

Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees
University of Kentucky
Friday, February 23, 2024

The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky met on Friday, February 23, 2024, in the Gatton Student Center, Harris Ballroom.

I. Meeting Opened

Chair Brockman called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. and asked Secretary Webb to report the attendance.

II. Roll Call

The following members of the Executive Committee were present: E. Britt Brockman, Todd Case, Kimberly McCann, Elizabeth McCoy and Robert Vance. Secretary Webb announced that a quorum was present.

Other Board members present included: Cathy A. Black, Alex Boone, Ray Daniels, Ron Geoghegan, Brenda Gosney, Janie Greer, Lizzy Hornung, Lance Lucas, David Melanson, Paula Leach Pope, Frank Shoop and Hollie Swanson. Skip Berry attended via Zoom.

III. Approval of Minutes

Chair Brockman stated that the minutes of the December 4, 2023, Executive Committee meeting had been distributed. Trustee Vance moved approval of the minutes, and Trustee McCann seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

Chair Brockman yielded the floor to President Capilouto for remarks.

IV. President's Remarks

President Capilouto stated, "In October, you directed us to focus on five initiatives that would accelerate our progress in advancing Kentucky: Thoughtfully growing enrollment in ways that meet the workforce needs of our state; evaluating the foundational courses our students take – the UK Core – to ensure they are prepared for careers and to lead lives of meaning and purpose; creating and expanding partnerships in health care, with other educational institutions and the public and private sectors to strengthen pipelines for our students and to create more opportunities to serve; working to recruit and retain an outstanding 21st-century workforce so central to all that we do; and assessing the regulations and rules – both externally and internally – that determine whether we can be quickly responsive to, and always in alignment with, the state's priorities."

"We will hear progress reports today from each of the work groups we have formed around these key initiatives. These work groups are facilitated by leaders from throughout our campus. They are composed of faculty, staff and students as well as nominated members from our shared governance groups. They have done outstanding work and I'm very appreciative of their efforts."

“This morning, we will hear from the co-facilitators of Work Group 5 or More Responsiveness. Our co-facilitators are Treasurer Penny Cox and Vice President for Research Lisa Cassis. Penny and Lisa have 87 years of service to UK, and while they have administrative roles they have never forgotten where they came from.”

“Penny started as a clerk typist staff member in 1972. Lisa started as an assistant professor in the Division of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics in the College of Pharmacy in 1988. Lisa considers herself first as a member of the faculty. I am pleased to introduce them to report to you on their progress in this critical area.”

President Capilouto invited Treasurer Cox and Vice President Cassis to the podium for their report.

V. Project Accelerate: Work Group 5

Vice President for Research Lisa Cassis stated in addition to Co-facilitator Treasurer Cox, she was joined by UK’s Deloitte partners representing Work Group 5 within Project Accelerate. Dr. Cassis explained that she would provide an overview of the work group’s charge and present a response to Senate Joint Resolution 98 (SJR 98). Treasurer Cox will present UK’s high level current state governance structure, and the Deloitte subject matter experts will present findings from benchmark institutions in comparison to UK’s existing regulations and provide an overview of vested parties’ interview themes in relation to the work group’s charge.

“The scope of our project is consistent with the UK Purpose, to accelerate efforts to advance Kentucky, our economy, health and welfare, and quality of life that ensures and enables more responsiveness through reviewing our policies, procedures and financial strategies to ensure we are aligned with the needs of our state. Specifically, by reviewing our Governing (GR) and Administrative (AR) regulations and relationships with Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), with the goal of ensuring the institution is poised to accelerate our progress and growth.”

“Work Group 5 had several project inputs in our deliberations to date including qualitative assessment through interviews with vested parties and work group meetings, internal scans of our GRs and ARs, Senate Rules, Board minutes and shared governance documents, external benchmarking against 26 peer institutions, and analysis of SJR 98.”

“As our first deliverable, we evaluated SJR 98, which directs CPE to assess whether Kentucky’s governance structure is adequate to meet the state’s current and future human capital and workforce needs. SJR 98 has three main areas, the efficacy of Kentucky’s postsecondary governance structure, the feasibility of a new four-year public institution in southeastern Kentucky, and the feasibility/impact of narrowing Kentucky Community and Technical College System’s (KCTCS) scope to technical education and training only.”

“Work Group 5 reviewed all available documents regarding the three areas of SJR 98 and we will provide input to you today in the form of pros and cons around each of these three areas beginning with the current postsecondary governance structure. Four options were proposed for consideration within SJR 98, varying from maintaining the

current structure with improved execution of authorities, to creating a new superboard of single, statewide governance of higher education.”

Dr. Cassis provided context for each option and summarized the pros and cons from Work Group 5’s perspective into themes. Option 1 was considered the least disruptive and most conducive to the group’s charge to make UK more responsive to the needs of the Commonwealth, but did pose an additional administrative burden, raised concerns about state control and autonomy, and thus misaligned with UK’s goals of increased responsiveness. Other governance structure options were more disruptive and moved further away from the work group’s charge to be responsive to the needs of the citizens.

The second area of SJR 98 was the feasibility of a new four-year public institution in southeastern Kentucky. The pros from Work Group 5 included increased access, partnership opportunities, potential to bolster economic development in the region, deliver local academic experience and improve quality of life. Cons included increased competition for limited resources, taking students from other institutions, difficulties in recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, issues of feasibility and increased competition amongst four-year Kentucky institutions.

The third area of SJR 98 related to narrowing the scope of KCTCS. Pros included differentiating higher education across Kentucky, being responsive to workforce needs and specialization opportunities, with cons including consequences of cost redistribution, difficulties in separating functions, loss of prestige for the community, reductions in accessibility and the need to relocate faculty to other regions.

Dr. Cassis then yielded the floor to Treasurer Cox to provide a high-level review of UK’s current governance structure.

Treasurer Cox discussed the current governance model from the citizens of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the University noting the bounds of certain external regulations. She explained the General Assembly establishes the University and defines the powers of the UK Board of Trustees. As authorized by statutes, the Board of Trustees delegates authority as the chief administrative officer of the University to the President.

Ms. Cox discussed UK’s governing bodies and how they reflect the shared interests and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and President. Governing Regulations provide details on the responsibilities of the Board of Trustees as the final authority in all matters affecting the institution and exercises jurisdiction over the institution’s financial, educational, and other policies and its relation with the state and federal governments. The President serves as both chief administrative officer and chief executive officer.

UK’s shared governance structure reflects the shared interests and responsibilities of the University Senate, Senate Council, Staff Senate and Student Government Association (SGA). Ms. Cox explained the University Senate establishes the broad educational policies of the University and develops University Senate rules for the conduct of its functions.

UK's Senate Council appoints standing or special committees of the University Senate, the Staff Senate serves as the official representative body of the staff of the University, and the Student Government is the official representative of the student body in University matters to ensure a maximum of self-government and to foster mutual respect, collaboration and cooperation between students and the faculty, staff and administration.

Ms. Cox continued by discussing the two sections of UK's Governing Regulations that outline shared governance which is intended to promote inclusive and shared responsibility. GR II.A.2 delegates administrative authority to the President reflecting the advisory role of faculty, staff and students. GR II.A.3 delegates policy-making authority over educational policy to the University Senate, which is composed of faculty, students and administrators.

Ms. Cox completed her report by reviewing the full excerpt of GR II.A.3 that delegates power from the Board of Trustees to the University Senate. She then introduced Emily Omrod, manager of Deloitte's Higher Education practice to present benchmarking and interview results.

Ms. Omrod thanked the Committee and introduced her Deloitte colleagues Scott Friedman and Andrew Steil. She explained their team supporting the More Responsiveness effort has worked with over 200 colleges and universities around the country, and around the world, including in the Commonwealth. "We have been supporting Dr. Cassis, Ms. Cox and the More Responsiveness Work Group since early December 2023. Today we will be sharing peer benchmarking findings and interview observations as it relates to shared governance at the University of Kentucky."

Ms. Omrod stated that they looked at the authority given to shared governance bodies across 26 institutions, including UK. The benchmark peers included the Southeastern Conference (SEC), excluding Vanderbilt as they are private, the contiguous campus eight, and Kentucky public institutions. Nineteen of these peers are Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) accredited. The remaining institutions are accredited by a similar accrediting body. "Our team analyzed over 50 available regulations and policy documents across all peer benchmarking institutions, specifically focusing on the comparison to all 14 of UK's GRs. While our analysis showed minor discrepancies between UK's 14 GRs and the equivalent of its peers, the most notable discrepancies were found in GR II: Governance of the University of Kentucky and GR IV: The University Senate. This is where we will focus our presentation today."

Ms. Omrod reported that GR II describes the authority, membership, committees and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees. Furthermore, it outlines how different governing bodies at UK work with the Board of Trustees to operationalize its mission and charge. "Today we want to especially look at how the University Senate's role and authority is outlined in GR II.A.3."

"You will remember the language in GR II.A.3 from what Penny shared related to the current state of shared governance at UK. Given the ambiguity in that clause of the GR II related to authority over academic/educational policy, our team analyzed the

authority given to peer universities or faculty senates. Our analysis showed 15 of the 26 institutions give greater than advisory authority to their university or faculty senates. Of those 15, UK is the outlier in that the University's governing regulations do not explicitly limit the University Senate's authority. Additionally, the language "broad academic policy" is vague. Of the peer groups we looked at, over half explicitly outline the areas where their university or faculty senate have authority as well as what is in their advisory purview."

Ms. Omrod continued by discussing the University Senate structure and noting the latest organizational chart publicly available is from 2003. "While this org chart has changed since 2003, it is a helpful resource in that it outlines the authority given to the University Senate by the GRs and the Senate rules", pointing out that the lines in blue outline the authority given by the governing regulations and the lines in black outline the authority established by the Senate Rules.

"In 2003, UK's University Senate rules were 159 pages. The University Senate had 16 committees and 3 subcommittees. Fast-forward to 2024 – the Senate has 305 pages and counting, 30 committees, several of which overlap with administrative or academic unit functions, and a publicly unknown number of subcommittees."

"In summary, our benchmarking analysis found several areas where the University of Kentucky's shared governance structure is an outlier when compared to its benchmarked peers. Most notably, UK is different in the authority given to its University Senate, the ambiguity around the definition of broad academic policy in both GR II and IV, and lastly in the content and complexity of the University Senate rules."

"We interviewed a wide array of vested parties across campus, including students, faculty, staff and administrators. The groups we interviewed were chosen by Work Group 5 and the interview candidates nominated were chosen by the leaders of the respective governing body, academic or administrative unit."

Ms. Omrod explained that the same questions were used in every interview. While they may have deviated from the question bank to follow the flow of conversation, they always came back to the prescribed questions as their North Star.

"Today we will be sharing general themes as well as more detailed themes related to the certain governing bodies we heard throughout our interviews. For a theme to be considered in our analysis, the idea had to be mentioned by multiple different vested parties. I want to first state that all the interviewees we spoke to emphasized the importance of shared governance at UK. This aligns with the 2021 UK Strategic Plan's "UK purpose" which named shared governance as a critical value. However, while shared governance was identified as a critical function to promote a collaborative, diverse, transparent, and informed campus community, many expressed areas of UK's shared governance that are hindering the institution's ability to be "more responsive."

Ms. Omrod discussed five key themes that emerged regarding UK's responsiveness; where UK's shared governance structure, GRs and ARs may impact timely decision-making.

- Loss of Student Focus: Concerns were raised about decisions at UK being driven by faculty preferences rather than student needs, hindering the institution's responsiveness to evolving educational demands.
- Lack of Role Clarity: It was shared that ambiguity in shared governance roles leads to inefficiencies and conflicts within decision-making processes, impeding responsiveness.
- Culture Shift: Perceived cultural shifts within shared governance bodies raised concerns about alignment with UK's mission and values, potentially compromising institutional integrity.
- Desire and Need to Innovate: Interviewees stressed the importance of UK's ability to innovate and respond to evolving needs for advancing the interests of the Commonwealth and its constituents.
- Institutional Growth: Despite significant growth, respondents indicated that UK's shared governance structure has not fully adapted to the institution's tremendous growth, posing challenges in effectively addressing the needs of its diverse and expanding community.

Ms. Omrod transitioned from the broader examination of themes impacting UK's responsiveness to a more focused analysis of the University Senate's influence on timely decision-making, which she stated was discussed by nearly all interviewees and stakeholder groups. "While our exploration of global themes provided valuable insights into overarching trends, it is important to delve into the specific mechanisms within the University that shape the institution's ability to respond effectively to challenges and opportunities. By examining the impact of the University Senate, we aim to pinpoint areas where its role intersects with the broader themes identified, shedding light on how internal governance dynamics can either facilitate or impede the capacity for timely and effective decision-making."

The University Senate, as one of the most critical shared governance bodies at UK, plays a significant role in key decision-making processes. Ms. Omrod highlighted six key themes that emerged regarding the University Senate's impact on timely decision-making, reflecting broader interview themes.

- Rules: Interviewees shared challenges with the length and complexity of the University Senate's rules that cause problems in timely and fair decision-making. Additionally, we heard that vested parties have a hard time knowing where to go for certain issues given the density of the rules.
- Focus: Concerns were raised about the level of minutia and detail where the University Senate and Senate Council spend their time. Individuals shared that the University Senate does not always engage the experts when making critical decisions and can sometimes overrule decisions they are not informed about.

- Culture: While some vested parties felt that the University Senate is a strong advocate for faculty, others said the “combative culture of the Senate” is not reflective of the general UK culture and does not align with UK’s mission and values.
- Leadership: Some respondents shared that the issue with the University Senate is more with its leadership body in the Senate Council. We heard from interviewees that the Senate Council’s membership tends to be made up of folks who are disgruntled with the University.
- Structure: Respondents indicated that the number of committees in the University Senate can stifle progress and innovation as well as cause confusion about who at the University is responsible for what.
- Representation: We heard from stakeholders that the University of Kentucky’s University Senate operates as a faculty senate. Vested parties expressed that shared governance should better represent the diversity of the University community, including its over 3,000 faculty, 12,000 staff and 30,000 students.

Dr. Cassis thanked Ms. Omrod, “Chair Brockman, members of the Executive Committee, as we all reflect on the findings shared today, Penny and I, as leaders of this work group, return to the charge you gave to President Capilouto and that he asked us to work on. Today we discussed an analysis of SJR98 and reported to you a robust review of benchmarking and feedback on the University’s regulations. The work group came together over several hours and considered a broad range of perspectives across all topics presented. We have sought in a diligent, dispassionate and objective way to provide you with the information and analysis you need and that you asked for as we consider how to accelerate our progress as an institution. Chair Brockman, thank you for inviting Work Group 5 here today to present these updates and with that, I hand the floor back to you.”

“I want to thank Dr. Cassis, Treasurer Cox, members of Work Group 5 and the representatives from Deloitte for this thoughtful and substantive analysis,” stated Chair Brockman, “I am very appreciative as well of the work of faculty, staff, students and administrators who have devoted their time to the work groups that comprise this important initiative.”

“I also want to thank the members of the Executive Committee and the entire Board for their constructive engagement on this issue. The questions are important. The issues we have heard about today are critical to our progress and our future as Kentucky’s university. Before we open this up to further questions, I want to offer a few thoughts about what we’ve heard and the context for our discussions today.”

“Our Strategic Plan – unanimously endorsed by this Board in 2021 – directed this University to focus on the most important priorities we have to advance this state. Among those was a direction to examine Governing Regulations and other processes and procedures for how they help or hinder our capacity to respond to the state’s needs.”

“In October, as a Board, we unanimously directed President Capilouto to focus on five specific areas – direct outgrowths of our Strategic Plan – that would help us accelerate our progress in advancing this state. We are hearing progress reports on all of

them today. My point is that we have been thinking about, and discussing, this need and others for some time.”

“I carefully reviewed these slides before the presentation today and what I have heard only reinforces my belief about the importance of shared governance. It is a deeply held value, embedded in all that we do. It is essential to who we are. But I also believe there is an urgent need to streamline and clarify the rules we have to ensure that we truly honor shared governance, which is designed to give everyone a voice. We do not have that today, in my judgment.”

“I want to hear questions and dialogue from our Executive Committee first, before turning to the entire Board. But as we do that, I want to offer a few framing principles that I believe are important for us to consider and, ultimately, direct further action on:”

“Educational policymaking is a critical concept. We all – the Board, the faculty, staff, students and the administration – have a role here. But within our Governing Regulations, that idea is broadly – and not clearly – defined and described. We need to do that. And let me be clear, as I have thought about this issue and heard from many of you, there is no intention – and it will not happen – to change the faculty’s leading and critical role in the curriculum of this institution. That will not change. However educational policymaking involves more than curriculum. And we need clarity around roles and duties with respect to that idea.”

“It is also clear to me from the presentation and my review of it that our governance structure is not in alignment with our benchmarks. We are an outlier. Indeed, we are one of one. That must change. We have too many rules and processes. We need to streamline them to free up faculty, colleges and units to be the innovators and creators they are for this campus. The Board has an essential role in this process. The Board has the final and ultimate policymaking authority for all aspects of the University, including educational policy. We need to state that clearly in the Governing Regulations. As trustees, we are the fiduciaries of this institution. And it is a sacred trust. We need to make that clear to everyone.”

“Finally, I have also heard the suggestion that even talking about these issues would somehow run afoul of laws, regulations and our accreditation. I want to make clear that we will not do that. We are seeking to strengthen our rules by inserting clarity over ambiguity and streamlining them rather than adding to the bureaucracy. Aligning ourselves more closely with other peers – the majority of whom are accredited by the same body we are – should not be seen as a threat. It should be welcomed as an opportunity to be better.”

“With that, I would like to open this up for more questions and discussion, starting with members of the Executive Committee.”

Chair Brockman recognized Trustee Vance for comments.

“Thank you, Chair Brockman. Like you, I appreciate the information presented. In fact, I am personally very pleased and excited about this initiative. We are working together to chart a course not for next year or the year after, but for the next several years.

Our focus is always Kentucky. But we know that we must accelerate our efforts to meet the state's needs. The report clearly highlights the opportunities we must seize to improve and refine the rules of the road that we use to govern this institution. All institutions – no matter how accomplished they are – gain from reflection. We should always be willing to ask the question of how we can do better. That is what this report reflects – how all of us ... our board and our campus ... can refine and improve. We want to strengthen shared governance – to me, that means ensuring everyone has a voice. We have some of the best faculty in the world, doing incredible work on behalf of students, patients, communities and our state. We need to free them to do even more. That means providing clarity about areas of responsibility and decision-making.”

Trustee Vance continued, “It means streamlining the rules and processes we have to be more like some of our peers. I agree wholeheartedly that our next step should be to direct President Capilouto and his team to engage the campus, thoughtfully but quickly, in discussions about how we can strengthen the rules and regulations while insisting that everyone has a seat at the table. I am excited and pleased about the potential this process holds for our University and what that will mean for Kentucky.”

Chair Brockman thanked Trustee Vance and introduced Vice Chair McCann for comments.

Vice Chair McCann thanked the presenters and stated that she agreed with the Chairman that it is concerning, and we have been given a responsibility and need to ensure that the model we have is working and what works well is kept and what does not work well may need some adjustments. “I think that it is so important and paramount that the University be able to move in a timely and efficient manner, especially with the world we all live in today. “Obviously these GRs have evolved over a number of years and as a result sometimes you just have to step back and take another look. Obviously, it is time to step back and take another look. I commend everyone who has been working on this process and appreciate all the information. I think this Board of Trustees has a huge responsibility here and we need to listen and have all the information we can and make some good decisions.”

Hearing no further comments from the Executive Committee, Chair Brockman opened the floor for comments from the other members present and recognized Trustee Swanson.

Trustee Swanson stated she was confused as to why this Board was told in December by the Provost that the SACS reaccreditation review was flawless. She stated that SACS did not appear to have an issue with how the Senate functioned and it was maintained in that report many times typically with the words “insure quality” and asked the Chair how they could reconcile these apparent differences. “Did anyone look at the function and how well the Senate functioned”, questioned Dr. Swanson.

Chair Brockman recognized President Capilouto for comment.

The President explained that he spoke to the President of SACS, Dr. Belle Wheeland, the day prior and is preparing for another accreditation review as he serves on many as a panel member. SACS further clarified as she said to the President, that their

standards most clearly reflected the revisions that came out in the last few weeks. “Do not tell universities how to do shared governance, they just tell you to do it. There are a variety of ways in which one can do it, I think that is reflected in the recognition that others that were reviewed that differ from ours are also accredited.”

Trustee Swanson said she interprets that as the quality of the work that the Senate does is not in question, and asked if there has ever been a proposal put to the Board that has been rejected because of poor quality.

President Capilouto said he reflects on what has been presented and that is the ambiguity and differences in role clarity.

Trustee Swanson stated that she was also surprised that when the Board gave the charge the charge was about the ARs and GRs and as she understood it there are 1,151 pages of ARs and GRs and yet the scope is very narrowly focused on GR.II.A.3 and GR.IV.B which specifically refers to the Senate and the function of the Senate.

Chair Brockman called on Dr. Cassis to comment on Trustee Swanson’s remarks. Dr. Cassis stated that Work Group 5 is looking at every one of the GRs and ARs and that they started with these because they are the main ways the University is governed through the current shared governance structure.

Deloitte Manager Emily Omrod stated through this project she and the Deloitte team supporting the work group has done an analysis of all 14 of the Governing Regulations (GRs) as well as all the Administrative Regulations (ARs) and for today’s purposes wanted to bring forward the most notable discrepancies. As they continue through the remainder of the project, they will be sharing a current state assessment report that shows an analysis of all the ARs and GRs and provide further detail.

Chair Brockman recognized Trustee Melanson for comment. He asked if the structure of the Staff Senate had been looked at and did they have a report they could share at some point. “I think that would be informative for those of us on the Staff Senate.”

Ms. Emrod stated that they heard a lot about the Staff Senate but in the current Governing Regulations, there is more detail about the University Senate’s rules and functions and more detail about how the Student Government Association is structured. “In our analysis of the current state assessment, we will talk about Staff Senate, how it is outlined in the Governing Regulations, and also share themes we heard from speaking to members of the Staff Senate.”

Chair Brockman recognized Trustee Ballard for comments.

Trustee Ballard stated that like Trustee Swanson he was elected to represent the faculty and reflected in his conversations with faculty that there is a significant body of them that referred to the focus from one of the slides presented that was almost a direct quote from what he heard. (The University Senate “focuses on minutiae and limits creativity.” They “do not engage the experts” and overrule decisions they are not informed about.) Dr. Ballard stated, “I do not view this report as a loss of shared governance I view this as an attempt to maintain shared governance by shifting subject matter experts. There

is a large body of faculty that do not view this as a loss of our voice, that it would still be maintained. It would just not necessarily be with the University Senate.”

Trustee Swanson stated that so far what they have heard is evidence from interviews and as a scientist, she hoped that they would follow up with data and questioned if the sample was biased and whether the interviewees were properly informed about what they were talking about. She used the student interviews as an example wondering if they were asked about administration but were their answers interpreted to be focused on the Senate. Dr. Swanson also asked if they had data that implies that the Senate is slower at course approvals.

Chair Brockman called on Dr. Cassis and Ms. Omrod for comments.

Dr. Cassis discussed the process where the work group developed a dashboard, which they used to outline their charge, the deliverables and every aspect of what they were trying to do. That was distributed to those who were interviewed in advance. Ms. Omrod spoke to Dr. Swanson’s question regarding the student interviews and stated that she conducted those interviews and used the questions presented to the Committee that day. She pointed out that there was direct mention of the University Senate when they spoke to students. “We did not extrapolate or interpret the administration as the University Senate.” She then recognized her colleague Scott Friedman to discuss their process.

Mr. Friedman explained that the goal and charge from the work group committee was to identify themes from a broad group of vested parties and interview participants.

Trustee Swanson stated that she had some data that was compiled by the Senate Council Office and from start to finish for the years 2016 to 2023 the average time for an approval process was a total of 16 weeks. She compared to some benchmark institutions and stated that the University of Arizona has two to three years for their process. She then broke it down to the number of steps and reported that Ohio State has a 12-step process for course approvals whereas UK’s is a nine-step process and the mean number of steps from benchmark institutions was 11.8. She suggested this type of data as a suggestion to use with the work group’s processes.

Ms. Omrod pointed out that their charge was to specifically look at the language in the Governing Regulations and Administrative Regulations to determine how it benchmarked against other institutions. She reported that they did not specifically look at the process detail for each of the institutions to Dr. Swanson’s point because there is a lot of ambiguity concerning how long that takes and the information is usually not publicly available.

Dr. Cassis added that they are welcome to the work group’s next steps and their charge as they look at shared governance of the institution as a whole, they will understand more about UK’s own processes and how they are approached. “We are all here to improve shared governance and make sure everyone has a voice and we want to have that dialogue as we move forward in our charge.”

Dr. Swanson questioned the wording used during the report specifically the word “unique” and asked if the University Senate was unique and detailed the specific

membership and that it was chaired by the President.

Ms. Omrod explained that of the universities they looked at, others had university senates but where UK is unique is that GR11 and GR14 do not explicitly limit the authority of the University Senate as it relates to broad academic policy.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Brockman moved on to other business.

VI. Other Business

Chair Brockman stated, “Although some of the findings are challenging – and I appreciate the passion and sincere beliefs that many bring to this issue as they should – what we have heard clearly lays out a case for necessary change. There are changes that must occur if we are to accelerate our efforts to advance this state and, specifically, to align with the needs and priorities of the Commonwealth.”

“In that regard, I am excited about what has been presented. The findings and our dialogue this morning are undergirded by a belief that this is a place that learns and grows and that is willing to meet any challenge. In my view, that is not a choice we have, it is a calling we must meet. And I believe we will.”

“To that end, and with this Committee’s concurrence, I would like to ask the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary to draft a board resolution for the full Board’s review and consideration later today. I believe as an Executive Committee, we should direct the President to move quickly and thoughtfully to provide recommendations regarding our Governing Regulations consistent with the principles I have outlined and our discussion this morning. My expectation is that we will have something to review and consider at our meeting this afternoon.”

Chair Brockman entertained a motion directing the Secretary and Assistant Secretary to draft such a motion for the full Board’s review later that afternoon. Trustee McCoy made the motion and Trustee Case seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

VII. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Rachel Watts Webb,
Secretary