University of Kentucky
Staff Senate

Staff Senate Attendance Sheet

Meeting Specifics		
Purpose	**Frequency**	**Senate Chair**
Regularly Scheduled	2nd Thursday of every month	Olivia Ellis
Date	**Time**	**Location**
03.14.2024	1:00 p.m.	Zoom/Rosenburg Law School Grand Court Room

Committee				
☒ **Chair: Olivia Ellis**	☐ **Vice-Chair: Courtney Chafin**	☐ **Secretary: Sarah Steen**	☐ **Treasurer: Kaleb Grey**	☒ **Parliamentarian: Chris Larmour**
☐ **PC: Bobbi Jo Allen**	☒ James Aaron	☒ Mike Adams	☒ Allissa Anderson	☒ Ginger Anderson
☒ Dawn Baker	☒ Tiara Ball	☒ Mandi Banahan	☒ Kelley Beverly	☐ Amanda Biddle
☐ Shelly Bishop	☐ John Blaine	☐ Joshua Borgemenke	☐ Benito Botaka	☐ James Boxx
☒ Sabrina Brewer	☒ Jennifer Bridge	☒ Cynthia Brown	☐ Olwen Burton	☒ Chris Carney
☐ AJ Carpenter	☒ Melissa Claar	☒ Christy Coffman	☐ Anna Cox	☐ Alexandra Curtis
☒ Dale Davis	☐ Kevin Duncan	☐ Ann Eads	☒ Rebecca Earls	☐
☒ Ryan Farley	☐ Andrew Fast	☒ Jonnisa Ferguson	☒ Sarah Fitzgerald	☒ Kevin Fleming
☒ Jennifer Fore	☒ Jennifer Fransen	☒ Sandra Frey	☒ Tenia Gatewood	☒ Perry Gibson
☒ Sheneda Goforth	☒ Beth Goins	☒ Joseph Hacker	☒ Kel Hahn	☐ Charles Hayley
☒ Laura Hall	☐ James Hamblin	☒ Charla Hamilton	☒ Kyle Hardesty	☒ Lyndall Harned
☒ Carl Harper	☒ Catherine Hayden	☒ Ginni Haynes	☐ Jaymie Hays	☐ Joshua Henry
☐ Andrew Hernandez	☒ Jennifer Hill	☒ Jordan Hoehler	☒ Dean Holt	☒ Kevin Horn-Pacheco
☒ Amanda Hornsby	☐ Jessica Howard	☒ Curtis Hudson	☒ Iyad Jabbour	☒ Amy Jones
☒ Terry Keys	☐ Zachary King	☐ Jennifer Knuf	☒ Elizabeth Kostrub	☒ Julieanne Kravetz
☐ Kelly Lamping	☒ Brittany Lawrence	☒ Sheena Lee	☒ Harrison Levans	☒ Lisa Lockman
☐ Amy Lombard	☒ Amy Lorenzo	☒ Fadyia Lowe	☐ Megan Lucy	☐ Ashley Marcum
☒ Marie Marefat	☒ Troy Martin	☐ Heather McAtee	☒ Courtney McCalla	☒ Glenn Means III
☒ Tiffany Miller	☐ Te'Quisha Miller	☐ Stephanie Million	☐ Addison Zane Mills	☒ Allison Montero
☒ Krystle Moore	☒ Daniel Naas	☐ Pamela Noble	☒ Sarah Orr	☒ Cary Osborne
☒ Karen Owsley McCann	☒ Scott Pappas	☒ Stephanie Peeples	☒ Aaron Peffer	☒ Monica Perez
☒ Kristen Pickett	☒ Tessa Pinkerton	☐ Kevin Puckett	☒ Cory Qualls	☒ Covetta Ramey
☐ Tiffany Randolph	☐ Gage Redimarker	☐ Stephen Reed	☒ Farhad Rezaei	☐ Ben Rice
☒ Ritchelle Ruiz	☒ Amanda Schagane	☒ Stefan Schagane	☐ Sandra Shepherd	☒ Sydney Shields
☐ Carol Simpson	☒ Scott Sorrell	☒ Karena Spears	☒ Clem Stambaugh	☐ Tymory Stanton
☐ Hardin Stevens	☒ Nathan Stewart	☐ Andrea Strassburg	☒ Justin Sumner	☒ Nancy Taylor
☐ Preston Thomas	☒ Mindy Thompson	☒ Madeline Trudeau	☒ Aaron Vaught	☒ Allison Walters
☐ Jeanine Washington	☒ Halley White	☐ Christine Wildes	☐ Johnna Wilford	☒ Alice Williams
☐ Stephen Williams	☒ Elijah Wilson	☐ Laurel Wood	☒ Sandy Wooton Gay	☒ Misty Wright

University of Kentucky
Staff Senate

☒ Markeda Yarbrough	☒ Stephanie Zapata	☐ Laure Ziembroski Smith		
Ex Officios, Visitors and Standing Guests				
☒ **President Eli Capilouto**	☒ **EVPFA Eric Monday**	☒ **Trustee Dave Melanson**	☐ Richard Amos	☐ Provost DiPaola
☒ Melissa Frederick	☒ Catie Lasley	☐ Katrice Albert	☐ **SGA President** Lizzy Hornung	☐ **Faculty Senate Council Chair** DeShana Collett
☐ Sandra Shuffet, MD	☐ Elizabeth Baker	☒ Azetta Beatty	☐ Jay Blanton	☐ Gail Carbol
☐ Darin Cecil	☒ Angela Croucher	☐ Alex Dixon	☐ Rebecca Dysart	☒ Jody Ensman
☐ Brenda Heeter	☒ Angela Martin	☐ Katie Hardwick	☒ Tammy Akin	☐ Bill Verble
☐ Steven Ivey	☒ Penny Cox	☒ Tiana The		

Agenda Topics Covered		
Task ID	**Agenda Item**	**Presenter/Facilitator**
1	Call to Order/Approve Minutes	C. Chafin
2	President's Report	E. Capilouto
3	Trustee's Report	D. Melanson
4	Guest Speakers	
5	Officer Reports	C. Chafin, S. Steen, K. Grey, C. Larmour
6	Committee Reports	Committee Chairs
7	Items from the Floor	
8	Adjournment	C. Chafin

Action Items		
Item	**Assigned to**	**Due Date**

Notes	
Topic	**Discussion**
1. Call to Order/Approve Minutes	• Meeting called to order at 1:04pm • Minutes were approved without revision.
2. President's Report	• Dr. Capilouto provided the update. • Meeting with you today to discuss and get some feedback about what shared governance means at the University of Kentucky. In 2021 our Board of Trustees adopted our strategic plan. With that plan it gave us strategic direction which included our taking a close look at our guidance and policies to better structure and define the roles with respect to the bedrock principle of shared governance among faculty, students, staff, and administrators. Our Board regulations and university governmental regulations define our shared governance constituency groups as those four. In October of last year, the Board met for its retreat. Dr. Capilouto

characterizes it as the “Be More, Do More” Board Retreat. The Board wanted us to accelerate our progress. Given where Kentucky stands today at an inflection point and the essentiality of the University of Kentucky serving as a key participant in advancing as leading the efforts appropriate to us to move our state forward.

- There were five “mores”
    - More graduates. We were asked to look at a smart growth plan in alignment with Kentucky’s workforce. We always want to say we’re preparing students for more than jobs, and that their lives have meaning and purpose – we want them to be community leaders, whether that’s in their professional community or in the community in which they reside.
    - More readiness. It has been 10-15 years since we reviewed our core curriculum. These are 30 credit hours that are the foundational hours that every student has to take. Many students come to campus having completed these requirements through dual credit course and things like that. Are we certain they have the competencies, the tool kits and what can we do to make certain that they do.
    - More partnerships – many of the things we’ve been able to do at UK have been made possible by productive partnerships by working shoulder to shoulder with those individuals who first share our values in ways that maybe we could not offer capability to advance Kentucky.
    - More recruitment and more retention – we have recognized that things have changed in the last decade. Our workforce has changed. What our employees have to manage, and juggle can vary in terms of their family circumstances, where they are, their tenure of work or age in life. I hope many of you are engaging in the interactive processes we have underway. I think we have well over 3,500 people to look at our benefits packages. Can we give more flexibility?
    - Lastly, More responsiveness. Last year the Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Joint Resolution that asked CPE to conduct a study on the governance of higher education in Kentucky. Those are all the rules and structures within which we work. Some changes have been recommended and I’m not certain if those will be drafted into legislation, but we thought it was important for our campus to take a look at what was recommended through that study and at the same time let’s look at the rules and regulations in which we govern ourselves.
- Work groups were set up for each of these topics and the leaders of the respective constituency groups were asked to recommend participants to serve. Almost every group was made up of staff, faculty, students, and administrators. If there were interviews conducted by those groups, we went back to the individuals who led the constituency groups and asked for recommendations. The more responsiveness group presented to the Board of Trustees a look that compared us with our peer institutions contiguous with our state in the Southeastern Conference, excluding Vanderbilt, which is a private institution. The results of that were that we were an outlier and in a strategic manner in terms of what we delegated as educational policy.

The University Senate has an extensive set of laws, over 300 pages, that provide thoughtful, good direction over time about how we operate and conduct largely our academic enterprise. The Board Directed Dr. Capilouto as is consistent with SACS to further define the respective responsibilities amongst power respective to constituency groups in terms of shared governance. They made it clear they wanted promises of the faculty when it comes to curriculum content course content and evaluation of students and programs. He began holding listening sessions and communicated to campus the themes that were heard in those first sessions. In particular it was noted that while we have a university senate it has no staff representation. Our students participated in very small numbers as voting members and had questions about their voice. More clarity was mentioned and that some people believed if we focus on the details within the process, we lose site of the forest for the trees. Given that we are a growing complex organization, we should have our own internal governing bodies focusing on some of the larger issues we face as a university. It was brought up the possibility of more local control for those matters that are largely self-contained within a college and don't involve activities or programs that are underway in our respective colleges. Our Rules and Regulations – it's not just the faculty senate that has some lengthy rules, there are our G.R.s (Governing Regulations) and A.R.s (administrative regulations) that govern our university.

- Tianna from my office has been at most of the meetings and just taking notes for me. It is important that I can listen carefully and reflect as I synthesize in you and others have shared with me. I also want to take this opportunity to say we are an outstanding university. We have accomplished the unimaginable over the last decade. I think many people envy us and some think their problem is us – our success. I don't necessarily think that's necessarily the case, but I think we have done an extraordinary job in serving Kentucky and I know each and every one of you put your hearts and souls into that and I wanted to thank you.
- Questions: Tianna is taking notes without attribution for Dr. Capilouto.
    - P. Gibson: This is my second year as a senator and whenever I initially joined Staff Senate I, perhaps naively, thought that it works very much like how the actual Senate works. I thought that this was a body wherein we would pass opinions or policies on for them and then go on to the President or Board of Trustees or some executive figure to be approved or denied. I must confess that I very well might have misunderstood the official definition of what shared governance was.
    - R. Earls: I am trying to understand shared governance parts because I am hearing different things. I've been talking to faculty and I've been talking to the different shared healthcare shared governance. Are we wanting to get all the shared governance together, pick the different ones or have them elected to bring to the board?
        - Dr. Capilouto: Please elaborate on that.
        - R. Earls: I've spoken to some faculty members who have been in your discussions/forums and they were talking about uniting all the different shared governance like faculty, staff, nursing and everyone. So, would that be

	considered part of the seat on the Board of Trustees? I'm also hearing that healthcare has its own shared governance and are there going to be elections through the different departments and then build up – that is what I am unsure of what the discussion are with shared governance. Is it for Staff Senate? The faculty? For Nursing? Healthcare? Campus? ▪ Dr. Capilouto: Let me try to bring some clarity as to how things stand now. The Student Government Association (SGA) do have representation on the Board and on certain matters they are able to reflect their opinions then it comes to the President, and he can make recommendations to the Board. The staff enjoys the advice that can be provided to him. When we have done things like remote work policies or benefits, we consult with you and the part of what comes to the board. The University Senate as it currently stands – and there's confusion about who holds responsibility for educational policy – and in essence policies can be passed without going through him and a recommendation made to the board. It doesn't mean every policy, because when we do have an academic program, a new one that goes to the Board for approval. The University Senate is made up of 85% faculty who can vote. The seats in the Senate are basically distributed in accord with how many faculty have their appointments in their respective colleges. So, colleges like Arts & Sciences and Medicine – the larger colleges – have more seats on the University Senate. Their governing organizations and how they engage have been largely left to them. So, what we are talking about when I say more voice is how do we engage those who have responsibilities, expertise, and advice on particular matters? How do we organize that in some sort of formal way to make sure we hear all voices? ▪ R. Earls: How would it be determined who would be on the board for all senators if we come together? ▪ Dr. Capilouto: Right now, he doesn't have a decision or know how it's going to look. He is hosting these feedback sessions to get ideas to consider about ways we can hear move voices. One of your colleagues said to me something important in a listening session last Friday afternoon. That was it's not about my class – whether I'm faculty, staff, student, or administration it's about my role. If I am in a role that has me close to a situation that's of importance that I have experience and expertise, I think it would be valuable for me to contribute in the formative stage, and possibly at the stage where we conclude. I've heard faculty say when it comes to something like content of the curriculum, they think that's something in which they have expertise and should have some heavy weight to it. I agree with those and I would call it helpful advice I've been receiving and thinking about. We cannot have all 3,000 faculty, 20,000

staff and 34,000 students vote on every matter at the University. But how we how we organized to get the best advice and best opinions declared on the things we do that affect the entire university is important.
    - R. Earls: My concern is that the everyday person/staff is going to get over shadowed/overlooked.
- M. Trudaeu: I work in Student Success and my feedback would be that whatever form of shared governance takes share should be representative. I think that's part of the conversation. I've heard from both my fellow senators and so far it feels as if we don't all have an equal voice and not that we all need an equal voice on the all the topics but that we all should feel equally represented in the overall structure of the university. However, it looks like going forward do we get equal voices in the rooms where they should be represented?
- C. McCullough: I also work for Student Success and I've heard from staff at this moment they don't feel like they have a seat at the table. Staff need to be able to have a voice at the table – whether it's a frontline healthcare worker, if it's physical plant staff it has to be considered in this space and in the larger space when thinking about shared governance. I think it's an antiquated model that needs to be revitalized.
- B. Goins: I heard this in a meeting from someone that mentioned that people want a voice, a vote and a veto. I think this is how a lot of us feel and perceive the situation. It stuck with me yesterday and I wanted to share that.
- C. Brown: When I think about it, shared governance removes the silos, and creates multi-disciplinary groups to make decisions that are best for the whole and not just individual agendas. I think the right folks need to be involved in decision making with things directly impacting something going on in their specific area and currently that's not happening. I have been at the University for 2 years and I was shocked by the culture of how things get done. I think people have gotten stale in their approach to how we look at moving forward and I want to make sure you are aware of that.
- Chair Ellis: I just want to say that I appreciate you all are willing to say that even the system of Staff Senate isn't working as well as you had hoped it would. Please know it doesn't offend me if you have criticisms of the current situation in the current functions.
- J. Kravetz: In your introduction you mentioned that UK was a bit of an outlier. Would you mind explaining what caused anyone to come to that conclusion, and also what we might be able to learn from other universities, who may be an example or represent more options or ideas for us?
    - Dr. Capilouto: We asked a consulting group that works with over 500 universities was to dispassionately and objectively review our governing regulations, administrative regulations and senate bylaws. We are one of the few that have a University Senate which as primacy in terms of academic policy making in that it is not presented to the president for review and approval before it's adopted and it can be

approved without Board of Trustees approval. There's no recourse if it is passed and have to live by it. That's the difference. The Board delegated academic policy authority and responsibility to the Faculty Sente.

- T. Keys: We have been discussing shared governance a lot in these past session and there are many people who do not have that phrase in their vernacular and they do not know what it means. How do you define shared governance? When you don't work with it everyday it's hard to define because they have to figure out what it means. Additional feedback when I've asked my colleagues what they're getting from your emails and they tell me that they don't understand what you want from them. I want to do what's going to be the best for the university, but I can't tell from the emails it is that you're really wanting from me in the process.
  - Dr. Capilouto: I want your ideas and suggestions on the decision we make through it that you deal with every day. Ideas and suggestions on the rules we use to operate on a variety of matters are contained in these regulations and bylaws. How can we have voices that offer advice, opinions, endorsements, votes on matters that concern largely the entire university?
- T. Keys: The other part is that we are looking for better communication on why this is important to me as a staff person and how that's going to make a difference in the way that I do my job. How can we do better as an administration to get these out there so everyone can understand and that everyone has a voice to share their opinions. There are many jobs that don't have the privilege of being able to sit in front of a computer and read the emails in-depth and provide feedback and how can we give that privilege to more people so they can get a voice in what we have to say?
  - Dr. Capilouto: In many ways I look to you as the voice of the people you just described. You're right, not everyone has immediate access. I want to say that Everybody is somebody. Everybody matters. Everybody is worthy at the University of Kentucky. We need rules and regulations that support that. I believe the way you interact with one another and the care you just shared illustrates that everybody is somebody at UK.
  - Chair Ellis: Now that we have access to our Salesforce we are going to send an update tomorrow about appreciation day, but are going to include some information on what is shared governance and what does it look like for staff now. Why is it important to you? And now that ewe have this communication channel we might be able to be part of the solution.
- A. Jones: I think we need to empower our current bodies such as Staff Senate instead of inventing new bodies in order to make these policy changes.
- K. Hardesty: I work in the registrar's office and I wanted to bring up something in regards to responsiveness and retention that you were talking about earlier in your plan. The Board of Trustees has

delegated those policy changes to the University Senate and that's something that I live and breathe and I believe that the Senate rules can be cumbersome. That's the part of the responsiveness and retaining students is that higher education is constantly changing, and it's hard for us to adapt to those changes when I am dealing with policies that haven't been reviewed since 1964 – a graduate school issue I dealt with the other day . There are a lot of things that I think that if they were moved under the Provost or somewhere else where you don't have 300 voices in a room trying to make every single policy change we could maybe get more done.

- Dr. Capilouto: Would like more on the example you provided without violating confidentiality.
- K. Hardesty: One issue had to do with a graduate course within the student's major at the 400G level not counting towards their program completion. But the way the actual policy was written wasn't very clear, so we had to get clarification because it had never been an issue because a student had never taken a 400G course and failed it until this happened. It had never been reviewed to see whether or not that bad ben applying. Another really good one is the degree list that is sent to the University Senate before it goes to the Board for approval. It seems like it hasn't caught up to where we are. We have the student files staying in the colleges where they're kept in paper format and people are reviewing to make sure students are meeting the degree requirements. It makes sense that you would need faculty input to verify the degree applications, but we now have the wonderful degree audit system that's built, baste on faculty recommendations in the curriculum, so having to have it debated and reviewed prior to sending it to the Board seems like an excessive rubber stamp that's not allow us to quickly deal with students and we could give them more time to apply for graduation as opposed to those last minute people who have to be pushed until August.

- M. Thompson: While I appreciate the need for communication, I think it can kind of be a 2-way street. If you want to see change, you have to be willing to see what is needed to address that change and not expect people to come to you with the information. If you're not reading your emails, that's not the university's fault. I do understand that there is a subset of people that do not have access to their email or a computer in their work place and that might be a way we can improve, by focusing communications to this set of people As far as shared governance, I think it would be great to have a percentage of staff involved in this decision making. You mentioned earlier either individual with expertise in that area, I think if we only focus on individuals we are missing a portion of input that is also valuable since staff, in my opinion, is kind of the glue because we are working with students and faculty. It is like we have the secret sauce so to speak and it might be beneficial to

	have one member that doesn't have expertise in that area – such as someone from PPD who isn't working in student success, etc. ○ Anonymous Question: The conversation around shared governance often involves discussion of the University Senate, Staff Senate and student government. How do the committees established by the administrative regulations fall into this conversation around shared governance? ▪ Dr. Capilouto: That is an incredibly good point. Some of the feedback that has been given to me, it is usually on an individual office, but some recognition that sometimes administration drops the ball. How can we be responsive in those situations? So fair point. We do have routine, systematic, periodic, scheduled review of administrators of key offices and those involve significant input from those individuals that are served by that unit. Think what you are talking about is how we serve those who turn to us and how we serve each other in the best ways possible. The administration does have a set of responsibilities and authorities that we need to effectively and efficiently conduct. ○ M. Wright: We need leadership across campus to understand the importance of staff's role in shared governance and allow their people to participate. One issue that we run into a lot of times with Staff Senate members is having supervisors allowing them to come to the meetings and have a voice in this body which raises difficulties. Use the current triad (Staff Senate, Faculty Senate, and SGA) these are the voices and ideas of their areas and if we put the group together in meetings (bi-annually) then we could have discussions together amongst the areas. ○ J. Aaron: I wanted to put the idea out there of when you talk about shared governance – In my experience there can be a body that can come up with a policy or a guideline and then there can be a body that comes up with the implementation, the SOP or what have you for how that guideline is addressed. Then there could be body that deals with the repercussions of whether or not a guideline, policy, or SOP are adhered to. This might be a way to think about the future governance model to cross some bridges when people think a faculty role is a certain thing or a staff role is a certain thing is to incorporate them. ○ J. Bridge: I am currently serving as President-Elect on a National board and we're all land grant universities. So I reached out to that board, and I said, "What are your experiences? You know, with this type of work of leadership organization as far as shared governance" and I received a variety of responses back. One, most all of them felt that because they are under that form, that they love it. But 2 of them made comments that I thought that I would just share. It says "it's just a clever way to say we seek input from the faculty and staff in decision making." The other one that I thought hit it more on the head is said, "I think it does matter. I think it's not always fully true. Sometimes it's in name only, in other words, all the partners in the shared situation are not equal." I think right now,

when we look at our current structure, we have a little bit of imbalance that could be more equal.
    - De. Capilouto: Would you like elaborate on how we could make it more equal?
    - J. Bridge: Well, I think when you have the majority on staff senate to represent a larger component of the university, and I'll use extension as an example, because we are out here in the state. We're all in all 120 counties. We don't always have representation when it comes to a voice for off campus, and we're not the only off campus employees that we have. It shouldn't matter where we are located in this state, because if I have a colleague in Fulton that should be represented and have a wonderful voice to be a representative, they should have the opportunity to be on a committee. It doesn't matter where they're located in the state, because it's the voice. Are we truly representing the people that we represent? Or we will be focusing on our own ideas? That's why, you know, you're reaching out. I feel sure other people are reaching out but sometimes when we're in leadership positions, we don't always reach out to get a more diverse thought process to bring it in when the decision making happens. So, and I'm not talking just extension, I think healthcare has a tremendous component as well. When it comes to main campus, we talk about main campus, so I still have understanding that I'm trying to capture when it comes to that organizational structure with University of Kentucky. And if and I'm sure there are others out there as well. But I do appreciate your seeking input and your listening, and I've always appreciated that about you and Dr. Monday.
- Chair Ellis: For those last three hands, please type up your question and you can either send it to me, put it in that form, or send it to Chris. You're all still welcome to provide that feedback. But we do want to wrap up. All the comments you all have shared here are insightful, not just for the President and Dr. Monday, but also for me as your current chair and information that I can pass on to future chairs. This is very much, not a siloed operation. It's not just the president running from group to group, asking for input. They are taking this very seriously. So, you know, what does the final format look like? What does the final development for Staff and Staff Senate look like? We're working on that, and that's not a silent conversation. Please know that even though this is a quick turnaround and a quick month, we are doing a lot of these sessions. There is so much input and such a thorough investigation of this this topic that I feel confident that we are going to get somewhere great with it, and a lot of the questions might come down to the details. For example, let us say we keep the Staff Senate body the way it is, but do we need to change the details internally? And how do we better communicate what shared governance is? How do we better communicate these issues or these items that we need staff to be involved in? With administrative developments and advancement, technological developments in advancement comes our bodies, development, and advancement. Without your all voice and your critiques and your ideas, we're not going to be able to adapt. If you have further ones, and you aren't

	in one of our committees that is meeting with Eric more directly. You are more than welcome to submit using that form, or you can send it to me or someone else you feel comfortable sharing that your feedback.
3. Trustee Report	• Dave Melanson provided the update. • D. Melanson shared the chair's report and the resolution that the Board passed at the last meeting on the Teams channel so whenever you want, you can read what was approved at the Board Meeting. • The Board has tasked the President and his team to come back with some recommendations, so we will see what those look like. Today was a big part of it as well as the listening session that are taking place across campus. There will be two readings of whatever is brought back from the President and there will also be two readings to any changes to the regulations as we always do. That's part of the process, so we will see what it looks like. • Thankful for you all and what you did today was pretty cool to hear you sharing. This is an important opportunity – this is a great opportunity for Staff Senate and staff governance to establish the ability to have a greater voice. • Dave is one of 20 Board Members, and he represents all staff. He's very proud that he works off-campus, too. • Would like to about the FCRS that he posted in Teams earlier. There has been a lot happening in UK Healthcare and he's gotten a lot of questions about what is going on with the expansion. FCR 13, 14 of the finance committee report, bylines 13, 14, 15, and 16 discuss the expansion of UK Healthcare into Madison Co. This will entail doing renovations to that faculty and the Board approved several things that will include mammography, x-ray, and tomography scan, mobile imaging MRI. There will also be a retail pharmacy location and a UK Physical Therapy clinic. • We are looking to expand into Georgetown, but there's nothing assigned to Georgetown yet and they're still looking for spaces. • FCR 17 – another location is Frankfort, and this project is in the Frankfort Regional Hospital. This new lease will be home to a retail pharmacy and primary care clinics – unsure which ones now. We have been partners with Frankfort Regional Medical Center for years. This is continuing that relationship. • Hamburg expansion – will be a P3 – a public private partnership. It's in the early phases, but we have purchased the land, but nothing has moved forward yet even though the Board has given their approval to move forward. • Another exciting thing that there's going to be another new parking structure that will be over at the new Markey Cancer Center. • Question: Timelines on these buildings? : ○ D. Melanson: They're already doing stuff at the Richmond location, and he can get you a more formal date, but construction and such is happening already in Richmond, so I would say possibly sometime this year. Georgetown does not have a location yet. Frankfort has started but will be behind the Richmond location. Also look at another space in the Georgetown Road/Newtown Pike area but have not found a space yet for that location.

- Chair Ellis: if you have sent a question to the "Staff Senate" user in Zoom, it is not actively being monitored, so please send those to Chris Larmour.
    - I. Jabbour: Are those expansions taking into consideration having enough space for employees to park and not have to pay an arm and a leg since most of our employees do not make $100,000 plus?
        - D. Melanson: I think that will be a very appealing part of these places, there will not be any paid parking. Like the Turfland location where there is plenty of free patient parking and employee parking.
    - M. Adams: The image itself at this point will be positive for us. We must take charge of that. I sent it to the President last Friday, but we must identify what shared governance is to us and how we see our role in the shared governance with the University. They are open to that. Did you ever get the any information from the consultants about our peers that have Staff Senate?
        - D. Melanson: We asked in the meeting. One thing that was not mentioned about in his report was that they are looking through all the AR, which we have one that controls Staff Senate, so we are going to get comparative data from other Staff Senates look like at other institutions. Do not have it at this point but will get it. Would bee good for this body to look at it to see how we compare across other institutions.
    - Question from Audience: I know I've spoken up today already, but I love higher ed policy, so I'm really interested in this. I was at the Senate meeting the other day and really appreciate the way you spoke up and immediately brought Staff Senate into the conversation. My question for you and Chair Ellis is what pieces do you need from us to make sure that the conversation move forward? I know you have guys have done a really good job building relations, but right now I think we have an opportunity in this moment in time where we can maybe push for not just influence at this point, but a seat at the table. So what pieces do you need from us?
        - D. Melanson: I will let Chair Ellis answer from her side, but from my side is report, share your opinions and thoughts with me. If there's something that you think we should be doing or if there's something at a different institution that's being done or if you've heard about something, we would love to hear about it. I don't take part in any of these sessions and give feedback, it's not my role, my role is to listening and trying to figure out what you're suggesting we do. I think one of the things that came from this, we have a new faculty trustee Ballard, what we need more local control for faculty issues. I've been a senator for 6.5-7 years and no faculty trustee has ever asked to meet with me to go over a topic ever. My fellow trustees ask me all the time, I get texts every week asking me what is happening on campus.
        - Chair Ellis: I need you all to speak up in these spaces and committees that are having conversations. You need to

because I am one person and I am the elected chair, but I'm still just one voice. Whenever I tell leaders that staff don't feel as though their voice is being taken as strongly as a faculty member, they'll go yeah but when they hear 5, 10, 15 people, the whole Senate body saying something similar, they go "oh okay…" Mike Adams has been a past chair, Troy Martin has been a past chair, Jon Gent has been a past chair and everyone of us have tried to advocate on behalf of staff and I do think we have been heard, I do think we have been listened to, but the weight is much stronger when you there's 130 voices also yielding the hammer, right? So, I'm not saying you have to agree, that is not my intent, my job is to represent a holistic view. I don't work in healthcare, extension, or student success. I'm doing my best with the information that you give me. But I also need you all to speak up as senators and as employees as well because that's what really pushes our dial in favor.

- Chat question: What is the Board of Trustee's ultimate end goal with the shared governance review? Are there any specific priorities that will change?
  - D. Melanson: I do not know. The Board is not involved in developing or deciding what is in the curriculum.
- M. Thompson: I think it can be challenging to speak up with the leadership. Personally, I do not feel their body language is receptive or sincere to what I'm saying so that makes me not want to speak up in the future. But feel that some other senators feel the same way – that when we do speak up, there's no acknowledgement or sincere appreciation for it. Also, D. Melanson, how can we change the climate where they are exchanging with them to make sure the connection is there?
  - D. Melanson: I have great engagement with the Board of Trustees, they ask my opinion constantly – how I feel about topics, how staff feel about topics, etc. The 16 appointments, they ask my opinion about a lot of things and I'm a committee chair. It takes work and it takes effort, but I am really proud of the relationship that I've built with the BOT.
- In-person question: I want to thank you and Chair Ellis for your leadership. I'm not surprised that the faculty have not asked your opinion, but I think this new one there's a not more hope for that. I've heard really good stuff about him from students. From staff that I have talked to have shared with me, I think they feel kind of like second rate citizens at the University as compared to faculty. Idon' twat it to be like an us vs. them thing, but I would love for it to be less adversarial. I am wondering if this is maybe why we haven't had the type of engagement we'd like from outside the Senate body, or where we think they are having trouble understanding the charge from the President or what our role is because we are constantly being omitted. I am in workgroup 5 and they went through the whole thing with Deloitte and when you've been omitted

so many times, it's like it becomes intentional. We aren't saying we need to be in charge of the institution, but staff want to be considered part of the voice and have a voice at the table and be asked what we think and be part of the equation when things are being decided. You all have done an amazing job at having influence and respect of our partners and I hope that doesn't change with this shared governance thing, but I hope that you can advocate for us to have an equal seat at the table, because we deserve it.
    - D. Melanson: Thank you, really. I know you feel like people aren't listening, but I am. I hope others know that, too and I am going to take these comments back with me.
- K. Hardesty: I completed my Masters in Higher Education through UK and It's something we talked about a lot is the weird divide between staff and faculty on a lot of campuses that would often times seem adversarial. I think that especially because the university is so large that we get siloed. There a lot of times that the only interactions we have with faculty are through email or when policy bumps against an agenda and they are unhappy about it., even when ultimately they are the ones who wrote the policy. I just think that there's a weird culture shift because we're so isolated, and that kind of breaking that down could really help going forward, and would help us all to help students, and then thereby to help the Commonwealth.
- J. Sumner: A lot of things I hear from constituents in my area and has happened to me, is that not just the University Senate, but from the many decision-making committees within the university that would strongly affect your role, your job and you were never involved in part of the decision-making process. Dr. Capilouto is asking is to view this as a magic wand to redo shared governance and what would that look like? I think, maybe, that the University Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government don't exist in their current forms. Maybe we are one university senate that has representation from all parts of campus and then our sub committees get formed based on who we are representing, maybe we have a Senate and House of Representatives where the House of Representatives is similar to Staff Senate and Senate is representing colleges. I'm excited about the opportunity we have to make some really big changes.
- I. Jabbour: So, I am feeling and something I've gathered firsthand and from talking to people – we are far from reaching or talking about shared governance because still today we are building buildings or making decisions without consulting the people that may know better about whatever needs to be built. I heard that after the built Central Pharmacy was built that none of the pharmacists were asked about the space when it was being built. So, the question is why are we talking about the bigger stuff when the little stuff like this isn't being addressed?
- R. Earls: I think if we had more transparency about how decisions are made or why decisions are made it would go a long way to boost staff morale.

	▪ D. Melanson: It sounds like there' a theme and something we clearly need to work on and chat about. Can both of these things be tackled at the same time? I think shared governance is on multiple levels. I think right now the Board of Trustees is looking at it at a university-wide level. Maybe a continued project after this is addressed is some guidelines to help push down into individual unit decision-making. ○ C. Brown: Want to speak on the project management piece you spoke about. I was said that your department's intent is to always talk to the folks that are going to occupy the space and I can tell you in my first 9-months here I was asked to start a second clinic which I did. But I will tell you, no one talked to me, my physicians about what was needed in the space. It was basically laid out for us. They had my clinical clean supply room clear in the far back corner where my staff would have to leave the clinic and go through three doors to get clean supplies which is crazy! I can tell you that it doesn't always happen, and I could have saved them a lot of money if they just had a conversation with me. They ordered things for my department that we don't even use and didn't get the supplies we really needed. ○ C. Ramey: Have been discussing with our faculty here in Princeton about these reviews of shared governance and what has come up (these faculty have administrative experience) that we're here for the students because that's why the university exists, and I've heard it over the years that you can't have the students without the faculty, but you can't have either if you don't have a knowledgeable staff to support either of those groups. It's my opinion that until staff is acknowledged, recognized and rewarded for their contributions and until we incentivize staff to stay in a job, we're losing critical institutional knowledge in every area that keeps this university going. It just seems that in recent years all our processes have become more complicated, not less. You change things constantly and when changes are made, it's like people go back to the very beginning instead of looking at where we are currently THEN making changes from that point forward. The shared governance discussions have been around how things just seem to be more complicated now than they ever have. And it just seems like stress levels are higher and it just feels like we need to be focusing on some of these shared governance discussions on ways to have better retention of staff. so that you have that institutional knowledge retained.
4. Guest Speakers:	•
5. Officer Reports	• Chair: O. Ellis ○ Appreciation T-shirt orders are open and her inbox is flooded. This year its set up where individuals have to order their own t-shirts, but understand there are some departments that don't have computer

	access or have other needs and have reached out to Chair Ellis individually. ○ Interviews for the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs have concluded and should hopefully have some movement in the hiring process soon. Chair Ellis participated in this interview committee and brought of staff concerns where she could and Dr. DiPaola said he was glad that she was there representing the staff in these decisions. ○ If you have additional feedback on the shared governance aspect, there is a specific feedback link you can use and will have Parliamentarian Larmour post it in Teams. ○ Bobbi Jo is doing well. She anticipates being back in April, probably not in person, but slowly coming back into work and I will work on her priorities so please continue to be patient with us as we are all managing more than any of us can handle. Bobbi Jo does a lot so keep her in your thoughts and reach out to her if you haven't. ○ HR is moving. Information about who is moving and where they're moving can be found on their website. Please have grace and patience to our HR Team as they are being impacted. ○ UK at Work Survey results are out and have been out for a while. The EC got a briefer with Catie Lasley the other day about those results at the university level. I encourage you to check out those results online as well and send us any questions you have. ○ Bylaws amendment discussion. Today is just discussion, no vote. The information has been sent out via Teams and was email to the senate body and there have been opportunities for comments in those spaces, but I wanted to be sure we had time to discuss it in our meeting today. The intention of this amendment is to codify the idea that the Chair, when elected, would be elected for a 2-year term. So instead of it being 2023-2024 and 2024-2024, it would be 2023-2025. The intention with this amendment is to address specifically the Chair. IF there is any conversation or desire to consider other officers, that's separate. If an amendment like this passes, we would then look at another amendment to address the other officers. ▪ Question 1: Would the longer term make it harder to find someone to run for chair? • Chair Ellis: it is already hard to find someone to run for Chair. Honestly, this stability might actually make it easier because you can plan a little further ahead. But it is a concern and needs to be addressed. If the Chair doesn't want to continue into a second year, they have the right to resign and set down from the position. ▪ Question 2: What if we don't like the Chair after a year? • Chair Ellis: You always have a right to bring a vote of no confidence. There are ways that you can all someone up for not fulfilling their duties and those are outlined in our bylaws and sops, or a parliamentarian can help you with that.

	○ Current Article 2 states that Staff Senate shall elect officers to serve for one year, or until their respective successors have been elected and seated. Whomever is elected in the Spring will start on July 1 of the next academic year. ○ L. Harned: is there a current term limit for the Chair or the other officers? ▪ Chair Ellis: there currently is no term limit, but if there's a desire for a term limit that would be a separate amendment to the bylaws. ○ M. Trudeau: I was curious if there was any discussion about instead of adding a year to the term that we could move the officer elections up by like a month to have a longer overlap between chairs so that they could have more context and training before starting the new role? ▪ Chair Ellis: that has been a conversation and there have bene 2 ways that conversation has gone. 1) we can make that change and change the timing of our elections easily, so that is something that we could pursue with or without this passing. Bylaws committee has specifically talked about that. We didn't want to bring up a bunch of changes at once. There was discussion about if this passed then bringing up changing the processes during the election process. We agree that it would make sense and be more helpful to move the officer elections earlier. ○ A. Hornsby: Not sure if this is a conversation that needs to happen fully here. If someone from healthcare who had a more patient-focused role, who would this change in term of how they apply with their supervisor? Because I'm assuming the Chair Role is a 50/50 split where their pay funding comes from, correct? ▪ Chair Ellis: Right now, if someone wants to run for chair, they have to have supervisor approval. In this if the two-year term passes and the candidate could tell their supervisor that the expectation is a two-year term, but at the end of the first year we can re-assess if this is a good fit for their role in the job and make the decision to continue into the second year or possibly resign and move back to their job. ▪ A. Hornsby: my thought behind asking is neither for or against the 2-year term, but more thinking towards the future where we have more senators from healthcare and if one ran for Chair, I wouldn't want any undue hardship on that. But it's helpful to know that they could stop after one year if they need to. ▪ Chair Ellis: I think that's an important thing to consider as well. Two years, in my opinion as the current chair, is a safety net and a planning space. But that conversation with the supervisor needs to happen and is critical that there's a game plan in place to reassess at certain timeframes if the arrangement is still working out for all parties involved. So, this amendment, the intention behind it is to provide space that if someone doesn't have to worry about their role when

they're in it, they can go ahead and build those relationships and focus long term instead of going short term, unless they have to. That's the reality. We haven't had a patient-focused chair. How do we adjust our body in the way it operates to accommodate someone like that?

- J. Sumner: My question is very similar to the one I had last year. Why are we singling out the Chair role versus all the officers? It's not just about the chair because it is changing 2.1.1 which is about all officers. What is the reasoning? The Vice-Chair has to fill in for the Chair, do they not have the same issue that the Chair does? My thoughts on this would be if that relationship building is the issue with this, could we look at changing the officers where it is a role where you elect the Vice-Chair and then the Vice-Chair roles into the Chair role the next year. I have a problem with extending these offices to reduce the amount of time to where others could take the role. I've been a senator for around 8 years and we've had 2 chairs the whole time. I think that could be an issue with this body, not getting enough new representation – no offense to Chair Ellis or Past-Chair Gent. But I think that little turnover is healthy.
  - Chair Ellis: While the Vice-Chair does fill in for the Chair as needed, the roles are very different. There are very few circumstances where the Vice-Chair can act as the chair in the sense of being the voice of the Staff Senate body. The Vice-Chair also does not have a required time commitment. It is still fully volunteer where ethe Chair role is required to give half of their working time to the position. In my role as Chair, I have done a lot in this role to include Vice-Chair Chafin a bit more to help with the load, especially since Bobbi Jo has been out. About 80% of what the Chair has to do is never seen by the Staff Senate or the staff in general. So that's one of the reasons we are specifically looking at the Chair's term and not the other officers. The relationship building and those conversations have to start hard and fast and they don't stop. Having 2 years to build relationships and to think about the future. Another point you brought you about the number of Chairs in your time as a Senator, if I remember correctly, there has only been one opposed election. Some people weren't running for Chair. Is 2 years prohibitive? Great question! But we have elections for Chair every year and people aren't going for it. So, is it worth it to keep that up annual let's do an elections/re-elections? Two years seems like a long time, but it does go by fast. If during the two-years if you want someone else in, you can call someone for not doing their job. I'm not trying to lessen the argument, Justin as it is a fair point. We don't have a big change in leadership quite often and that's a good thing, because we have more and more relationships that we are building, and we are getting stronger.
  - J. Sumner: With the relationship building, looking at the University Senate what is their timeline, and they rotate off

	and are in an ex-officio role at that role guiding the current Chair. With a role like this we should be very intentional and mindful of having new voices in this role. But I've had people who wrote me saying they want to run for Chair but that's "Olivia's Role", etc. I would love to run for Trustee one day, but Dave Melanson does such an amazing job, and I don't want to run against him. There aren't just rules that are keeping people from running, but they're not going to attempt those roles because someone else is wanting them. ▪ Chair Ellis: The Representative for University Senate as in the Senate Council Chair – they must be re-elected, and their election process is very different than ours. Their term is one year. They don't meet and vote in a body. They nominate names. If someone is able and capable and nominated, and no one else who was nominated wants to do it. That's who does it. As far as that being someone's role and they don't want to run against them – it's not. It's not my role, it's not Jon's role. We very much mean if you're interested, please run. It doesn't mean that maybe you think you can do a better job, it means that you want an opportunity at leadership and want to provide a different voice. Justin – run for Trustee. We are not glued to our power and our titles. This is beyond this amendment conversation, it is your responsibility to seek that out, and I will not take it personally, Dave will not take it personally. Courtney, Chris, Kaleb, Sarah, your committee chairs, none of us will take it personally because we want other people to be a part of this. That's why you all elected us. That's why you elected me to this position because one of my positions was, I want us to be treated more like people, you know, humans, first employees second, and that's what I ran on. But someone else can run on the same thing or can run on something different. And we must share that burden. I really challenge you all and encourage you to check, to challenge your own mindset, and don't make that excuse of oh, it's their role. Just run for it. It's not embarrassing if you if you lose, just run for it. If you are interested because you don't know how good you will be until you're doing it all right. We cannot run an election or a body on hypotheticals. I think it is our responsibility to make sure our bylaws, our SOPs, and our functions are least prohibitive as possible, while also strengthening the ability of this body and the leadership in this body to maintain connections and relationships and the goodwill of staffs in it. Justin, I hope you don't take that as like a personal attack against you in any way. But you're not the first person to mention that to me. And I really wanna make it clear that this is not my role. I expect people to start running for it. You don't have to do it this year if you're not

comfortable with it, but we need to have more competitive elections.

- M. Adams: a healthy body or organization you will see competition in leadership. Which is what we want here. We don't want it to get to the point where it's stagnant and we don't want to see that happen. We want to see people step up and take on leadership roles. We want to develop leaders through the Senate. Going back to the two-year thing, you have to pan ahead and in order to be able to do that, you need that time that the extended term will give you. Because by the time you get your feet under you, you're looking at re-election.
- T. Martin: I only did one year and wish that I had the ability to serve two years. You're just getting into the groove by the time elections come around. But we do have the practice of past-Chair that's helpful. I think mine was the longest of 4-years with Jon. But the past-chairs are there to assist and provide guidance and feedback to the current chair. There's always someone there to help the chair out.
- M. Trudeau: I'm more favor of the Chair two years less so of the others. Would also like to know how chairs are selected for each of the committees.
  - Chair Ellis: yes, that's a separate thing, but yes, understood.
- L. Harned: If this amendment passes and the Chair is elected for 2 years, and they step down after 1 year, will the Vice-Chair automatically become Chair since there's no scheduled election for Chair that year?
  - Chair Ellis: If the Chair steps down the Vice-Chair is acting Chair until the election can be held. Not meaning the next year, but until the next month or Staff Senate meeting is held to hold a vote. It's a short-term acting Chair.
  - C. Larmour: The Vice-Chair does not automatically become Chair but will preside over meetings when the Chair is unable or if the seat is vacant. An election for the rest of the Chair's term will happen at the next Main Body session and will serve out the remainder of the term.
- T. Keys: So Vice-Chair steps in until the next election and then the person elected would complete the originally elected term and if they so choose, could run again for another 2-year term. This doesn't have any restrictions on how many a person can run for an office.
  - C. Larmour: they can say they're stepping down at the end of a fiscal year to coincide with a general election.
- Chair Ellis: This did not come from me, this was a suggestion from me and the other chairs, but this is being proposed and was approved by the Bylaws committee then through the Executive Committee.
- K. Hahn: Don't think this has been mentioned, but this amendment will have no bearing on the elections we will be conducing in May. If a vote passes on this amendment, it will go into effect July 1, 2024, to be applied to the elections in May 2025.

	○ C. Larmour: This doesn't have to pass. As you may remember last year's meeting got kind of messy, so the Bylaws committee wanted to bring this back again this year to give it a fair consideration and allow discussion and people to think about it and vote as they see fit. If you don't feel this is a good idea, you're welcome to vote against it. Again, we just wanted to give it it's due diligence of conversation and consideration. • Chair Ellis: If you have disagreements, you're welcome to vote no. It will not offend us. Senator Hornsby and Senator Sumner made some very good points. • Vice-Chair: C. Chafin • Secretary: S. Steen ○ No Report • Treasurer: K. Grey ○ No Report • Parliamentarian: C. Larmour ○ No Report
6.	• Consent agenda approved unanimously. • Pulled reports: Employee Engagement, HAC ○ Employee Engagement – M. Thompson ▪ Wanted to remind everyone that we have many events coming up and will be posted in the Senate Teams. ○ Healthcare Advisory Committee – A. Hornsby ▪ Provided feedback on the 12th floor opening and had a large list of things to share with her. IF anyone has specific feedback, please reach out to Senator Hornsby or someone in HAC. ▪ Received a lot of questions about tech scheduling, surg pay and retirement and cost for insurance. These may bleed into benefits and will share if needed. ▪ Having a town hall in 2 weeks at our meeting with Parking. ▪ Met with Employee Engagement and get the Senate link more prominent on The Loop. ▪ IF you're thinking of running for a leadership role, please speak to those whose position that you want to run for and let them tell you everything involved. ▪ Understand there are a lot of people in healthcare that are not in our committee – remember you have a whole committee that is seeking feedback on the issues that you affect you. • I. Jabbour: Questions about the 12th floor? ○ A. Hornsby, please reach out to me directly.
7. Items from the Floor	• C. Harper made a motion to have a 5-minute recess to stretch legs since they have been sitting for over 2 hours. Motion passed and there was a 5-minute recess.

	• Sincerely thank you for speaking opening today about everything we have discussed. Please reach out to the officers if you have questions about running for the roles.
8. Adjournment	• Motion to adjourn by C. Larmour with a second from M. Perez. The meeting adjourned at 3:58pm.