

Meeting Specifics		
Purpose	Frequency	
Regularly Scheduled	Bi-weekly	
Date	Time	Location
August 31, 2026	3:00-5:00 p.m.	Classroom Building Rm. 328
Faculty Senate		
☒ Chair: Hoch, Hanna	☐ Design: VACANT	☒ Honors: Wells, Matt
☒ Provost Liaison: Harper, Christine	☒ Design: O'Bryan, Mark	☒ Honors: Roberts, Sherelle
☒ Trustee: Petrone, Karen	☒ Education: Bennett, Stephanie	☒ Libraries: Weig, Eric
☒ Trustee: Vanderford, Nathan	☒ Education: Cormier, Marc	☒ Libraries: McDonnell, Andrew
☒ Agriculture, Food & Environment: Rentfrow, Gregg	☒ Engineering: Rankin, Stephen	☒ Medicine: Akpunonu, Peter
☒ Agriculture, Food & Environment: Teets, Nicholas	☐ Engineering: Poovathingal, Savio	☐ Medicine: Thibault, Olivier
☒ Arts & Sciences: Voss, Steve	☒ Fine Arts: Alley, Becky	☒ Nursing: Clemmons, Jill
☒ Arts & Sciences: Samers, Michael	☒ Fine Arts: Kerns, Bradley	☒ Nursing: Falls, Candace
☒ Business & Economics: Chait, Jon	☒ Graduate School: Butler, J.S.	☐ Pharmacy: Freeman, Trish
☒ Business & Economics: Vincent, Leslie	☒ Graduate School: Montgomery, Kathleen	☒ Pharmacy: Bauer, Bjoern
☒ Communication & Information: Tai, Zixue	☒ Health Sciences: Vanderford, Cheryl	☒ Public Health: Haynes, Erin
☒ Communication & Information: Pilny, Andy	☒ Health Sciences: Metzler-Wilson, Kristen	☒ Public Health: Ingram, Richard
☒ Dentistry: Dominguez Fernandez, Enif	☒ Law: Lowry, Christy	☒ 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	☒ Schmidt, Julie
☒ Visitor: Jones, Davy	☒ Visitor: Thigpen, Ryan	☒ Visitor: Zilis, Mike
☒ Visitor: Barnhart, Sheila	☐ Visitor:	☐ Visitor:

Agenda Item	Presenter/Facilitator
Roll Call Approval of the Minutes 10 min	H. Hoch
Opening Remarks Updates Announcements 15 min	H. Hoch
New Degree Program: Earth Hazards and Atmospheric Sciences (A&S) 10 min	C. Harper
Shared Governance Committee Updates 30 min	B. Alley
Provost Updates and Consultation 30 min	B. DiPaola/ C. Harper
Title Series Ad Hoc Committee Updates 5 min	L. Vincent/ J. Hoch
Faculty Affairs Committee Updates 5 min	L. Vincent
Faculty Trustee Updates 5 min	K. Petrone/ N. Vanderford
Call for Agenda Items	H. Hoch
Next Meeting September 14 3:00-5:00 p.m. White Hall Classroom Building Rm. 328	

Minutes

Agenda Item: Roll Call | Approval of the Minutes

Presenter: H. Hoch

- H. Hoch called the meeting to order at 3:00p.m.
- Faculty Senate went through roll call.
- August 17 meeting minutes were approved.

Agenda Item: Opening Remarks | Updates | Announcements

Presenter: H. Hoch

- H. Hoch provided opening remarks to the Faculty Senate.
 - H. Hoch shared general guidelines that will enhance the functionality and maximize the time of the Faculty Senate meetings.
 - Every Faculty Senator will speak once per topic before coming back around to give everyone a chance to speak.
 - Before speaking, state your name and college.
 - G. Rentfrow will help the Faculty Senate keep to the time listed in the agenda. The Faculty Senate will be notified when there are 2 minutes remaining. The Faculty Senate may vote to add time to that agenda item to continue discussion.
 - Video conferencing will be permitted for the full Faculty Senate for emergencies. When utilizing video conferencing, your camera must remain on.
 - H. Hoch sent the names of 20 faculty provided by the Faculty Senate to serve on the Equal Dignity Hearing/Appeals Board. The list wasn't representative of all colleges. H. Hoch asked that the Faculty Senate work to ensure that we have broad representation when called upon.
 - H. Hoch shared that the Student Government Association President and Vice President, along with members of Staff Senate and Faculty Senate will continue to organize the shared governance body fall social.
 - H. Hoch recommended that the Faculty Senate approve two new members to the Shared Governance Committee.
 - Savio Poovathingal
 - Ketrell McWhorter (ex-officio)
 - The Faculty Senate approved the recommendation to add the two new members to the Shared Governance Committee.
 - H. Hoch shared the timeline for the President's Council nominations. H. Hoch shared that nominations will be accepted through September 4. Two Qualtrics surveys will go out at 9:00am on September 8. One survey will be to select the 5 Faculty Senators to send forward, and one survey will be to select the 5 non-Faculty Senators to send forward. The Qualtrics surveys will close on September 11. Please send nominations directly to H. Hoch. H. Hoch will send an email to Faculty Senate at 5:00pm today with additional information. H. Hoch asked if you are nominating someone else, please confirm that they would like to be nominated.
 - The Faculty Senate discussed the updates from H. Hoch. The discussion included what constitutes an emergency for participation via video conferencing and whether CVs would be available for review for non-Faculty Senators nominated for the President's Council.
 - H. Hoch indicated that she would work on defining an emergency that would be approved for video conferencing. H. Hoch stated that she would amend her email to ask those who are nominating non-Faculty Senators to request a CV for review.

New Degree Program: Earth Hazards and Atmospheric Sciences (A&S) 10 min

Presenter: C. Harper

- C. Harper opened the floor for questions on the proposed Earth Hazards and Atmospheric Sciences degree proposal. R. Thigpen and M. Zilis were available from the College of Arts and Sciences to answer questions.
 - The Faculty Senate had no questions.
- C. Harper reminded the Faculty Senate that they will need to vote in Curriculum on all curricular proposals by 5:00pm on Tuesday, September 1.

Agenda Item: Shared Governance Committee Updates

Presenter: B. Alley

- B. Alley provided an update from the Shared Governance Committee (SGC).
 - B. Alley gave an overview of the Administrative Regulation (AR) review process. As ARs are released for community feedback, there will be a two-week window to submit feedback. Part of the Faculty Senate review process is to compile feedback from constituents and submit a summary from the Faculty Senate. When soliciting feedback, remind constituents to share their feedback individually and through the collective process. B. Alley shared a working document with the Faculty Senate to compile feedback from their constituents on the two revised ARs that are posted for public comment. The shared document will be available through September 3. The SGC will create a summary document that will be shared with a Qualtrics link at 9:00am on September 4 for the Faculty Senate to accept the summary feedback on the ARs and submit the feedback to the Office of the Provost. The Qualtrics survey will close at 5:00pm on September 4. The feedback will be submitted on behalf of the Faculty Senate by the Office of the Provost of September 8.
 - Academic Programs
 - Student Academic Administration
 - B. Alley introduced the discussion on the HB 490 recommendation document. The document is based on feedback from both surveys that were sent out and dialogue at the Faculty Senate retreat. SGC tried to make the recommendation document concise while capturing the main topics and concerns. The recommendation document is meant to communicate the big priorities that the faculty find most important.
 - H. Hoch opened the floor for discussion on the HB 490 recommendation document.
 - The Faculty Senate discussed the HB 490 recommendation document. The discussion included what the trustees have or will see before the Board of Trustees meeting and the timeline for approval.
 - B. DiPaola provided an overview of the timeline and what is needed for the University to respond to HB 490. The Office of the Provost needs to share a document with the University by the end of the week. That document will be reviewed and edited by the University before being put into a policy and sent to the Board as an ASACR on September 11. B. DiPaola would like to put together a HB 490 Working Group with 10-12 Faculty Senators that will meet this week to help inform what is sent forward to the University.
 - The Faculty Senate accepted the HB 490 recommendation document.
 - A motion was made to amend the agenda to continue the discussion on the HB 490 Work Group at the end of the meeting.
 - The Faculty Senate approved the motion to amend the agenda to discuss the HB 490 Work Group at the end of the meeting.
 - Please see Appendix A for the committee report and Appendix B for the HB 490 recommendation document.

Agenda Item: Provost Updates and Consultation

Presenter: B. DiPaola/C. Harper

- B. DiPaola and C. Harper provided updates from the Office of the Provost.
 - B. DiPaola shared an update on college dean searches. There will be dean searches for the College of Design, the College of Engineering and the College of Business and Economics. The current process for hiring a dean takes about 240 days. There have been discussions on how to streamline that process

through an updated AR. Pending approval of the updated AR, the Office of the Provost will begin the process of working with search firms for the dean searches.

- The Faculty Senate discussed the update on the college dean searches. The discussion included whether a GR would be needed, and how this process would be different than the existing expedited appointment process for deans.
- B. DiPaola stated that a GR will go to the Board in September and will require two readings. B. DiPaola shared that previously deans were reassured that their appointments would be approved, but the revised AR brings attention to and streamlines the approval process.
- In response to a question from the Faculty Senate, C. Harper provided updates on the anonymity of the AR feedback survey. The survey is conducted through Qualtrics. The web team does not ask for linkblue IDs, but they are currently tracking IP addresses. C. Harper indicated that the web team was open to removing the IP address if it is seen as a barrier in collecting feedback.
 - Th Faculty Senate discussed the update on the anonymity of the AR feedback survey. That discussion included a request to have the IP address removed from tracking in the AR feedback survey.
- C. Harper will request that the web team remove the IP address tracking from the AR feedback survey.
- C. Harper responded to a request from a Faculty Senator to create a FAQ regarding interpretations of the newly released policies. C. Harper will work with the Office of the Provost and Public Relations to get an FAQ on the webpage. C. Harper asked that the Faculty Senate share any consistent questions they receive regarding the policies so that she can add that information to the FAQ.
- R. Thomas was invited to respond to Faculty Senate questions regarding UK FRAME.
 - R. Thomas responded to 21 questions from the Faculty Senate on UK FRAME.
 - The Faculty Senate discussed the response from R. Thomas on UK FRAME. That discussion included whether each department needed to have their own appeals process or if there would be a University wide appeals process, whether the evaluation would include the years not covered for faculty in the colleges that were not operating on an annual review cycle, how and when grants would be captured in the evaluation, if there would be transparency on how colleges are converting multi-level ratings to a three tier rating, and whether there would be a feedback loop on metrics after this first cycle.
 - R. Thomas indicated that there would be a university wide appeals process that would start in the department. For the first cycle of UK FRAME reviews there will be a look back for the faculty in colleges that were not operating on an annual review cycle and confirmed that all faculty will be reviewed during this cycle. R. Thomas communicated that they will be looking at active grants and not just those received during the review cycle. R. Thomas stated that the expectation is that the colleges will be transparent on how they will convert multi-level ratings to a three-tier rating and would like to hear from faculty if that is not the case. R. Thomas stated that she will defer the college internal process about a feedback loop on metrics.
 - The Faculty Senate agreed that the mechanism by which the questions were collected and responded to regarding UK FRAME was a great way to move forward. H. Hoch will leave the shared document open and ask R. Thomas to attend the Faculty Senate meetings and respond to questions as she has time.

Agenda Item: Title Series Ad Hoc Committee Updates

Presenter: L. Vincent/J. Hoch

- H. Hoch provided an update from the Title Series Ad Hoc Committee.
 - H. Hoch and L. Vincent will meet this week to review feedback provided at the Faculty Senate retreat. They will make a plan to reconvene the committee after they have completed their review. A more formal update will be provided at the September 14 meeting.

Agenda Item: Faculty Affairs Committee Updates

Presenter: L. Vincent

- H. Hoch shared a reminder that L. Vincent would like to step down as chair of FAC once the work on the title series project is complete. The Faculty Senate will soon be recruiting for a chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee.

Agenda Item: Faculty Trustee Updates

Presenter: K. Petrone/N. Vanderford

- K. Petrone and N. Vanderford provided updates from the Faculty Trustees.
 - K. Petrone shared that the June Board meeting included discussions on hiring college deans, the Compass Group and Beyond Blue.
 - N. Vanderford reminded the Faculty Senate that the September and October Board meetings will be held off campus.

Agenda Item: Office of the provost HB 490 Workgroup

Presenter: H. Hoch

- H. Hoch asked the Faculty Senate how they wanted to identify the 10-12 Faculty Senators to participate in the HB 490 Work Group with the Office of the Provost.
 - The Faculty Senate agreed to solicit the names of volunteers. The following Faculty Senators agreed to serve on the HB 490 Work Group.
 - S. Voss
 - B. Alley
 - A. Jones
 - S. Roberts
 - E. Weig
 - A. Pilny
 - A. Wiemann
 - H. Hoch will reach out the Faculty Senators who are absent to give them an opportunity to participate in the work group.

Agenda Item: From the Floor

Presenter: Faculty Senate

- Z. Tai asked if the Faculty Senate would be holding office hours on the off Monday's this academic year.
 - H. Hoch indicated that this was included in the discussion at the communication table at the Faculty Senate retreat. H. Hoch will meet with T. Freeman this week to review the feedback collected and will bring this topic for discussion at the September 14 Faculty Senate meeting. H. Hoch asked that the Faculty Senate share anything they want included on the agenda with her by Monday, September 7.
- S. Roberts asked if there were any updates on the AR Intellectual Property.
 - C. Harper shared that the AR Intellectual Property is still under review. C. Harper will provide feedback to the Faculty Senate once the ARs are promulgated.
- M. O'Bryan asked for an update on the Faculty Senate communication plan.
 - H. Hoch reiterated that the plan is to discuss the communication plan at the September 14 Faculty Senate meeting.

Agenda Item: Call for Agenda Items

Presenter: H. Hoch

- S. Voss asked that the Office of the Provost provide context and respond to questions on new college rules regarding course enrollment minimums.
- N. Vanderford asked for an update on the current and future status of the Graduate School.

Other Information

Adjournment	
Meeting adjourned at 4:45p.m.	
Next Meeting	
September 14 3:00-5:00 p.m. White Hall Classroom Building Rm. 328	

SGC Report – Monday, August 31, 2026

1. AR review

- a. Collect AR feedback on shared document through **Thursday the 3rd at 5pm**
- b. SGC creates a summary document for feedback by **9am on Friday the 4th** that will be shared
- c. Camille will have a vote open via Qualtrics on Friday the 4th at 9am to approve the document.
- d. Vote for approval of summary document will close **5pm on the 4th**, and she will submit the feedback on the 8th (the 7th is a holiday).

2. HB490 Recommendations Document

Faculty Senate Recommendations Regarding Implementation of HB 490

These recommendations reflect feedback gathered from Faculty Senators through a survey and subsequent discussions. They are intended to identify principles and priorities that should guide the University's response rather than to prescribe specific policy language or administrative procedures.

Faculty Senate Priorities

- Establish transparent, quantitative, multi-year standards before financial circumstances may trigger consideration of faculty reductions.
- Ensure meaningful faculty participation in both the determination that reductions are necessary and decisions affecting individual faculty members.
- Require documented consideration of reasonable alternatives before terminating faculty appointments.
- Protect academic freedom and evaluate academic programs within the University's full teaching, research, creative, service, and land-grant mission—not solely through enrollment or revenue.
- Ensure transparent, consistent, individualized procedures and meaningful opportunities for affected faculty to understand, respond to, and seek review of decisions.

1. Evidence, Transparency, and a Clearly Defined Threshold for Action

Any determination that the financial circumstances of an academic college/unit (anywhere within the university where faculty work) warrant faculty reductions—whether or not the unit itself is proposed for reduction or elimination—should be based upon clear, transparent, and documented evidence.

The Faculty Senate recommends that:

- The University clearly define the financial conditions and terminology that may trigger consideration of faculty reductions, including *financial exigency* and other financial circumstances identified in HB 490.
- For grounds based on low enrollment or misalignment of revenue and costs, the University establish clear, quantitative thresholds that must be met before faculty reductions may be considered. These thresholds should demonstrate a substantial and sustained condition over a meaningful, multi-year period rather than a temporary or cyclical fluctuation.
- Reaching such a threshold should not alone be sufficient to justify faculty reductions. Financial determinations should be supported by multiple measures and considered within the broader financial and academic context of the college/unit and the University.

- Any analysis of misalignment between revenue and costs should clearly identify the revenues and expenses included in the calculation, distinguish recurring operating expenses from temporary or nonrecurring costs, and provide sufficient context to allow meaningful comparison and review. Where appropriate, the University should consider alternative approaches to academic budgeting and cost allocation when evaluating whether a genuine and sustained financial misalignment exists.
- Academic colleges/units identified as financially vulnerable must be given meaningful notice and, whenever circumstances permit, sufficient time and opportunity to understand the concerns, respond to the evidence, and pursue improvement before faculty reductions are initiated.
- The evidence and rationale supporting such determinations must be transparent and available for meaningful faculty review through established shared-governance processes.
- If the University seeks to identify bona fide financial reasons beyond those specifically enumerated in HB 490, the rationale and proposed criteria should be publicly articulated and subject to meaningful faculty review before being presented to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The Senate recognizes that financial conditions may differ substantially among academic disciplines and units. Consequently, enrollment, tuition generation, or other measures of direct revenue should not alone determine the academic value or viability of a program.

2. Academic Mission, Academic Freedom, and Safeguards Against Bias

Financial considerations should be evaluated within the context of the University's broader academic and public mission.

As Kentucky's land-grant university, the University of Kentucky has responsibilities that extend beyond the generation of tuition revenue. Academic programs contribute to the University through teaching, research, creative activity, service, community engagement, public programming, and other forms of intellectual, cultural, economic, and civic impact.

The Faculty Senate therefore recommends that:

- Decisions regarding academic colleges/units consider their contributions to the University's full mission and not rely solely on revenue generation or enrollment.
- Academic judgments regarding the value, quality, or future of academic programs include meaningful faculty participation and disciplinary expertise.
- Processes include safeguards against actual or perceived bias, retaliation, or the use of financial criteria as a means of circumventing established protections for academic freedom or faculty employment.
- Criteria used in these decisions be clear and consistently applied across the University.

3. Meaningful Faculty Involvement at Both Stages of Decision-Making

The Faculty Senate recognizes two distinct stages at which faculty participation is important: **(1) determining that the financial circumstances of an academic college/unit warrant consideration of faculty reductions, and (2) determining how any necessary reductions affecting individual faculty members will be implemented.**

The Faculty Senate recommends meaningful faculty involvement at both stages.

When an academic unit/college is identified as financially vulnerable, affected faculty and appropriate faculty governance bodies should have an opportunity to review relevant evidence, provide academic and disciplinary context, identify potential consequences, and propose alternatives.

If faculty reductions are subsequently determined to be necessary, faculty participation should also be incorporated into the process by which recommendations affecting individual faculty members are developed and reviewed. The precise mechanisms may differ by academic college/unit, but the process should provide meaningful participation by faculty with appropriate knowledge of the college/unit, its curriculum, and its academic mission.

The process should also clearly distinguish the financial or programmatic determination that faculty reductions are necessary from the subsequent determination that a particular faculty member will be recommended for removal. Recommendations affecting individual faculty members should be based on clear, predetermined, consistently applied criteria, with a written rationale demonstrating how those criteria were applied to each individual recommendation.

In both stages, faculty consultation should occur sufficiently early to have the potential to influence the outcome rather than occurring only after substantive decisions have already been made.

4. Faculty Termination as a Measure of Last Resort

Before faculty appointments are terminated for financial reasons, the University should make a documented, good-faith effort to consider reasonable alternatives.

Depending upon the circumstances, these alternatives may include attrition, retirement or voluntary separation incentives, hiring reductions or freezes, administrative reductions, budget reallocations, program restructuring, reassignment, retraining, or other measures appropriate to the affected college/unit and the University's financial circumstances.

The Faculty Senate recommends that consideration of alternatives be documented and occur before recommendations for faculty termination are finalized.

5. Procedural Fairness and Protections for Affected Faculty

When financial circumstances ultimately result in a recommendation to terminate a faculty appointment, the process should be transparent, consistent, and provide meaningful opportunities for the affected faculty member to understand, respond to, and seek review of the decision.

At minimum, the Faculty Senate recommends that affected faculty have:

- Access to the evidence upon which the recommendation is based;
- A written rationale explaining both the financial basis for the action and the basis for the decision affecting the individual faculty member;
- An opportunity for faculty hearing and/or review;
- A meaningful opportunity to respond and submit relevant evidence;
- Written findings resulting from the review process; and
- Access to a clearly defined appeal process.

These protections should apply individually to each faculty member recommended for removal; consideration of multiple faculty reductions arising from the same financial determination should not eliminate any individual's opportunity for review and response.

The University should also make reasonable efforts to mitigate the effects of faculty reductions through advance notice, reassignment to appropriate available positions, retraining where appropriate, and voluntary separation or retirement opportunities.

Conclusion

Decisions affecting academic programs and faculty appointments have consequences extending well beyond immediate financial calculations. They affect academic freedom, institutional stability, faculty recruitment and retention, student opportunities, and the University's ability to fulfill its teaching, research, creative, service, and land-grant missions.

The Faculty Senate therefore urges the University to implement HB 490 in a manner that preserves, to the greatest extent possible, the protections and processes already established within University policy and shared governance. Where existing University regulations can be brought into compliance with the new law through limited modification, the Senate encourages the University to favor that approach over unnecessary restructuring of established faculty protections.

As the University finalizes its response to HB 490, the Faculty Senate offers these recommendations as a statement of the principles faculty consider essential to its implementation: **evidence and transparency; meaningful faculty involvement; consideration of alternatives before termination; protection of academic freedom and the University's academic mission; and procedural fairness and meaningful**

protections for affected faculty. We urge that these principles be reflected in the policies and procedures adopted by the University.