

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE MEETING MINUTES

* * * * *

JANUARY 29, 2007

* * * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR

I N D E X

PAGES

MINUTES OF MEETING. 3-100

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE. 101

CHAIR TAGAVI: We have a couple of
obligatory stuff to take care of,
and then I'll turn it over to
Provost Subbaswamy. Approval of the
December 11, 2006, minutes, they have
been distributed. There were some
changes that was brought to our
attention. We have included those
in track changes. Are there any
further corrections or discussions
to be had? All right. Hearing none,
the minutes stand approved.
If you notice, Sheila is sitting
there all by herself for a couple
of reasons. One of them are
parliamentarian. Gifford Blyton is
not feeling good. He recently has
lost some weight, and I think he needs
a pacemaker. Whether he would get it
or not, we don't know. So, please,
I would ask you to keep him in your
prayers and your positive thoughts,
and I just wanted to let you know why
he's not here.
By Senate rule, of course, the Senate

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

could always waive its own rules. The Senate has also given Senate Council the power to waive rules and in extraordinary situations, Senate Council Chair could waive rules. But the requirement is that when this happens, we have to report it to you, and that's what I'm going to be doing. On December--on January 22, the Senate Council voted to approve two Education Abroad course changes, ISP/499 and IES/433, on behalf of the Senate. The application deadline of March 1 requires swift approval so students have sufficient time to fill out applications, et cetera. Both courses--of these courses serve for fee calculation purposes only. In other words, you have these students who go abroad, but for fee calculation here, they take these courses, but then they take some other courses abroad. The changes that was requested was, one, to allow a grade of "S" and switching to zero credit hours. It used to be maybe one to sixteen or one to eighteen. So Senate Council considers these nonacademic corrections or modifications, and on behalf of the Senate, this waiver was--we waived the rule so we could approve it so it doesn't have to go through Senate approval, and I'm refer--reporting it to you. Continuing, extension of transfer of KCTCS grades into UK GPA. Originally, it was decided that starting with grades issued in the fall 2006 we would no longer calculate KCTCS grades into UK GPA. But over the summer, some students were incorrectly advised to take KCTCS courses to increase UK GPA. The Registrar then contacted my office late December, in fact, very late December. If I remember correctly, it was the Friday before the campus was going to shut down, and I asked the Registrar how much time do I have, and he said a couple of hours. So I contacted--of course, I could have given the extension. It was recommended that we extend this by one more semester and no further. I could have done that, but I wrote to my Senate Council members over the listserv, and I got unanimous support. And as a result, I went ahead and granted the extension. This is not a new waiver, but continue doing what we were doing for years and years and years for one more semester, and Senate Council members made sure I would tell the Registrar and

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

everybody involved that no more. One more. I also--on behalf of the Senate Council, I waived SR 5.1.8.5.A.2, which is a two-year window for retroactive withdrawal. What happened was, we received the complete application on December 15, which was within the two-year window, but the Retroactive Withdrawal Committee could not make a decision before the two-year window was over, so I went ahead and approved that waiver. And the rationale that I used was two. One is, a proposal is in the works, so that--to apply the two-year window to submission of RWA application, as opposed to presently where it is for the committee to make the decision. And Senate Council has routinely, in the past, given a waiver to students in similar circumstances. Therefore, I acted on behalf of the Senate Council and approved the waiver. Okay. The next item of the agenda is the White paper on a revision of USP to continue UK's general education reform effort. Provost Swamy, if I could give a couple of introductory things quickly just to bring everybody to the present situation, we started with External Review Committee of the USP. There was also an Internal Review Committee. They began deliberation July 20, 2005, and final report was submitted May 2006. Members of that committee, which I have informed and I invited them to be here today, are Alan DeSantis, Chair Emeritus; Tony Hardin; Jeff Osborne; Jane Peters; Bill Rayens, the Chair of the committee; and Jane Wells. After that, there was a GERA Committee, began deliberation fall 2004; final report was submitted to you all in October 2006, not too long ago. Members are Phil Kraemer, Ruth Beatty, Richard Greissman, Deborah Moore, Connie Ray, Ernie Yanarella, Larry Grabau, Jane Jensen, Norman Pettigo (phonetically), William Rayens, and Rebecca Scott, Gerald Smith, and I was also ex-officio on that committee. The following resolution grew out of the presentation of GERA's final report to Senate Council, and it was then brought to the Senate. It said that the Senate Council, with attention to general comments offered in the University Senate's review of GERA's final report, worked with the Provost to propose curriculum models; generate a new course structure, and

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

establish a plan for a curriculum implementation. As a result of that resolution, which was approved on October 9, '06, meeting, then a White paper on a revision of USP--sorry--a USP Reform Steering Committee was appointed by myself. This effect is kind of new to me. That was not the effect that I put in there, so if it's too flashy, I apologize. So we had a joint charge from Provost Subbaswamy and myself sent to the members of this committee which says, to work with all relevant stakeholders to generate a concrete curricular framework for a new general education program for the University of Kentucky and get it passed by the University Senate by May 15, 2007. The members of that committee--oh, by the way, additional resources regarding this effort are on the website, and these are the additional resources. Please, if you haven't looked at them now, you could look at them in the future. The Steering Committee members, and as I read the names, if you are here, please stand up so everybody would see you and I know you are here. Kim Anderson? She is not here. Larry Grabau? Larry Grabau has a class. He will be a few minutes late, he has told me. Steven Hoch? Thank you for coming. Nancy Johnson, I have--yes. Thank you. Phil Kraemer? Okay. I did everybody. The first two was initiated by the Senate Council, and the next two was suggested by the Provost, and Phil Kraemer, of course, is the natural choice to be chairing this committee. The Provost then proposed a White paper in order to jump start the effort of the Steering Committee, not meant--this is not meant to be considered the final report. And today, neither the Provost, nor the Steering Committee, are here to "defend" this proposal, but rather we would like to have a conversation so that we would engage the Steering Committee. The Provost has told me that after his brief presentation and introduction of the White paper, he has to be somewhere, so he will be leaving and the rest of us would then engage the Steering Committee. The Provost also shared the White paper with the faculty in an area mass e-mailing that, I trust, everyone of you have received it. Today we will give input and engage the Steering Committee regarding the White paper.

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

So--no, not yet. Provost, please.

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Thank you very much. I really don't want to take a lot of time. First of all, I want to commend the Senate Council for its leadership in calling this meeting. I think that, in itself, shows the seriousness with which the Senate is approaching this USP reform effort. USP or general education reform in this country at universities sort of gets a lot of attention and goes through a revision almost every 20 years. You can sort of look at this. It started in the '60s with Harvard, and Harvard has actually sat out one cycle and has just woken up in the last--in this current cycle, but most universities have gone through two cycles every 20 years or so. And so, really, what started here in July 2004, or thereabouts, is a natural part of what has been going on in the country, and to a great many regards, you are to be complimented as a faculty because you're ahead of the curve, in fact. This effort, I did not start it, as Mr. Tagavi, Dr. Tagavi, Professor Tagavi, Senate Council Chair Tagavi has indicated, and it's really a natural process. I take my cue, I think, as most of us did, from the July 2005--the preliminary report from the DeSantis report, which kind of laid out an agenda. It said, to help facilitate this change--the change in USP, the committee recommends the following, and I read--and I quote from that. Campus-wide conversations that actively seek out ideas and opinions from all faculty members. And that did take place in the context of the GERA, General Education Reform and Assessment Committee, and it was a year-and-a-half long process. Strong and influential implementation by a task force that can command attention and respect from the campus at large. This is a jointly-appointed steering group apart from the GERA Committee and the DeSantis Committee. The current Steering Committee is, in fact, I hope you'll agree, is a highly-qualified and a small committee in order to really meet frequently and be able to move this agenda along. Then strong, top-down leadership that can push the faculty out of its inertia--not my words--and into participatory change. And I think to the extent that there is any faculty inertia at all--I don't believe there is any--this is really my role--my

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

role in synthesizing in the form of a White paper, not only the internal conversations that had been taking place within this campus and within this university, but also bringing it--bringing the external conversation, national conversation, on the liberal education and American promise, the LEAP that I borrowed for this purposes--for this purpose, from the AAC&U, American Association of Colleges and Universities, ten-year effort. They started in 2005, and it's meant to be a ten-year effort, ongoing effort, to try to change the general education conversation and practices in this country. And many states, in fact, by the way, have adopted the AAC&U model and the AAC&U call for statewide efforts, Wisconsin and Ohio, among others; Florida, I believe also. So if you go to their website, you'll see that we're, in fact, a part of that national conversation as well. Then reward system for faculty who commit time and energy towards undergraduate reform. Obviously, we need to talk a lot more about this, but certainly, in the White paper, I suggest that this summer, if we charge a particular--a faculty group with fleshing out the details of the program, and so forth, then they will be paid, you know, summer salary, and so forth, plus doing the resources necessary to flesh all of this out. And then ongoing, I think they will be in a position to recommend what other resources need to be put into this. Unambiguous and unconditional commitment to doing no harm to graduate programs that depend on an intricate relationship with USP for funding. I think that goes without saying. I mean, I think that if we don't separate those two, then it'll all come back to, again, a question of resources, and we will not be able to bring about the kinds of changes that are forward looking. Then realistic and honest levels of funding, and I think it's important to have both terms in there, realistic and honest, so you have--so that's a two-way commitment. It has to be realistic on the one side and honest on the other side, and that's an ongoing conversation. For meaningful and significant reform to take place, funding is a necessity. Doing more with less is a (inaudible) anathema, I agree. So with that premise, then, this is, as I said, a natural part

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

of the way we are. I really don't want to go over the structure of the White paper itself or the suggested curriculum framework, because that's really what needs to be discussed by yourself. I just want to leave you with the following thoughts. I've been in this business a long time, so there are certain ways of doing business that I have learned which I have found to be very effective. So as you enter into this dialogue, which--you know, over the next couple of months, I'd like you to always enter it with the notion of constructive criticism. And my definition of constructive criticism--some of you have heard this before--is, when you say, I don't like it to something that's put forward in front of you, you have to say because and explain, and then say--follow it with, therefore, I suggest. Simply saying I don't like it is not constructive criticism. So please enter into all of this debate with I don't like it because--explain your objections, and then therefore, I suggest. Then other mistakes we make when we have collective deliberations, and I hope you will all avoid this, as--there are certain policy-making don'ts that I want to share with you. You already know this. Do not enter into policy-making by anecdote. You know, I had a friend whose son was a student in physics and do you know what happened? That is no basis for forming curricular changes or forming policy changes. Then the other is policy-making by autobiography. When I was a student, you should think--you know what the program was like, et cetera. Well, that's irrelevant. We're looking forward. So that's also not a good practice. And then policy-making by what I call the bandwagon effect, just jump onto a bandwagon. I mean, having said that, I brought you onto the AAC&U LEAP bandwagon. No, I hope not, because it's really drawing from what discussions have taken place internally, and it just simply maps it on--or grafts it on to a national conversation. And then I guess ultra-pessimism and ultra-optimism are also to be avoided. That is, if you approach this by saying, oh, our Kentucky students could never do it, or it would never work at a research university. Of course, it won't work because you started out with that

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT
premise. And likewise, ultra optimism in the sense of saying, yes, you know, the resources are limitless or changes are an unlimited scope. I mean, we need to be a little pragmatic as well. So some of these are sort of common sense principles for any collective deliberation. And with those caveats, I, again, thank you very much for engaging in this dialogue so quickly, and I hope you'll sustain your interest and engagement in it through its completion. With that, I'll leave you to the...

CHAIR TAGAVI: Thank you, Provost. Phil, as the chair of the Steering Committee, would you like to say anything?

PHIL KRAEMER: I'd rather not say anything. Actually, I think our role--and the whole committee--most members are here, so let's--and there really would be nothing to say. If you've read the White paper and have read the e-mail across campus, we're still looking for feedback, and the date of that is February 15th. I want a conspicuous (inaudible) what I hear here, but also encourage you that beyond today--offer whatever it is you have to say, and the Steering Committee is going to take all of that quite seriously. We've met a couple of times. We've begun to talk about what this White paper idea looks like, but there's nothing that I'd rather share with you about that. I think we're still at the same phase that I hope most of you are at considering this is a very good opportunity for the university. I encourage us to talk about this in ways that may be more and more on the optimistic side that the Provost warned us about than the pessimistic side. This is a chance to be ambitious. This is a chance to maybe think of something that is not being done elsewhere at our benchmark, so perhaps we concur on something. With that, I'd rather just hear the conversation, so we're not here to defend the Provost's White paper. If the conversation turns bad, it's going to Swamy's White paper, but I think it won't turn bad. I think there's a lot that's there; a lot of it's challenging. It certainly looks very different in the framework we've had, and I think it should look very different. It's been a long time. I see my colleague, Lou Swift, is here, that could recount the history of the existing USP program, and I

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

think we've been remiss in not looking as closely as we should at general education given what we are as a research university and where we are now in the nation with higher education.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Lou, I just noticed you a few seconds before Phil mentioned you--your name. I'm glad you are here. I meant to send you an e-mail several weeks ago, and I messed it up and I called your assistant. If that's why you're here, I really appreciate the short notice. Could you please get up so everybody would see you because your name is synonymous, as far as I know, with USP, so I appreciate you coming here, and please let us know your thoughts and input.

LOU SWIFT: Well, obviously, I'm very interested, and I'm delighted that the faculty (inaudible) needed. And Swamy was right. Every 20 years, the university has to do this or should do it.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Thank you for being here. All right, let's start the dialogue. If I could ask you, please direct your questions to me rather than having side discussions that sometimes happens. I will--if there are many, many questions, and I hope there are, I will not go to a person for a second time until everybody who wants to speak for the first time has spoken, so let's start. Raffi?

RAPHAEL FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering. It seems to me that when I think of a universities study program, I think of a set of course requirements. Now, the White paper says that's not the right way to think of it. We should think of learning outcomes, and that makes sense to me, but how, after it's all finished, do we avoid ending up just with a list of course requirements, maybe new courses, but just a list of course requirements? So it's a question, not a suggestion.

CHAIR TAGAVI: When a question is asked, I would like to give the Steering Committee members the first crack, and then, of course, if one of the other senators wants to agree, disagree, extend, engage, please let me know. Any of the Steering Committee members would like to respond to that comment? I know you are here because I asked you to get up when I was mentioning your name earlier.

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

PHIL KRAEMER: Anyone on the Steering Committee can handle any of these. I don't want to stand, though, in a sense giving you the answer as if there is one. I think at some point we do talk about any curriculum in terms of courses. I hope it's not just a list of courses. I thought--I hope it has a coherence to it and a framework--is an intelligent framework that would justify whatever course listings we have, and the Steering Committee was very concerned about the coherence of the framework to avoid a banquet of courses that are fulfilled in isolation, something on the national scene being described as less intentional. We want this to be an intentional framework where the pieces make sense and they fit together. So I thought--I guess the answer would be, we avoid that. I don't know how, but we avoid it.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Are there any comments regarding that question?

BOB GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and--

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Interrupting) Bob Grossman?

BOB GROSSMAN: --Arts and Sciences. But along those lines, though, your--what your comment brought to mind was the old cross-disciplinary requirement of USP, which was just an absolute nightmare to administer and made no sense to the students. So, you know, when you talk about a coherent set of courses and how important it is to keep the coherency together--the coherence. You--it could turn into just an exercise and check the boxes just as easily as a list of required courses, so I guess my suggestion would be, when you--when it comes down to brass tacks, that you be aware of that problem and don't, in trying to avoid having a list of courses, go too far overboard the other way and make the whole thing impossible for anyone to understand in terms of what the students have to do to graduate in four years. That's a suggestion along Swamy's line.

CHAIR TAGAVI: One thing I meant to mention I forgot, if you notice, in a couple of our title power point, I had discussion only, which means we are not here to approve or disapprove anything; we are here to discuss. One other point, Deborah Moore, who is involved in the assessment, wrote us and said she's engaged and she cannot be here until 4:00. So if there are any assessment questions, I would

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

appreciate if you hold it until 4:00 when she's here. I saw a hand here, and then we'll go over there. Name?

RAY FORGUE: Ray Forgue for Family Studies. Your question led me to think in terms of--you've got these learning outcomes and, of course, we can make a checklist of those and say that these courses will get you these different outcomes and integrate it all, but I'm always concerned about the students who will leave here not knowing what they know. And the degree to which we can make this program such that the students can say after leaving it--we may have to be real in their face about this (inaudible), but let them know that as a result of going through USP, you have certain knowledge bases, certain skills and certain tools, a bag of tricks, so to speak, that you could then, you know--and we ask students to write resumes, and on the resume they're supposed to say--you know, make it a listing of what you can do and bring to some organization that they'll go to work for to the degree that they could come out of a program being able to enunciate that so that they would know why they took it; what they've got out of it; and what they can then use it for. I think that'd be a big step.

CHAIR TAGAVI: These are very good questions. I would ask you to indulge my--let me limit further comments related to this question, and if we exhaust this, then we go to the next person. Are there any comments regarding this--to this comment? Ernie?

ERNIE YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella, Department of Political Science. I would hope that the Steering Committee, as it proceeds, would bear in mind very carefully what both the External Review Committee and GERA sought to suggest in terms of a way to use this phrase now, a way forward since it's taken on a certain political spin in the national political media. But I think in order to go forward with this reform, I think that there are a couple of really important things that came out of that report. One is the issue of identity. We were concerned with thinking about how to move beyond university studies in a way that students and faculty and advisors had a clear sense of what all the general education--the thrust of general education was intended. One of the

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

proposals that I recommended was thinking about this in terms of 21st century studies to give this a kind of identity, or to use the president's term, a brand that students could carry around in their heads and think about in terms of what it is that general education is seeking to do. A second thing that we talked about, and this plays off of the last comments, is in what direction was--is this new general education framework inclined? Is it going to orient itself more towards a kind of distributional requirement, which I think USP evolved into, although, Lou, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that when USP was initially articulated, there were some large goals or objectives that underpinned, but that tended, however, to get marginalized the longer that USP was institutionalized and to the degree at which--in which that program was not reviewed in a timely manner. So I think that a second key recommendation that emanated from both ERC and GERA was that we orient any new curricular reform in general education towards an outcome-based approach, one that was to underline the kinds of outcomes that we expected students to gain over a period of their four or six years of undergraduate education here. And then finally--I don't think that I'm overly anticipating what Deb will say--in orienting any general education reform effort towards an outcome-based approach, we felt it really important to link very tightly such a reform to ongoing and continuing assessment. Assessment of what? Assessment of the overall program. Assessment of what? Assessment of courses. An assessment of what--not specific faculty efforts, but rather to the issue of the program and courses so that corrections could be made, as we perhaps saw the cross-disciplinary requirement began to go by the wayside. There could be efforts made by an ongoing body to bring that back into the basic fold. So as we proceed, I think these three elements are really quite crucial, and I would hope that the Steering Committee, as it proceeds over the next month or two, will bear these in mind and, I would hope, integrate them into whatever materializes through this ongoing conversation and perhaps comes back to the University Senate.

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

- CHAIR TAGAVI: There was a question here.
Name, please. If you could introduce yourself.
- DIANE SNOW: Diane Snow, Med Center. I see mention in the document a focus group with students, but what I've heard and seen so far sounds very top-down. Are there actually constructive statements that have come from, in particular, past students who are out in the world that say, my education was lacking this because and I suggest in the format that Swamy told us to use? Are there--is there any kind of input like that from the students?
- CHAIR TAGAVI: I don't know if--the Steering Committee started very recently. I don't know if they have (inaudible) students, so--but I can ask my friend, Ernie Yanarella, because under his leadership, he held--how many forums?
- ERNIE YANARELLA: We had 15 forums.
- CHAIR TAGAVI: Fifteen forums.
- ERNIE YANARELLA: This was a joint effort by the membership of GERA and Phil's leadership as well. We made an effort to have a student quorum. We made an extensive effort to do so, and as the student government association made it clear that it was not particularly interested in the formative phase of this process and that--from which we concluded, in talking with a number of these students, that their--they were--they would be most particularly interested in requirements and in classes--or curriculum, and so the--we would welcome, I think, the Steering Committee--the new Steering Committee to invite students, but I suspect that they will have a similar response.
- CHAIR TAGAVI: Any of the Steering Committee members have a response to that comment--the idea comment by--
- PHIL KRAEMER: (Interrupting) I would just add that I think there's still--as we go through this process, that we take the feedback and then we bring it forth to this body. When we bring it forth to this body, I think we have to bring it forth to students as well. That may be the time that we will try again to solicit input. In terms of your other question, which is, I think, even more important, the idea of what students are confronting once they leave our campuses, we did have one of the forums that brought together some individuals from the real world, business, et cetera, but a lot of the information that is circulating through AAC&U is

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

information has been gleaned from the kinds of surveys that have been given to recipients of curricula across the nation, and that has informed many of these principles that you see in the White paper itself, that there is a concern for the need for students to be quite flexible. This idea of lifelong learning is used so often that it becomes a bromide, but it's meaningful. They have to be flexible enough and have nimble enough minds to re-learn and re-tool across careers, and I think a lot of that is featured in the materials you can find not only on--I believe the GERA website is--Ernie, is that still there?

ERNIE YANARELLA: It's still up, yes.

CHAIR TAGAVI: It is up.

PHIL KRAEMER: But it informed many of the national reports that are available for us all to look at, and I think much of what Swamy included was informed by that as well.

CHAIR TAGAVI: By the way, one way to ensure students vigorous input would be to say USP courses would have plus and minus for the grade. Those of you who remember what happened last time, you know what I'm talking about.

VOICE: Are you suggesting that, Kaveh?

CHAIR TAGAVI: Okay. Back there, please introduce yourself.

JOANNA BADAGLIACCO: Joanna Badagliacco from Sociology and Discovery Seminar Program, and I notice that there is a discussion at least brought up in here about an experience, a capstone experience, and I'm wondering--I have many questions, but one of them is: What about an experience when the students first come in? We had a lot of success with smaller classes where their expectations are raised as to what they would expect, not only of themselves but also of their professors with regard to learning. So I wonder if--and with the comments on where smaller classes or a first-year experience might be for students? And my other half of the question--or second question, but I'm getting it in as the other half, is how do you deal with very large classes successfully in the first and second year and also get across that mentoring and that attention to students that they sometimes feel is daunting?

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any response to that

comment?

PHIL KRAEMER: I hate to hog all the time in the Steering Committee, jump in whenever you want. I think we have to keep our mind and eyes on the first-year experience, and I think the Steering Committee will be very concerned about that, although we're not talking about the curriculum. It would still be the framework, but I think the goal would be to present a framework proposal that made clear that, as we implement it, we're going to have to address that. We have to constrain any curriculum by the reality in which you operate, which is sources, large classes, numbers of students coming in, and hopefully we can decide a kind of framework that could be implemented in a way to address that, and that's an important signal to look for. But if we deliver to you something that simply ignores those issues, I think we've failed our mission.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Okay. Any other question? We are going to put the Steering Committee members' name up here so everybody knows who they are, because they are not speaking up. There you are. Larry Grabau, by the way, he said he will be late, and by God, he was late, but he is here. Any comments?

LARRY GRABAU: I'd just like to follow up on that, not by answering Joanna's very important question about the first-year experience, because I think that's something that the Steering Committee is going to have to really dig into. We have issues of retention; we have long-term issues of graduation rate, and so forth, and I think it's really crucial to focus a lot of attention and a lot of resources on that initial experience. The External Review Committee and GERA really thought long and hard about two other elements that relate to the capstone experience. One was the idea of general education in the major, trying to figure out ways in which the requirements for general education, learning outcomes, and any distributional requirements, could be folded into the major. So this would reduce the number of courses that would be necessary in the general education curriculum proper. The other element, which you rightly mentioned, is the capstone experience. We felt that it would be valuable if we could engage in something of a kind

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

of a change in mindset about general education. At other universities, general education is not seen as something that is--that students have to try to get done within the first two years so they can get on with the major, get on with what's really crucial or really important. At places like Miami University and other universities, there is a sense in which general education goes through the entire undergraduate experience. So we thought that the capstone experience would be one way of enlarging the frame of reference for students as they were thinking about general education in a way that would take us beyond the habit of thought that both students and faculty got--had gotten into with regard to USP, as USP being focused on the first two years, and then the major, the real education, taking place in the last two, three, four, five.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Over to Jane Jensen.

JANE JENSEN: Jane Jensen, Educational (inaudible). I think to echo the idea of an inclusive holistic experience, what I don't like about the White paper or the construction of any of the committees thus far is that it doesn't include the whole campus in the sense of the other educators on campus, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs. We have academic advisors here, and I know that they're represented in the administrative level, but they're not represented in the experiential level, and so, therefore, I would like to suggest and really strongly emphasize to the Steering Committee that the co-curricular aspect of whatever reform comes out be clearly articulated throughout the advising structure, throughout Student Affairs, think of your student programs, residence life, I mean, all the way down to the Johnson Center and everything else on campus. One of the reasons that Miami-Ohio is held up as a benchmark for this kind of reform is that they had a professor of student--of higher education within their structure who communicated very closely with the whole campus, including their Student Affairs and their Academic Affairs. It was very much a joint partnership. The other thing I would point out just as a caveat is that the Student Affairs as a field is actually about ten years

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

into doing something that they called the student learning imperative, which is a way of training all of the people who are coming through Student Affairs, and I'm talking about people like the--you know, like a Director of Student Activities, those types of positions. Their professional ethos is now one of learning outcomes and objectives. They're used to this language; this is not new to them, and I think that they would embrace this new--the structure of the White paper and the structure of the discussion, but they do have to be included. They have to be at the table, and it can't be at the end when they no longer have a voice.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any comment regarding that comment from Steering Committee members other than Phil Kraemer? Okay, how about Phil Kraemer?

PHIL KRAEMER: I hear you, Dr. Jensen. I think this is something that the Steering Committee has already talked about, that there's a real opportunity here to use the co-curriculum, not in a way that it's what they do in their spare time, but use it more strategically. A lot of the learning experiences that our students have which fit into a good general education program, even though they aren't necessarily in the classroom, and I think we're going to be very concerned about doing that, as we go through our work, to find ways to--in our deliberations to bring in that voice that may not be among those five, but we can get the voice representative if we do that. Likewise, thinking about experiences like education abroad, I mean, those are tremendous opportunities to gain a real cross-cultural perspective, and in the past those experiences have been in addition to or aside--peripheral to a curriculum. Now is the chance to see if those can be effectively integrated in a credible way which use some of these learning outcomes, and I think that's what the student learning outcomes approach gives us, is a chance to really ask, what is it we want our students to learn, to know, and be able to do, and then begin to think there are many ways they can acquire those experiences, and that may be a way that's very important for a research university, to try to manage large numbers of students as well. But this is duly noted.

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any comment regarding this comment, and when there is no more, then I'd ask for a new topic. Yes, over there.

VOICE: I don't know if this ties in or not, but--

VOICE: (Interrupting) I'm sorry.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Name?

STEVE PARKER: Parker--Steve Parker, (inaudible) Health Promotion. I don't know if this ties in or not, but--these comments here, but basically we need--this is a suggestion. We need to offer a health and wellness class at the university level at USP. It ties in with everything else. It's--I think we're looking at a state that has major problems of obesity, Type II diabetes. There's nothing in the university studies that applies to health and wellness. On top of that, we need to--if we're going to do that, and we should do that, we should have the funding to be able to offer that course because of the number of students that course is going to attract. Number two, in terms of health and--well, this in terms of USP--we need to offer a number of courses where students can have choices to get in those courses. After a couple or three weeks, students are brokering to get in those courses. They go to a number of professors because they have to override into those courses to get them. There's just not enough courses or not enough funds or not enough instructors to actually do those courses. As you can see, a couple of years ago that we had to eliminate for three years Communication 181 or 252, or whatever, from the university studies. So those are some suggestions. And then I'm an undergraduate advisor. I work with students all the time, and those are some of the things that have come across my desk that I feel like are important.

CHAIR TAGAVI: And I noticed, by the way, Deborah Moore, came in. She's a member of GERA and has expertise assistance, so if you have assistant questions, we could have those, Ernie, please.

ERNIE YANARELLA: I just wanted to follow up on what Jane had said and what Phil had also added to by pointing out a couple of things about the co-curricular element in a new general education curriculum. I think that

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

really that dimension needs to be extraordinarily exploited in the context of reworking our general education foundations. I thought I saw Peter Barras. Is Peter here? Peter Barras was part of one of the forums, and fairly early on, as I recall, Peter, and you suggested the importance of riveting the attention of our first-year students through UK 101, providing them with an opportunity to get a sense of what this new general education curriculum is all about. I mean, here's a tailor-made opportunity to develop a clear sense of identity. You know, what are the goals of this new general education program; what is its basic thrust; what is it that you should expect to get out of your undergraduate education? I think that co-curricular element is something that needs to be more tightly fastened to the more curricular dimensions. Student Affairs continues to work on these co-curricular aspects. I was at a--I was chairing a meeting with representatives from that group just last week on another matter, and I learned that they're in the process of trying to fold in a common readings day for students at a particular year. I've forgotten whether it was freshman or sophomore year. I believe it was first year. Here's another opportunity to try to promote both the idea of the university as a community of learners and of, again, expanding our sense of what it is that we're trying to do for general education. And then finally, I would point out--and I don't know if there are any people from the College of Fine Arts--their readiness to become fully involved in some of these curricular and co-curricular elements that relate to the arts. We have myriad opportunities on this campus, far many than any one of us could take advantage of, and they are more than just opportunities for faculty to experience elements of high culture. They are critical opportunities for us to weed into the general education curriculum opportunities that many of the students who come here would be experiencing for the first time and would have a great opportunity to develop a more cosmopolitan orientation.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any other comments? Name?

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

BEN WITHERS: I'm Ben Withers from the Department of Art and the College of Fine Arts, and I want to second what Ernie has just said. We are--we stand ready to engage that kind of co-curricular activity in the college.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Yes?

SHELLEY STEINER: Shelley Steiner, Biology. In listening to this, I guess how are we going to assess the suc--how did we assess the past USP program; how are we going to assess what's going on now? I mean, social experiments come and go, and we have all kinds of different opinions about what's great and what's not great. At one point in the '70s, there was no core, just take courses. There's been a whole lot of experiments, and how are we going to assess this? I mean, that requires that we specifically know what product we want. Do we want a more cosmopolitan student? Is that what we're aiming for? What--that's what's lost in my mind. I mean, I've read the White paper, and so on. Generalities are there, but it's hard for me to pick up specifically how we're going to assess what we're doing.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Let me (inaudible) actually to anybody who is aware of how we assess the USP, and then I would ask Deb--maybe Deborah Moore to talk about assessment of the new one.

PHIL KRAEMER: That one I do want to jump on. It's a very important question, and I'd say we haven't assessed USP very well. There are two motivations for curricular reform. One of them is from afar. We look at the curriculum and we make judgments about it that just isn't structured to function well. So there's some omissions in our current USP given where the world is and where we think our students need to be, but that isn't the same as forming the indictment that the current curriculum has failed. Operationally we have some examples of failure. The cross-disciplinary requirement was mentioned. When I read or read the rationale for that, that sounded like one nice requirement, but it was very hard to implement it in management. So I have asked the USP Committee, the existing USP Committee, to spend its time this year concentrating on just this question: How are we going to govern whatever curriculum we have and how are we going to define the assessment? The beginning point is

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

articulating the student learning outcomes. So whatever framework we put together, we're going to have to bring you a list of compelling learning outcomes that--if stated properly, I think it will lead us to understand what we're going to have to do to assess. But even as I say that, we've got some decisions to make on how to do that. It is not necessarily easy to not only measure some of the aspects of our curriculum, but actually to collect the data, to get students to sit down through assessments, we're going to have to be creative about that and bring the talents of my colleague, Deb Moore, and others to that question, but it's assessment. You hit on what I think is very important. We can't continue to develop new curricula and reject them whenever there's a new fashion. We've got to know whether or not they're working, and I don't think that we can honestly say here that we know the USP is a failure in terms of what it's trying to achieve. We could infer that based on its architect, but that's a little different than where we want to be with the next change.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Deborah Moore, would you like to add to that?

DEBORAH MOORE: Sure. Well, I think it's true that we don't really have a good baseline at all on our old USP, so part of the effort that we're going to have is to lay a baseline in place and recognize that we'll have to set priorities on--in terms of what things we'll begin to measure first. We need some groups to begin to identify what tools are there. I can help with that process, but still, ultimately, it's faculty who have to decide whether it's this measure or that measure that they prefer in terms of the kind of quality of data that is gained from that process. We need to frame our questions and be clear about what we're trying to answer in terms of research questions here. And, you know, this is a process. It's an interchip process. What we have to do is bite off a chunk and go after that chunk, and then we bite off another chunk and go after that chunk, and so part of our strategy needs to be developing a plan where we set some priorities in place and decide which of these goals--if we have nine of them, if we have twelve of them--which we're going to go after first and begin a process where we communicate

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

cross-campus very clearly about that process that's in place and what our priorities are to get it here. And then have a group that receives that information and processes that information and communicates back what did we learn from that; what went well; what do we need to revise, so that we actually get into place an actual practice where we collect information, review that information, and then start with the next (inaudible). But I think the ultimate plan right now is to come up with a process to begin to break that down so it doesn't seem so overwhelming and to begin to set some priorities. If you just take one example, if you think about--here's a concept, a construct, qualitative--there's quantitative reasoning. There are lots of different ways that people are talking about defining that and also measuring it, so what we need to do is get clear on the definition that we hold, and then either look for an existing measure or begin to develop our own. Part of what we'll be also looking for is our efficiencies that we might gain from working with people in the majors who are doing these things, so we're going to be looking to the expertise that we have internally to actually do that work. So the first thing is to get a plan in place after we get our learning outcomes defined. That's a starting point.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Yes?

STEPHEN VOSS: Stephen Voss, Arts and Sciences. I regret that--is it Professor Parker's comments--didn't receive comment, so I wanted to bring us back to those. My recollection was during the GERA workshops this summer, health and nutrition was floating around in the list of the education for citizenship topics, and I regret that it's not here now. I agree with him completely. You know, understanding the human body, things like nutrition, physiology, for working out, these are problems that Americans are having trouble dealing with that's high--it's highly technical information. We've got a huge body of experts in the various areas that would inform it, and it strikes me that an educated professional in our society to exceed, one thing they have to know how to work is their own bodies, so I would urge the Steering Committee to consider returning health, wellness,

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

and nutrition to the list of education
for citizenship topics.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Thank you.

PHIL KRAEMER: I will react this time.

We will. Hearing that now at least
twice, I will take that to the
Steering Committee, and we'll discuss
that. That was brought out in GERA,
and maybe, Steve, that it isn't
necessarily a course. Again, think
about ways in which students can
achieve these outcomes. We have to
be creative. There's co-curricula,
a number of opportunities to get
students to the point we want them to
without necessarily creating a new
course or a course that can be very
hard to manage in terms of resources.
But indeed, this is registered.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Bob Wilson?

BOB WILSON: Yeah. I'm a little hesitant
to bring this up because it'll
probably make me a target again for
something, but I must say I'm a little
bit uncomfortable with all the talk
about co-curricular activities,
which I think used to be called
extracurricular activities, being used
as part of the educational process of
the university, not because I think
there's anything wrong with students
engaging in those or that there is a
learning that goes on that way, but
it usually--often when I used to hear,
oh, the amount of learning, but think
about all the learning that goes on in
these activities. It was used as a
way of pooh-poohing the classroom
learning that went on, and how it's
not really important that they learn
stuff in the classroom because they're
doing all this stuff out of the
classroom. Let's--I think we do need
to keep our eyes focused. We can
teach students everything that they
were supposed to learn by the time
they were age 22. This is a
university where there are academic
subjects where we--that we expect
students to learn. There's a body
of knowledge that we expect students
to master, and the--and as the faculty
of the university, we need to also
keep control of the curriculum, and a
lot of the co-curricular activities
aren't supervised by faculty, and so
how is that going to play into the
whole process that we have here at the
university of approving new curricula.
So I guess I would just say I think we
need to tread very, very carefully and
thoughtfully if we're going to be
moving in that direction.

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Inaudible).

VOICE: I'd just like to say the conceptual framework for that course in terms of health and wellness is already in place; the course is already in place in terms of being able to teach a course in masses. The reason why I mention the economics of it all and the funding of it all is that that course is required of all the majors in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion. So a number of professors that we need--we would need more professors to be able to teach the course, but in the College of Education, we are conceptual framework based, and so this is what we're talking about here, conceptual framework. We're talking about in terms of assessment based on conceptual framework. The course, like I said, is already there, and in terms of conceptual framework, that--those type of conceptual frameworks can be done with USP and trickle down to all the departments were the syllabi can address those issues in a concep--from the conceptual framework from the university to the department and also to the college. So I just wanted to make that clear, that we already have a program. It's KHP--(inaudible) KHP 230, and we've never been able to have a university studies because of the funding possibility problems that we have.

CONNIE SWANSON: Connie Swanson, College of Medicine. It seems to me what we're talking about more is integration, not creating new courses. So, for example, just throwing out an example, let's say you have a chemistry major. What would a chemistry major need to know about health and wellness? They're not... (Side A of tape ends here).

CHAIR TAGAVI: Is there a question here?

JIM HERTOOG: Jim Hertog, Communication and Information Studies. I would disagree with that entirely. I would think that general studies is something everybody who graduates from the University of Kentucky should have and know, and these are universal learning outcomes that one would be looking for. Essential skills of thinking and communicating is what I see here, which doesn't seem to be disciplinary specific. For me the whole point was, everybody who comes into every classroom should be able to think and to communicate, and it's not think

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

chemistry, or think social science, or think communications, like in my college. The very--I'm from such and such and this is my college is a bit of a problem here because we're all thinking in terms of our own colleges and how this should fit with our students. But if our students are all students from Kentucky, then this is the curriculum for all students from Kentucky, and then they become majors. Instead of how--you know, how can we fit this into the majors, it's like, if everybody is from Kentucky, this is what they should know. Okay, now they become a major in something. And if we look at the curriculum that way, then it's kind of a different, you know, concern here and a different operationalization of it. So that was how I was looking at it, and I'm wondering if I'm off base on this.

SHELLEY STEINER: I can't answer that question. I can say that I see a combination of both. In fact--

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Interrupting) (Inaudible).

SHELLEY STEINER: Shelley Steiner, Biology.

And what I think is good is to have faculty into discipline understand what the outcomes are so it can continue. Otherwise what you have is basic skills, and that's it. And if you do some of the application that was just suggested, then it continues on, and I can see it, for instance, in biology. I just wasn't aware of some of the issues. I was in a very--you know, a very--I am--hopefully it won't continue as much, but I'm in a very, you know, defined discipline. But this opens--I do know a lot about--I read in my area about the economics of it; I read about a lot of things day to day. It's part of it, and I can see it continuing after the beginning. Otherwise, it cuts off and it's not going to be sufficient, I don't think. I mean, it has to continue on through the majors, not separate courses, but built into courses. One can--one--if one knows that public policy is very important, biology (inaudible), say all kinds of stuff going on. It doesn't have to be--it could be built into a lot of different courses and with sensitivity really to the faculty of this, which is what this kind of process likely could do, at least for me. So I see a combination of both things--

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Interrupting) (Inaudible).

ARTHUR CAMMERS: Arthur Cammers, Chemistry.

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

I like the overall look and feel of the White paper in that it's less prescriptive. It seems to offer the student more latitude in their movement around campus and their career paths, their own goals that they can accomplish with what we have to offer. But we can avoid a certain level of anarchy in that system in order--and in order to do so, I think we have to increase the level of advisement of these students, and that is not apparent in the White paper. Right now students see the advisor, and let's say they have a chemistry major, picking on chemistry, but it's B.A. or B.S., and they have a path. You get to point A, point B, point C; it's iron clad, and that has never sat well with me. And I see a certain level of inquietude in the student as well, and especially those who are, you know, more free-thinkers and they have more of an opinion. So I think that advisement and infrastructure that focuses on advising needs to be a part of this discussion.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any more comments? Ernie?

ERNIE YANARELLA: I fully agree with those last comments, and I think that the advising network that was, I guess, one of our last forums showed a key concern and a key interest in precisely this area. I mean, we have a legend of very dedicated advisors who clearly have the students' hearts at their fundamental concern. And what they want are clear guidelines, and they want to be able to present students with a program that allows them to get through and to achieve the kind of student development that is the underpinning of such a program. And I think that if we go through this process, if we develop a rich framework for general education, if we move on to the kinds of curricular changes that are going to be necessary, I think that this will be well received by the myriad advisors that we have.

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Inaudible).

DIANE SNOW: Diane Snow, Med Center. At the risk of getting myself appointed to a survey committee here, I'm going to come back to my earlier comment about targeting the recent grads because we're going on a premise that the system doesn't work well in today's day and age. We're saying this isn't a good enough system as it is, and we need to find out what to tweak. So that population seems

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

to me to be one that we should be spending a lot of time with, and I realize it's going to be hard for them to articulate what I didn't get at UK. But I think if we talk to enough of those people who are recent grads--I don't know what span we would target, but somewhere through those conversations there would be things that would start popping up that would be the same. I was really good in my chemistry. I was really good in this and that. I knew how to do these kinds of problems. I knew how to make my way through a business, but what I never got was. And if we start hearing those kinds of comments over and over again, that could really help in this prescription of what do we need to do. But it seems that we're going a little bit blindly here from the top down again, as I said earlier, to try to decide what these kids need without really seeing what they're not getting very carefully.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Mr. Hoch?

DEAN HOCH: There is a very substantial body of research not specific to UK, but people who have researched higher education that look at exactly the sort of questions that you're asking such that I don't think that we need to look specifically at UK students and whether they can assess properly or not. I mean, one of the big, I think, inadequacies of our own profession is very few of us actually read the literature about our own industry. As a matter of fact, I would go so far as to say that the vast majority of us have never read a book about higher education. So it may be that this is our own deficiency and not the deficiency that this knowledge isn't there. There's some very good measures out there, some very good studies that have been done following up students' five years, ten years, et cetera.

DIANE SNOW: Any recently?

DEAN HOCH: Oh, yes, quite recently; very, very recently, a myriad of studies. For example, I just (inaudible) college. Most engineers, when they graduate, they write worse than when they entered the university, and this has been measured very well. Sorry.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Actually, you're being (inaudible). I did not appreciate USP until recently. If I could indulge you with a very quick personal story, my son--I will do that. My son just recently finished pharmacy here and,

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

of course, you know how well they are--they get paid, and now he's in law school, so often he tells me, Dad, I'm going to be having two doctorates, one more than you, and I'm getting paid more than you, and every time he says that, I said, but you never finished USP. Because, as you know, those who go to--through the pharmacy and law school don't necessarily finish USP. So that's one of my things I have over my son, so it's very important, I should say.

VOICE: You never finished USP either, did you?

CHAIR TAGAVI: Not in this country.

VOICE: Okay.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Don't talk to my son, okay.

ARTHUR CAMMERS: I think these last two comments really--

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Interrupting) I'm sorry. Name, please.

ARTHUR CAMMERS: Arthur Cammers, Chemistry.

These last two comments really highlight what--a panacea that's individual--a focus on individual responsibility on the part of the student would help the system out, so what I didn't get at UK, no. Recast that question to what I did not bother to take at UK, what--my responsibility was to see my own deficiency in my own education and why do I write worse after getting out of an engineering degree, because I didn't keep a bloody journal, you know, and if we could just get this point across to students from day one at UK 101, and this is all part of the curriculum, it's going to be a self-healing step in the structure of the individual youth student responsibility.

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Inaudible).

VOICE: That's really an important point, and I think what we're all going to have to take responsibility for as faculty. So (inaudible) in talking to students about what the purpose of their entire higher education is about and where their responsibilities are, I think, especially the liberal arts education that we often talk about as being so fundamental in advancing our minds. I don't think our students necessarily come in understanding (inaudible) curriculum potential, and we don't help ourselves when we don't talk among ourselves. So that any course we now teach, if it would be a USP social science course, there should be some effort by the faculty teaching

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

that to talk about that this is one course representing social sciences, and this is one of the requirements you have in the disciplinary category and tell them why it is, because I think that message needs to get across much earlier so that they do a better job in taking charge of their education because that's what they're going to need (inaudible) when they're through. No one is going to be looking at their grades in ten years out. It's what's the nature of their mind.

CHAIR TAGAVI: In the very back.

JOANNA BADAGLIACCO: My colleagues speak my mind, but also--

CHAIR TAGAVI: (Interrupting) What's your name? We'll have this transcribed for a Court Reporter so she (inaudible).

JOANNA BADAGLIACCO: Sure. I apologize. Joanna Badagliacco. I am from the Discovery Seminar Program and from the College of Arts and Sciences and Sociology. What I was trying to say was that it seems to me that UK 101 repeatedly comes up as a transitional course or some version of a transitional course that allows students to understand better what they expect out of their education, because I've been an advisor for many years, and what I recall most hearing is that I took this course; I just want to get over with this; I don't know why I'm taking this, and--but I really want to get a job here, and so I'm really focusing on--and I separate students in my mind, I think, those who want to be learners and those who want to get critical skills in a different way. And I--they're not here, most of them, to become professors, and they'll tell you that. They'll say, I just want to get out and get a job, so I think we need to spend a little time thinking about what do they want and help them understand what their expectations for themselves can be, and then make sure that they expect other things of us, and I think we don't do the best job in teaching them. A lot of us don't have the opportunity to teach except to lecture, and that's who say, okay, the next (inaudible) come in. So we have--it's a double-edged sword in lots of ways, and I guess the thing that I'm very concerned about is how do you mentor? It's not advising; it's mentoring; it's helping them get to be where they want to be, and they probably won't get that way until

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

they're several years out, maybe have children of their own, when they start to realize, I should have taken those USP courses. Thanks.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Dean Swift?

LOU SWIFT: It's always helpful to learn from your mistakes of the past, and I think I'd like to follow up on what Phil and Ernie said earlier. And one of the things we did not do when we put university studies in 20 years ago is we didn't change the culture of the faculty. Even if we had a big research grant to--or a big NEH grant to help with the cross-disciplinary things, we really didn't change the mind set so that departments were offering courses that were major courses arguing that they belonged in general studies because they taught the things that the goals of general studies aimed at teaching. I'm not sure that that was true, and those things were not articulated in these major courses. So even before you get down to the course level, Phil, I was wondering if the committee might think of, in very concrete terms and very idealistic terms in many ways, working with the faculty to change the mind set so that the faculty at large--and we're all this way; we're focused on our disciplines; this is the way we were trained; this is, in a large measure, the way we get promoted. This is a mind set that we have, which is quite natural, but I think we really need to work on the culture in order to achieve our goals, and then a lot of these other things will fall into place.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Dean Hoch?

DEAN HOCH: Lou, that's a great comment, and we've talked about it a real lot in the committee, that the USP program that will unfold, I'm pretty sure, is going to require a radical change in faculty culture. One of the single biggest problems we confront with the current USP program is we have--if you read what the goals are under each category, we have very, very lofty goals, but then we stick them in Anthropology 101, or a Psychology 101, or a History 101, which is an introduction to the discipline which, first, the faculty member over the past 20 years had probably never even read the goals. If the faculty member actually read the goals, they would say, well, that might be the goal for USP, but I don't give a damn because I'm teaching a history course and this

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

is what needs to be presented in my discipline, so they would--you know, they would ignore them, and they would ignore them, I think, probably for very good reasons. And this is really the major failure of the USP program that we have now, is the goals that we have are simply not being achieved at all given the courses that we actually stick the students in, and so one of the things that we're going to have to do is align the goals that we're talking about. I think the goals themselves are much different because we're far less interested now in saying there's a canon of knowledge--there's a body of knowledge that everyone needs to know because it's very clear now there's no canon of knowledge that we could all even remotely agree on that everyone needs to know. So if you move away from the canon and you focus on the kind of concerns that are embodied in the White paper, then how do you construct courses that, you know, permanently and forevermore achieve those goals? Because I think when we designed USP--and our USP is like many other USP programs in the nation, there was a disconnect probably from the very beginning, and this is the thing that we need to solve, and it is going to require a massive change in faculty culture. We're not going to be able to get away with the lofty goal and say, yeah, and this course that we already teach will work just fine.

CHAIR TAGAVI: In the center.

KEN CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Computer Science. So as I think about this as essentially a random faculty member, rolling this out, you know, I think about how it would affect what I teach, and I don't teach anything that's in USP now, but I advise students. If you want to talk about changing the culture, it seems to me that the single most important thing from where I'm sitting is to make very explicit the derivation of every piece of this thing however it ends up rolling out. And I'm talking about saying, this is what we want to achieve, and in more detail than, I think, for multi-disciplinary perspectives say why you think that this course--or what it is--in other words, what's the interface between this thing, whatever it ends up being, a course, or objective, or whatever, and what I'm teaching and what everybody else in the university is

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

doing, make that very explicit, put it on the web, and everybody that advises students ought to be thoroughly indoctrinated in that, and that's--it seems that would make the biggest difference for me.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Behind Ernie and then Ernie.

JOSEPH SOTTILE: Joseph Sottile from Engineering. I think these last two points are real crucial to the whole process because I think we have to consider implementation. One of the things that we're struggling with, at least I am in engineering, is our accreditation board has certain outcomes defined for us that we need to have in our program, one of which is life-long learning, all right. We don't have courses where the content is, you know, life-long learning, and it's difficult to demonstrate and evaluate.

VOICE: People graduate and they do only 2007 engineering and never learn anything beyond that?

JOSEPH SOTTILE: Well, you can see how it's difficult to--you know, well, what do we do? We go into a time machine, and that's just one example. We have others that are, you know, equally difficult to evaluate in specific courses because that's not the objective of our course, and we have to find a way to build it into it, and that's why I think this is difficult to do unless you have it specifically built into courses and why it's hard to do across a curriculum because someone in a 400 level course is not going to know how to put that part into it. It's going to be very difficult to implement without it having a real structure time to it. So I think the implementation is real important, and it has to be real clear where these things are going to be achieved. And the other thing is you have to strike a balance. I think you do have to consider all of the different majors as well because some majors will be--I don't know--better suited maybe to what is ultimately crafted, as opposed to someone like an engineer, who will have maybe, you know, a lot of deficiencies in these areas. So it--I think it's difficult unless you consider the implementation as well.

ERNIE YANARELLA: I'm just a little anxious about this idea of a once and for all framework that we're going to establish, you know, and then we're going to indoctrinate faculty and then

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

we're going to educate our students, and so forth. I look at this in a much more flexible kind of way. I think we're going to make mistakes, and I think that the spirit of this sort of pragmatic spirit that Deb's remarks captured, I think, is really what we ought to be about. Yes, we need to have a--as clear-sighted a framework as we can. Yes, we need to try to define those learning outcomes as well as we can, but it's going to change; it's going to evolve. And critical to this, I think, will involve building in an assessment process that's going to allow assessment offices to gather data, to find out, in the eminent words of our esteem president, is our children learning, and then to go from there and to determine the extent to which the courses that are being offered by departments are providing that kind of vehicle. To the extent that they aren't, then there are opportunities through--to faculty and departmental development to assist departments in trying to realign or to better align what they're offering in relationship to those learning goals, and I think the learning goals themselves are going to be up for grabs over a period of time. And if we're going to try to capture the spirit of life-long learning, we want to build in a degree of flexibility and acknowledge that these things will evolve and change as the program proceeds. But I think critical to that is the assessment mechanism. If we don't build that into the reform effort, then I think we're going to very likely find ourselves--not me and not probably even Phil, but some of the younger faculty here, 14, 18 years from now, looking at the Kraemer plan that's been instituted here at the University of Kentucky as the general education program and saying, how did we go wrong? You know, where--why aren't we achieving our goals? But we need to have a wholesale change. Thank you.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Just for the record, Ernie, that quote was from President Todd or--I just want to have it corrected. Any other comments? Thank you.

JIM HERTOOG: Jim Hertog. There's two ways to go at it. One is to say, okay, what classes do we have that meet these goals and others to say, here's the curriculum, let's build classes and staff them out of the resources we have at the university. I think

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

the second would be more successful.

LARRY GRABAU: Would you go ahead and say why?

JIM HERTOGE: Because the classes that are currently being produced are hostage to the departments and they're not going--they're going to have to adjust to these universal goals and--et cetera, but they'll never adjust completely; whereas a set of courses and a set of teachers who are teaching USP, or whatever, should be following the curriculum that's built by the committee and by the et cetera to build the classes to meet that curriculum, not to adjust the curriculum to meet the goals of the classes that are already in place.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Right here.

DIANE SNOW: Snow, Med Center. I'm going to practice tenacity here and come back to this one more time, if you'll allow me, but I--your point was very well taken, and I'm sorry (inaudible) about us understanding about higher education and what students do when they graduate, but it seems to me I'm picking up (inaudible) a lot of this conversation and a lot of it pertains to University of Kentucky students, and we're trying to design a curriculum or a way of learning for the specific people here in Kentucky. And if that be the case, do we have the same base of information as to what our students are achieving so far and where the errors are or where the gaps are? And I'd like to ask again, is it still worth--and I don't really want to be the chair of that committee. Is it still really worth going out and in some way assessing what our UK graduates think they did and didn't get?

PHIL KRAEMER: I can't deny that it wouldn't be a valid (inaudible). In terms of time lines, et cetera, I think it wouldn't be easy to do either because we'd have to really develop the appropriate assessment tool and then find our graduates. The senior survey that we do now typically doesn't address much in the curriculum, so we'd have to expend, I think, an appropriate amount of effort to define those assessment tools, and it may be that we--we really try to pursue a combination of both redefining some of the framework and adding the appropriate assessment tools from the very outset and use whatever information you have, whether it be from national studies, and maybe

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

try to address it in some way maybe this spring, our graduates, where they are, that assessment piece is very difficult. We've tried to assess students. I know we were doing a study with Wabash, a national study with one university component of that, and that may give us some information that we can feed back through. So I don't want to make it sound as if there's no data available from our UK students, but I hear your urgency on that, so the committee will talk about that.

DIANE SNOW: My point being that we're looking at today, sort of looking at now and how it's--how are things different in the world for these students now and how do we need to adjust our curriculum for students who are graduating now. So it seems like something that has to be addressed in very recent students and maybe something that should be begun in our assessments.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Over there.

DIANA HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, School of Music and Liberal Arts. I agree that we do need to get responses from students, but I think--some of these larger goals that are being discussed, these life learning goals, I don't think that your student and--you know, I'm not going to assume--I'll try not to assume too much, but it seems to me your average student that has gotten out of school, especially the student who really looks at the university as a vocational school rather than a vehicle for liberal education is going to say, oh, well, you know, I didn't need any of that stuff because I'm not using it in my job, or, you know, it's going to be that kind of orientation more than I didn't learn to be a good citizen who can critically look at--read the newspaper and critically respond to what's happening politically.

BOB GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences. I just want to follow up on a comment that was made earlier about how it would be easier to create some courses and populate them with faculty than to take the existing courses and--or the existing faculty with their existing courses and try to modify it. I agree it would certainly be easier to do the former, but I think at the end it would be ultimately self-defeating because you will, again, end up with ghetto courses that are relevant only in

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

those courses and the departments than, say, get those--take those courses, get them done with, and then the real learning can begin. And so I think even though it would--it will be much more difficult to change the mind set of--as much as it needs to be changed, I don't--I think there's a little bit too much exaggeration about how much the mind set of the faculty needs to be changed to address these goals. These--you look at these goals and they're--you know, they're all inoffensive. You know, I mean--now, I'm not going to look at it and say, oh, no, a campus doesn't need to be a life-long learner or be a good international citizen or--you know. I don't--but it's making the interface between those goals and that specific subject matter and ways of learning subject matter that is the difficult part, but that's where the work needs to happen to make this a real reform.

CHAIR TAGAVI: In the back, and then we're (inaudible).

ARTHUR CAMMERS: Following up on that, I think that we need to put into perspective the magnitude of the change we're trying to impact on the university and be careful that we're not oscillating about the optimum in that the change that we put in place goes too far. And instead of having a mob mentality and saying, well, the University of Kentucky is not doing a good job, fundamentally doing a disservice to the Commonwealth by poorly educating undergrads, this is not where we want to be heading, right, in our goals? What we want to say is, this needs to be examined. USP needs to be examined, and we're going to make perhaps minor changes that are going to be more in concert with the goals of the university. I think that the university currently is doing a great job, and I would recommend that my own daughter come here for an undergraduate education.

DEBORAH MOORE: A couple of different comments. In developing our assessment plan for this effort, there's no reason why we can't put in place a longitudinal effort to look at both qualitative and quantitative kinds of outcomes. There's nothing prohibiting us from doing that. In the case that Phil brought up of our participation in the Wabash longitudinal study, we were invited to participate in the quantitative

side of that. There is a qualitative longitudinal component that goes along with it. We have choices to make in terms of what we're doing now and where we would like it to go. We have some tools in place that we may want to re-tool or reconfigure to serve a slightly different purpose once we get clear on what our goals and our outcomes are. So we've got a lot of flexibility, but I don't remember exactly who said it, we need to be careful and very specific about articulating where we are in the overall plan and what agreements have been made and what progress we're making. I think that's going to be the key to our success. When I look back at what happened with USP before, what I saw is there was no sort of monitoring of the process to make sure it didn't drift in some odd ways. And what we're really trying to talk about now is a strategy where we keep a bead on it, keep an eye on it, and watch and take a reading and then monitor it. If it's not going in the direction we need, either it's a question of we didn't state our goals the way we really wanted it, or our measurement isn't working, or a variety of things, and we have to kind of monitor that whole process. We can do that; we just have to have a clear plan about how to go about it and also the fortitude to--you know, to put the energies into actually make it happen.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Right here.

RAY FORGUE: Ray Forgue, Family Studies. I guess this--going back to this distinction between having existing courses or new courses, I--it kind of worries me that that's somewhat of a false dichotomy and we need to have components of both truly to be integrating all this throughout the entire five years, four years, (inaudible) students have.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Are there any other comments? Phil, can you tell us what's next, what we are going to be doing (inaudible)--what are they going to be doing next (inaudible)?

PHIL KRAEMER: Well, we want to get as much feedback as we can, written feedback, by February 15th, so you can do that in any form that suits your fancy. It could be hard copies; it could be e-mail sent to me; it could be sent to Swamy. We're going to collect everything. The committee will be deliberating, spending a lot of time looking on--looking at that

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

information, and then trying to take all that into account to present something more concrete. Again, it would only be a framework. It's still--we want it to be a framework that implies some kind of implementation but doesn't dictate what that implementation is. So there's--a lot of the issues that were discussed here are really going to come out in that implementation phase, and this--the change of culture is absolutely critical, and I think some of that can be really heavy lifting. Some of it is really modest. My own example, when I came here and I was told--well, I asked where do you want to teach. At the undergraduate level, I said I'll teach introductory psychology five. That's a USP course. I didn't know what USP meant, but even sadder, I never felt compelled to ask. I think that's the intentionality that we have to get around. We've got to take responsibility for the curriculum and our students here. That isn't heavy lifting, but it goes beyond just the curriculum. It's about how we deal with each other as colleagues; what do we hire; what do we expect faculty to do, the reward structure. All of that stuff is part of the culture here, but we've got to spend some time on it, but I think we can deal with much of that. This has been a very useful conversation. I do want to thank all of you for the input here. I encourage you again to think about what else you may want to say and send it to us. We'd like to be inundated with information.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Enid Waldhart?

ENID WALDHART: Enid Waldhart, Communication. This is a follow-up on that, Phil, to say, okay, we direct comments to who?

PHIL KRAEMER: (Inaudible)--

ENID WALDHART: (Interrupting) It seems to me that it would be very helpful to have as much transparency as we can. I mean, February 15th is coming pretty quickly, and that if we're to have any sense about what anybody else has suggested or doing, it seems to me very foolish for us to try--everybody to do their own thing. Is there a public place where we can now say, we've heard this; where do you want us to send the comments, so that--yeah, I think it's (inaudible), but I don't know if it's what we want, but some place so that it is possible for people who have contributed for their

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT

contribution to be seen by other people just like what we've been talking about here?

- PHIL KRAEMER: At this point, there isn't that public place, but I'd ask for suggestions on that. I think with some e-mails there was the intention that they not be necessarily shared (inaudible), so we don't want to violate that. I think the committee needs to deliberate on this issue, Enid, and perhaps we (inaudible)--
- ENID WALDHART: (Interrupting) Can they do it really quickly?
- PHIL KRAEMER: --put the comments up, and what we--what our task is, is to take whatever feedback we have. You will see it reflected in whenever this proposal will be, and at that point, we're going to be having some really, I think, more intense conversations debating about what is and is not great about it in order for the Senate to approve it. To finish the timeline question, the goal would be to bring something to you, a framework, that the Senate would consider and hopefully approve. That would then precipitate the implementation phase. The Provost would like to begin this summer, and I think the Senate needs to have an awful lot of input on what that (inaudible) may look like. As the committees--a committee, how do you go at that, but until we get a framework to really address, it's hard to know what that would be like.
- BOB GROSSMAN: There's--when we were doing the academic offenses reform, we used the Big Blue Board, which is a website that Jim (inaudible) started where people could post comments. We used that for--there was an area set up for the academic offenses. You could do something similar for the USP reform.
- CHAIR TAGAVI: Any other--Dean Debski?
- LIZ DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Biology. Yeah. If I could just take you back to that framework because, as you mentioned, certainly the comments and the discussion is really going to start once you present something concrete. So I'm wondering when, you know--so you take this; you deliberate with the committee. When do you expect actually to bring something back to the Senate concrete that we would have enough time to discuss before voting on May 15th?
- PHIL KRAEMER: We'd like to try to bring something in March.
- LIZ DEBSKI: In March?
- PHIL KRAEMER: Yeah, yeah. Because you're

US January 29, 2007 xcript.TXT
right. At that point, then we'd use the Big Blue Board and the Big Yellow Board, and I think whatever else, to get--so it's not just a single conversation on the floor of the Senate, and we begin to (inaudible). I think we do need some time to talk about issue (inaudible) sharing and feedback (inaudible), and then hopefully by April would be the last Senate meeting. Is that correct?

CHARI TAGAVI: Ordinarily, we don't have May meeting, but this may be out of question.

PHIL KRAEMER: Maybe a year in which we would need that. (Inaudible).

LIZ DEBSKI: Yeah, because it seems we'd want a discussion. We'd want a discussion just presenting that proposal, and then on the subsequent meeting, we would want to make a vote on it.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Okay. It seems that we are ready to adjourn. I thank you for coming through this cold weather, and stay warm.

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, BARBARA ANN LeROY, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that the foregoing transcript was prepared from audiotapes; that I was not present during the aforementioned meeting; that the transcript was prepared under my direction and supervision and to the best of my ability to hear said tape.

My commission expires: March 9, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the day of , 2007.

BARBARA ANN LeROY, FAPR, RPR, CLVS
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE