Meeting Specifics		
Purpose	**Frequency**	
Regularly Scheduled	Bi-weekly	
Date	**Time**	**Location**
March 9, 2026	3:00-5:00 p.m.	Ralph G. Anderson Room 207

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:** Akpunonu, Peter
☒ **Agriculture, Food & Environment:** Teets, Nicholas	☒ **Engineering:** Poovathingal, Savio	☒ **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:** Jones, Davy	☐ **Visitor:**	☐ **Visitor:**
☐ **Visitor:**	☐ **Visitor:**	☐ **Visitor:**

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 30 min	C. Harper
Faculty Senate Chair Election Results 5 min	C. Harper
Senate Curriculum Committee Updates 5 min	J. Hammer
Title Series Ad Hoc Committee Updates 5 min	L. Vincent/ J. Hoch
UK Core Ad Hoc Committee Updates 5 min	M. Stein
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 23, 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.
- February 23 minutes were approved.

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

- C. Crawford gave opening remarks to the Faculty Senate.
  - C. Crawford thanked B. Alley for hosting office hours while he was out of office last week. He will not hold office hours next week due to spring break but encouraged the Faculty Senate to provide any potential agendas items via email.
  - C. Crawford was unable to participate in the President's Council meeting and indicated that he would like clarification on how the faculty on the President's Council is supposed to interface with the rest of the faculty in the University.

Agenda Item: Provost Updates and Consultation	**Presenter: C. Harper/B. DiPaola**

- C. Harper provided updates to the Faculty Senate on Integrate Blue, and a syllabus depot. R. Thomas responded to the Faculty Senate request for information on what is expected of 9-and-10-month faculty when they are off contract, and for an update on UK FRAME.
  - C. Harper responded to requests from the Faculty Senate regarding Integrate Blue. Higher education is facing increasing pressures and risks, whether financial and budgetary or through governmental directives and policy changes. In response to these risks, the University established Integrate Blue with the goal of improving organizational efficiency, consistency and quality of service delivery. Integrate Blue positions the University to continue to accelerate its growth. The initiative more closely aligns communications, branding, IT, and reporting to provide standard expectations and to ensure consistent messaging with one point of contact. Integrate Blue will help to assign individuals with roles and responsibilities that align with their skillsets, enabling employees to fully leverage their expertise and capabilities allowing for effective resource management. No employees will lose their positions, and no current UK employees will experience changes in their compensation or benefits. Employees may become part of a different organizational structure or report to a different supervisor, but the integration will not have an impact on the status of their employment pay or benefits. Service level agreements with the colleges and departments will define the needs and expected level of service provided by Integrate Blue. When needs are not met, Integrate Blue will work with the colleges and departments to fulfill those needs.
    - The Faculty Senate discussed whether colleges could use services outside of Integrate Blue if needs weren't met, if the colleges/departments would be charged for services provided by Integrate Blue, what mechanisms will be in place to provide high quality service, if future employees would see a decrease in salary/benefits, and if Integrate Blue would create a two-tiered system for employment.
  - C. Harper stated that the expertise currently within colleges would be maintained. The goal is not to change efficiency but to leave the knowledge base within the units. The deans are meeting on a regular basis to work through service level agreements to ensure needs are being met. Integrate Blue is meant to improve operational efficiency through consistent training and expertise. They do expect to see savings through centralization as they find duplication in vendors and contracts. C. Harper shared that she has not

heard anything about a two-tiered employment structure or that future employees will be making less money or have lessor benefits through Integrate Blue.

- o C. Harper provided an update on the syllabi depot initiative that the University Senate approved during the 2017-2018 academic year. When Information Technology Services (ITS) and the Office of the Registrar began working on the initiative during the 2018-2019 academic year, they found limitations that resulted in the depot not being built out. Those limitations included structure, storage, integration, and access compliance. Last fall a group consisting of ITS, the Office of the Registrar, and other members of campus looked at where this initiative left off and to complete benchmarking of peer institutions. Since the conversations began, there have been states that have mandated that higher education institutions publicly post course syllabi to ensure digital accessibility standards. C. Harper stated that the University of Kentucky will not publicly post course syllabi unless mandated by legislature. During this time Modern Campus, who owns the software that the University utilizes for the University Catalog and curriculum management system, has purchased Concourse. Concourse is a centralized syllabus management system that would allow integration with Canvas and support multiple templates to meet the needs of the University. Boiler plate language for university policies would be built into every syllabus, and faculty would be responsible for inputting course content. This would take the pressure off faculty to ensure that policies in their syllabus are up to date. Access to Concourse would be behind link blue authentication. The hope is to have a soft launch of a syllabi depot in summer/fall 2026 with full implementation in Spring 2027.
    - ▪ The Faculty Senate discussed whether there was a retention schedule for syllabus in the depot, if faculty participated in this initiative, what happens if faculty aren't currently using Canvas, if the syllabus would align with the current template, if faculty would need approval to distribute syllabus, what the Impetus of this initiative is, and what protections would be available to guard faculty from activists running syllabi through AI.
- C. Harper shared that a retention schedule has not been set, but that she expects it to be 5 years or less. This initiative originated from faculty through the former Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning and approved by the University Senate. We will continue to engage faculty over the summer to get feedback and make improvements to the syllabus template. The hope is to make this a seamless transition for faculty, and to provide training for canvas and the syllabus template where needed. C. Harper reiterated that all courses have a canvas shell, and that there will be a minimum use policy that covers access to the course syllabi. Syllabi would not need go through an approval process before faculty would be able to distribute to students unless a new course template was being created. Concourse allows for various levels of permission where we can ensure that only students enrolled in a class can see a syllabus. Benchmarking has shown that other institutions have removed the name of the instructor when the syllabus was moved to the depot. We will work with Concourse to understand how other institutions that use Concourse have dealt with this concern. A syllabi depot would allow students to see a course syllabus prior to enrollment, provide meaningful data on student engagement with syllabi, and ensure that University policies are updated. The deans and associate deans are aware of this initiative, and the Office of the Provost will provide additional updates and a timeline as we move forward.
- C. Harper addressed the two questions that came out of the Faculty Senate office hours on Monday. C. Harper stated that the Vice President for Research (VPR) would be better suited to answer the questions about IRB approval and to provide guidance regarding what is not approved by ITS to limit impact on research timelines. C. Harper suggested that faculty check the ITS website for an approved list of software, and to reach out to ITS prior to submitting the IRB to ensure that the process isn't slowed down. Regarding the request to hear from HR on the February 23 email notice of the Conduent data incident, C. Harper stated that employees should follow the instructions in the letter they received. If they have specific questions, they should contact HR directly.
- R. Thomas responded to the Faculty Senate's request regarding expectations of 9-and-10-month faculty when they are off contract. R. Thomas stated that 9-and-10-month faculty may be asked to teach over the summer and that faculty should be offered that opportunity. If faculty feel pressured into teaching over the summer, she should like to address that specifically with the faculty.
    - o The Faculty Senate discussed and clarified that the question isn't specially about teaching expectations, but whether faculty on 9-and-10-month contracts can be asked to supervise students or internship opportunities over the summer without additional compensation.

- R. Thomas stated that there is a lot of variation in expectations and it is best to address individual concerns through a conversation. The AR puts a cap on compensated work, but it does not address voluntary work when faculty are off contract. Faculty with concerns may reach out directly to R. Thomas.
- R. Thomas provided an update on UK FRAME. The college deans are currently submitting spreadsheets that include common metrics that can be used across the University for annual review. The deans were asked to think through what it means to be productive within their college. From here, the core team will look at the spreadsheets to get a sense of whether there are metrics that won't work, or if there are problematic areas. This review will help determine how the University moves forward to operationalize. The Office of the Provost will provide feedback to the deans before initiating another round of submissions. R. Thomas reminded the Faculty Senate that there are two uses for these metrics. A subset will be aggregated across colleges and the university, while all are potentially part of the faculty annual productivity review process.
  - The Faculty Senate discussed the update to UK FRAME. The discussion included where the University is in the process of figuring out what happens when faculty received a score of 1 and how the University will ensure that process is managed equitably across colleges, who is in the core group, how faculty get involved in the implementation of UK FRAME, and if the Office of the Provost will share the draft spreadsheets provided by the deans.
- R. Thomas reminded the Faculty Senate that we will collect data from July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027 with the ability to start evaluations after that. Summer 2027 would be the earliest someone could receive a score of 1. The Office of the Provost will review AR 3:11 that describes consequential reviews and come back to the Faculty Senate at a later date. R. Thomas shared that the core team included herself, Jana Jasinski, a member from the Office of Faculty Advancement, and a member from the Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Decision Support (IRADS). R. Thomas reiterated that she would keep coming back to this group as UK FRAME is operationalized and that she would be happy to share more information on metrics once they have a set of metrics and criteria that we can start tracking.

Agenda Item: Faculty Senate Chair Election Results	Presenter: C. Harper

- C. Harper provided an update on the Faculty Senate Chair Elections.
  - The SOP Elections for the Chair of the Faculty Senate requires a candidate to receive a majority vote of the Faculty Senate. IRADS alerted the Office of the Provost on Friday, March 6 that the results of the Faculty Senate Chair Election did not meet the minimum threshold of the above SOP. Half of the ballots received were blank (no vote recorded). C. Harper stated that we cannot, and will not, determine if the no votes were intentional or an error. To ensure validity of the Faculty Senate chair election, we will move forward with conducting a paper ballot. Senators participating in the meeting remotely may record their vote using an anonymous poll via zoom.

Agenda Item: Senate Curriculum Committee Updates	Presenter: J. Hammer

- J. Hammer provided updates from the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC).
  - The SCC was charged with figuring out how the Faculty Senate could discuss programs and certificates as a group prior to voting in Curriculum. The proposal from the SCC addresses a cadence and process for the Faculty Senate to review curriculum proposals.
    - The Faculty Senate discussed the SCC proposal for voting on curricular matters. That discussion included whether reviews would pause over the summer and the value of this process.
  - C. Harper stated that the proposals that come through Faculty Senate require Board and Trustees (BOT) approval and that the BOT does not meet over the summer. C. Harper reminded the Faculty Senate that they are advisory. She reiterated that if they did not approve a proposal, the Office of the Provost would discuss the concerns with the Faculty Senate before going back to the college.
  - The SCC proposal was accepted for the Faculty Senate.

- o J. Hammer reminded the Faculty Senate to record their official recommendation via Curriculum for the Graduate Certificate - Innovations at the Nexus of Food, Energy and Water Systems – Close proposal by 5:00pm Tuesday, March 10.
- Please see Appendix A for the SCC proposal for voting on curricular matters.

Agenda Item: Title Series Ad Hoc Committee Updates	**Presenter: L. Vincent/ J. Hoch**

- L. Vincent provided an update from the Title Series Ad Hoc Committee.
  - o L. Vincent and Hanna met with the Office of the Provost last week to get background information and clarity. The ad-hoc committee has a meeting scheduled for tomorrow, Tuesday, March 10 and hopes to have more information to share after that.

Agenda Item: UK Core Ad Hoc Committee Updates	**Presenter: M. Stein**

- M. Stein provided updates from the UK Core Ad Hoc Committee.
  - o M. Stein thanked the Faculty Senate for soliciting feedback. All colleges were represented in the 208 responses that they received. The key take away from the survey included that most respondents felt positive about the newly proposed competencies and felt that they should be incorporated into existing are student learning outcomes or integrated into a revamped UK 101 class. 36% of respondents are currently teaching a core class while 35% of respondents have never taught a UK Core class. The ad hoc committee will be meeting on Friday to start drafting a response. They hope to share more information after spring break.

Agenda Item: Faculty Affairs Committee Updates	**Presenter: L. Vincent**

- L. Vincent stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee had no updates.

Agenda Item: Shared Governance Committee Updates	**Presenter: B. Alley**

- B. Alley provided updates from the Shared Government Committee (SGC).
  - o B. Alley indicated that we are close to being able to send out the Faculty Senate Bulletin. The bulletin will be sent to the Faculty Senate. Senators will then share the bulletin with the faculty in their college. The bulletin will include a brief recap of the Faculty Senate meeting, things that are coming up, deadlines, and a link to the meeting minutes.
  - o B. Alley mentioned the discussion on the Faculty Senate statement on HB 490 that was tabled at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The SGC approved all suggestions in the document.
    - ▪ A motion was made to have the discussion on the Faculty Senate statement on HB 490be taken off the table.
    - ▪ The Faculty Senate discussed whether the document had been updated to reflect new political considerations.
  - o B. Alley stated that no content updates had been made to the document.
  - o The Faculty Senate statement on HB 490 was accepted by the Faculty Senate.
- B. Alley introduced the topic of awards granted through the Faculty Senate. The SGC proposal includes two awards that would be granted annually at the last Faculty Senate meeting of the year. The proposal includes suggested incentives, a timeline, and a nomination and selection process.
  - o The Faculty Senate discussed whether Faculty Senate chairs would be eligible, and if they have considered expanding eligibility to former senators or faculty serving on academic councils. B. Alley stated that they would like to receive feedback, revise the proposal, and bring it back to the Faculty Senate at the next meeting.
- Please see Appendix B for the SGC report and Appendix C for the Faculty Senate statement on HB 490.

Agenda Item: Faculty Trustee Updates	**Presenter: H. Swanson/K. Petrone**

- H. Swanson and K. Petrone provided updates from the Faculty Trustees.
  - HB 490 is with the Senate Committee on Committees but has not been assigned to a committee.
  - There is a mixed-use entertainment district planned for around Kroger Field and Memorial Coliseum that will provide new engagement opportunities and year-round event parking.
  - The campus transformation plan includes new facilities.
    - Several buildings for CAFÉ.
    - White Hall Classroom (Scheduled to open July 2026).
    - New residence hall (Scheduled to open in 2026.
    - Health Education Building (Scheduled to open in 2027).
    - Cancer building (Scheduled to open in December 2027).
    - 900 bed Chandler Hospital expansion.
    - An Arts district.
  - They received an update on college dean searches. That update did not include a search for a new dean of the Graduate School.
  - The report from the VPR included that our research funding is stable at $346 million.

Agenda Item: From the Floor	**Presenter: Faculty Senate**

- C. Harper announced the results from the Faculty Senate chair election.
  - J. Hoch was named Faculty Senate chair with her term beginning August 15, 2026.

Agenda Item: Call for Agenda Items	**Presenter: C. Crawford**

- None were added.

Other Information

Adjournment	
- Meeting adjourned at 4:58p.m.	

Next Meeting	
- Monday, March 23, 2026 3:00-5:00p.m., Ralph G. Anderson Room 207	

The Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC) recommends the following process for voting on curricular matters.

The Office of the Provost asks the Faculty Senate to provide recommendations on proposals to create new degree and certificate programs, and on proposals to close degree and certificate programs. In reviewing curricular proposals, the Faculty Senate will follow the process outlined in step 1-4 below. The SCC asks that Faculty Senators do not log their formal vote in Curriculum until steps 1-3 have been completed.

The process will be as follows:
1. Proposals received by the Office of the Provost to create new degree and certificate programs, and to close degree and certificate programs will be sent to the Faculty Senate, through Curriculum and email, no later than ten (10) business days before the next Faculty Senate meeting. The Faculty Senate is expected to review the proposals and submit questions on proposals to the SCC chair no later than five (5) business days before the next Faculty Senate meeting. The SCC chair, in consultation with the Office of the Provost, will share any questions received from the Faculty Senate with the proposal contact no later than four (4) business days before the next Faculty Senate meeting with a deadline to respond to the SCC chair no later than two (2) business day before the next Faculty Senate meeting. If a response is received, the SCC chair will share that information with the Faculty Senate via the Faculty Senate listserv.
2. Proposals received by the Office of the Provost to create new degree programs will have a dedicated agenda item for discussion during a Faculty Senate meeting. A representative from the proposed degree programs department/college will be invited to attend the Faculty Senate meeting by the Office of the Provost. During this agenda item, the Faculty Senate may ask the department/college representative questions relevant to the proposed new degree programs.
3. During the SCC update agenda item, the SCC chair will ask the Faculty Senate if any further discussion is needed on the curricular proposals (new degree and new certificate programs, and the closure of degree and certificate programs) that the Faculty Senate was asked to provide a recommendation on, or if any senators object to moving forward with a recommendation. The SCC chair will ask the Faculty Senate by raising their hand, for an informal query on whether they recommend approving, denying, or abstaining on proposals to create new degree and certificate programs, and/or to close degree and certificate programs.
4. Every voting Faculty Senator must log their formal recommendation via Curriculum on each proposal that was discussed at the Faculty Senate meeting. Formal recommendations must be made in Curriculum no later than 5:00pm on Tuesday following the Faculty Senate meeting where the proposals were discussed.

SGC Report – Monday, March 9, 2026

1. Vote on HB490 statement
2. Review Outstanding Senator Award proposal

Faculty Senate Outstanding Senator Award – Proposal

Purpose: The Faculty Senate Outstanding Senator Award recognizes senators who demonstrate exceptional commitment to shared governance through active participation, thoughtful leadership, and meaningful engagement with faculty constituents. The award highlights senators who contribute constructively to Senate deliberations, help advance faculty perspectives in university decision-making, and strengthen communication between the Senate and their colleges.

Award Structure
• Two awards are granted annually. Awardees will receive a plaque and (?) one-time cash honorarium.
• Presented at the final Faculty Senate meeting of the Spring semester.
• Open to any currently serving Faculty Senator.
• Nominations may be submitted by Faculty Senators.
• A brief nomination form will include short responses describing the nominee's contributions to Senate work and faculty governance.

Selection Process: A small selection committee (3–5 members) will review nominations and select award recipients. Committee membership should represent multiple colleges and may include past senators when possible.

Annual Timeline:

January	February–March	Early April	Late April / May
Call for nominations (open simple form)	Nomination period (~4–6 weeks)	Selection committee reviews nominations	Recipients announced at final Senate meeting

Faculty Senate Statement on HB490

As Kentucky's land-grant, flagship university, the University of Kentucky bears a distinctive responsibility: to serve the Commonwealth through teaching, research, creative activity, and public service. This responsibility should include maintaining programs that are perhaps limited in their capacity to drive revenue generation, but that are critically essential for the cultural, scientific, civic, and economic vitality of the state. A healthy university ecosystem depends on the coexistence of large and small programs, emerging and established disciplines, and fields that contribute in varied and sometimes indirect ways to the public good.

The Faculty Senate strongly opposes HB490. The following points frame our position:

1. The motivation or rationale for the proposed changes are not established; therefore, it is difficult to judge the need for HB490, particularly the new focus on financial reasons to terminate programs, departments, colleges, majors, or even remove faculty members.

   Absent clear evidence of necessity, such sweeping authority risks altering the foundational balance between fiscal stewardship and academic mission. Universities must be financially responsible, but financial metrics alone cannot determine academic value, societal contribution, or long-term institutional strength.

2. The drastic measures outlined in HB490 foster a climate of uncertainty and instability, having immediate and devastating consequences for faculty working in smaller, albeit important programs. This will erode the morale of the faculty, students, and staff. The consequences will be devastating now and will have long-term effects on recruiting at all academic levels in the future. This will hinder recruitment of top talent, employee retention, grant competitiveness, and the University's broader reputation.

3. Focusing entirely on financial status highlights the misalignment between revenue and cost, compromising the core mission of our institution. A university is not a corporation whose sole obligation is profit generation. Its value, based on academic integrity, is measured in research breakthroughs, educated citizens, creative output, community engagement, and long-term societal impact. Many disciplines that appear less immediately profitable provide foundational knowledge, interdisciplinary collaboration, and cultural capital that sustain the institution as a whole. Reducing academic evaluation to revenue generation risks narrowing the intellectual scope of the University and undermining its public mission.

For these reasons, we oppose HB490. Any policy affecting long-term program viability and faculty security must align with the enduring mission of higher education, preserve meaningful shared governance, and reflect a comprehensive understanding of the University's responsibilities to the Commonwealth, now and for generations to come.