works hard to have one voice when we tell our story and share our concerns with legislatures. The President and the Office of Government Relations receive input and use candor when having direct conversations with policy makers. It is important for us to focus on what we do well. What HB 490 does not entail is the elimination of due process, the elimination of tenure, the closure of programs, or immediate personnel actions. Tenure remains.

- There was additional discussion around whether the University intends to offer input to legislators on the bill, if the Office of the President or the Office of Public Relations raised concerns on the bill, and if data used to evaluate colleges/departments will be used to close programs. The Faculty Senate emphasized that the latter half of the bill is what faculty find concerning.
  - B. DiPaola reiterated that the President and the Office of Government Relations will seek input from the campus community and will broach the subject directly with legislators. The University has been effective in the past by using one voice, and we must rely on what we have done well. We must trust the President and government relations, as these things must be handled carefully and appropriately. The institution is doing well, and we must continue to do well for the Commonwealth and our students. There is no intent for the college/department evaluation to influence anything in HB 490. The College/Department evaluations were meant to be used as benchmarks to strategize for new programs and ensure that we are meeting the needs for the workforce.
- The Faculty Senate discussed HB 497 and its impact on the Donovan Sholars program.
  - C. Harper shared that there are several state mandates that are not funded where the University covers the cost of that tuition. The Office of the Provost will get more information on HB 497 and provide an update at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- C. Harper reminded that Faculty Senate of the timeline for the Faculty Senate chair election. The Qualtrics survey will open for voting tomorrow at 8:00am and close on March 5 at 5:00pm. The results of the Faculty Senate chair election will be announced at the March 9 Faculty Senate meeting.

**Agenda Item:** Faculty Senate Chair Candidate

**Presenter:** J. Hoch

- J. Hoch addressed the Faculty Senate as the Faculty Senate Chair candidate.
  - J. Hoch opened the floor for questions/dialogue regarding her candidacy.
    - The Faculty Senate asked J. Hoch to address what interests her in the role of Faculty Senate chair, what problems she would like to address, how she will handle balancing everything on her plate, what she has liked about the Faculty Senate work over the last year, and what she would like to lead the Faculty Senate to do better.
      - J. Hoch shared that she enjoys problem solving and collaborating. She has learned that there are a lot of opportunities to work with great people and find ways to answer questions that make things happen. She enjoys working on big projects with people who have different viewpoints. She doesn't go looking for problems, but she does see opportunities to collaborate and create new processes to enhance the voice of the faculty. She would like to see that faculty in all colleges get the opportunity to hear about what is going on in the Faculty Senate. That is important. It is important that the senators represent the faculty they serve by working with colleges to share and retrieve information. There are a variety of ways to collect that information, as every college has its own culture, size, and faculty bodies. She will be rolling off several college and professional commitments this year, which makes this a good time to pursue this opportunity. She likes that the Faculty Senate has been able to hear from people who are involved in different processes in and around the institution. The Faculty Senate has had the opportunity to ask questions and share answers back with the colleges. She thinks

this is something that we do well. She looks forward to hearing from the Provost about new policies and procedures, including why they were created. She believes that we should take advantage of the opportunity to hear from people around campus, our standing committees, and the faculty trustees. She would like to see more opportunities to take questions back to the faculty and learn about new initiatives that can serve the campus community. She believes that being able to bring information to the faculty and collect information from the faculty is important.

- C. Crawford made a few comments regarding his experience as Faculty Senate chair and the commitment that was required. He looks forward to J. Hoch bringing fresh ideas and new energy to the Faculty Senate. He shared that he spends around 15-20 hours a week with faculty, participating in office hours, and meeting with committees as the Faculty Senate chair. He believes that other senators were reluctant to put their names forward because of the time commitment and that the next chair should have a significant DOE commitment to do their job effectively, equitably, and to ensure a viable Faculty Senate.
- B. DiPaola reminded the Faculty Senate that the Office of the Provost said they would revisit the DOE after the first year.

**Agenda Item:** AR Feedback Discussion

**Presenter:** Faculty Senate

- B. Alley led the discussion on feedback provided by the Faculty Senate on the four Administrative Regulations (ARs) that were posted for public comment.
  - Dissemination of Research and Intellectual Property
    - The Faculty Senate discussed intellectual property and who would have the rights to materials (lectures/videos/original content creation) that were moved online. The Faculty Senate indicated that there is confusion around what approval would be needed if journal articles and book contracts belong to the University. There was additional discussion around the logistics of needing approval, if the University would own the copyright to material used in coursework, and the infringement on academic freedom.
  - Student Conduct and Student Rights
    - The Faculty Senate discussed the feedback and whether the AR covers state law that has recently been passed or university wide due process, and whether there is confusion about what code the AR is referring to.
      - C. Crawford shared that faculty are concerned that a lot of what was previously covered in ARs is being moved to policy. The concern isn't that a code doesn't exist, but that the code could be changed without notice.
    - There was additional discussion around rephrasing language in the feedback document to reflect the context that C. Crawford provided around the concerns of the faculty.
- The Faculty Senate edited their working document and accepted the Faculty Senate AR Review Summary February 2026 into record.
- Please see Appendix A for the Faculty Senate AR Review Summary February 2026 document.
- C. Crawford made a motion to amend the agenda.
  - The motion is to table all committee reports except for the Shared Governance Committee discussion on HB 490.
  - The motion to amend the agenda passed.

**Agenda Item:** UK Core Ad Hoc Committee Updates

**Presenter:** M. Stein

- This agenda item was tabled until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

**Agenda Item:** Senate Curriculum Committee Updates

**Presenter:** J. Hammer

- This agenda item was tables until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

<b>Agenda Item:</b> Faculty Affairs Committee Updates	<b>Presenter:</b> L. Vincent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This agenda item was tables until the next Faculty Senate meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>Agenda Item:</b> Shared Governance Committee Updates	<b>Presenter:</b> B. Alley
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B. Alley led the discussion on the Faculty Senate statement on HB 490. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Faculty Senate discussed who would see the statement and what the purpose was for the statement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C. Crawford provided context saying that the statement expresses the opinions of the Faculty Senate and voices solidarity with faculty.</li> </ul> </li> <li>There was additional discussion around the need to represent the faculty in their colleges, the value in sharing their concerns, and how the statement would be shared with the Office of Government Relations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B. DiPaola shared that the Office of the Provost will make sure that the Faculty Senate statement is shared with the right individuals, if the document is accepted by the Faculty Senate. He emphasized that they may want to finalize the document sooner rather than later.</li> </ul> </li> <li>S. Voss motioned to table the discussion on the Faculty Senate statement on HB 490. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The motion to table the discussion on the Faculty Senate statement on HB 490 passed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Agenda Item:</b> Faculty Trustee Updates	<b>Presenter:</b> H. Swanson/K. Petrone
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This agenda item was tables until the next Faculty Senate meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>Agenda Item:</b> From the Floor	<b>Presenter:</b> Faculty Senate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None were added.</li> </ul>	
<b>Agenda Item:</b> Call for Agenda Items	<b>Presenter:</b> C. Crawford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None were added.</li> </ul>	
<b>Other Information</b>	
<b>Adjournment</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting adjourned at 5:00p.m.</li> </ul>	
<b>Next Meeting</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monday, March 9, 2026 3:00-5:00p.m., Ralph G. Anderson Room 207</li> </ul>	

## **Faculty Senate AR Review Summary February 2026**

Faculty across colleges engaged seriously and constructively with the draft Administrative Regulations (ARs). The most significant and repeated concerns relate to the two research-focused ARs, particularly Dissemination of Research and Intellectual Property. Faculty also expressed meaningful concerns about Student Conduct and Student Rights, and more limited but notable feedback on the Student Government Association AR.

Faculty feedback was detailed and constructive. The most urgent issue is the Dissemination of Research and Intellectual Property AR, particularly preservation of traditional scholarly works protections and academic freedom.

There is a strong desire for:

- Clarity
- Explicit protection where longstanding norms exist
- Transparent governance structures
- Defined processes rather than delegated placeholders

Faculty are not opposing modernization of regulations but are seeking precision, balance, and shared governance safeguards in areas central to the University's academic mission.

### **1. AR - Dissemination of Research and Intellectual Property**

This AR generated the strongest and most consistent feedback. Concerns include:

- Loss of clear faculty ownership of scholarly work
- Potential University control over dissemination and publication
- Recruitment and competitiveness implications
- A destructive impact on academic freedom

The most repeated recommendation is to explicitly preserve the traditional scholarly works exception or clearly defer to existing protections.

### **Traditional Scholarly Works & Academic Freedom**

Faculty are deeply concerned that the draft appears to eliminate or override the longstanding exception (currently in AR 7:6) protecting faculty ownership of traditional scholarly works (journal articles, textbooks, artistic works, course materials including online assets). The draft states that all intellectual property is owned and controlled by the University unless otherwise provided, but it does not explicitly preserve these protections.

We urge that language from AR 7.6 to be restored. Traditional products of scholarly activity which have customarily been considered to be the unrestricted property of the author or originator are excepted from the general policy. Such traditional products include journal articles; textbooks; reviews; works of art including painting, sculpture, and musical compositions; and course materials such as syllabi, workbooks, and laboratory manuals. The University has not and will not claim any ownership rights to such traditional works and also

specifically disclaims any potential rights to do so under the “work for hire” provisions of the U.S. Copyright Act.

### **Royalty Income Sharing**

We urge that language from AR 7.6, Sec VII B to be restored. Net income derived from commercialization of intellectual property covered by this policy shall be shared as follows: 40% to the originator, 20% to the originator's department or immediate administrative unit, 20% to the dean of the originator's college, and 20% to UKRF.

**Faculty are concerned that the draft AR would impinge on academic freedom and create additional administrative burdens. Examples of situations include but are not limited to:**

- Concerns that faculty could not sign off to give copyright to a journal without getting permission from UK,
- Concerns that any material used in teaching, for example a medical image to discuss patient cases, would then become property of UK,
- Concerns that anything faculty do using UK resources is then UK property. UK resources include libraries, software (such as Adobe and Word), and more.
- Concerns that when using copyrighted figures in class, the university should not own the material including an image that was copyrighted by a publisher.

### **Centralization & Delegation**

Faculty are concerned about:

- Significant authority vested in the Vice President for Research without defined faculty review or appeal mechanisms
- Substantive details deferred to unspecified “policies, processes and procedures” not included with the draft
- Lack of clarity regarding revenue sharing and inventor incentives

Overall, faculty are seeking clarity, transparency, and governance safeguards in an area central to the academic mission.

## **2. AR - Administration of Research Activities**

Faculty requested clarification regarding:

- Consolidation of authority in the Vice President for Research (including proposal submission and grant oversight) and the role of OSPA
- Limited detail on research misconduct, compliance, and integrity processes
- Heavy reliance on external laws and websites without procedural explanation

Faculty are seeking clearer articulation of roles, compliance processes, and governance structure.

### **3. AR - Student Conduct and Student Rights**

#### **Concern About Clarity and Process**

Faculty expressed strong interest in protecting student rights while maintaining academic standards.

Key concerns include:

- The AR functions largely as a placeholder, delegating substance to a newly proposed Code without a defined governance process or timeline
- Some faculty members expressed explicit concern about removing information regarding required notifications and minimum penalties, as these helped both faculty & students
- The phrase allowing students to take “reasoned exception” to classroom views is viewed as vague and potentially undermining disciplinary standards
- Rights are clearly articulated, but responsibilities and balance are less explicit
- Consolidation of authority under Student Success raised concerns about governance clarity

Faculty support student protections but request clearer definitions and processes.

### **4. AR - Student Government Association**

Feedback was limited. Faculty requested clearer communication pathways between SGA and senior administration and noted broader questions about consistency in how representative governance bodies are structured and engaged.