

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

FEBRUARY 11, 2008

3:00 P.M.

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

W. T. YOUNG LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508  
(859) 254-0568

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR  
DAVID RANDALL, VICE-CHAIR  
DOUG MICHAEL, HONORARY PARLIAMENTARIAN  
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR  
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

going to go ahead and

CHAIR:

I think I'm

call the meeting to order. We have exciting number of agenda items today. First, I want to mention to you we don't have yet a permanent parliamentarian. My good friend and colleague, Doug Michael, raise your hand, please. He agreed to be parliamentarian of the day, and he's going to rule from the chair over there, when needed. Okay.

Let us first read the minutes from December 10, 2007. We did not receive any changes. Are there any discussion on the minutes that are in your handout? If

not, then the minutes are -- stand approved.

I have a couple of quick announcements. We had a December -- we had a December election for Senate Council. We had a first nomination round, 29 nominations, second and final round, 57 senators voted. And the new members are Debra Anderson, Nursing; Joe Chappell, Agriculture; and Hollie Swanson in Medicine. Are any of the three here? Please recognize them. We refer to them as new blood on the Senate Council. So please recognize these three for being very brave individuals.

We also have three outgoing Senate Council members, Debra Harley, Judy Lesnaw, and John Thelin. Are any of those people here? Could you just -- John, okay, John is here. They served with dedication and distinction and selflessness, and on behalf of the Senate Council and Senate, I thank every single one. Thank you very much.

Okay. Unfortunately, we have -- because we meet a week later in March and the Board of Trustees meets a week earlier, we have to do this today. There is -- we have done this several times before. You are all familiar with -- in fact, we have been doing this for a long, long time. The Senate is continuing to do this for BCTC until 2010. The list is in your -- in your handout we have done all the checking with my counterpart at BCTC. At this point, I need a motion and the recommend language is there so...

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture.

I'll move that we -- that we accept the recommendation as stated.

CHAIR: Any second? Joe Chappell.

CHAPPELL: Second.

CHAIR: Are there any discussion? Where is Michelle? We do have to vote; we need to count the vote. Or maybe we go through it, if there are no abstentions -- I will count the abstentions. If there are no abstention it stands approved. All those of you in favor of this recommendation, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any opposed?

Any abstain?

It is unanimous. Motion passes.

Thank you.

Okay. One of our two main topics. Let me give you a little bit of a background. We have had -- this is a very delicate process. I want you to know it's also an open process. In fact, my good friend Art Lester from Herald Leader is here. And I'm assuming that we also have people from Kentucky Kernel, perhaps Louisville newspaper also. It's also a --

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

there's a very delicate balance. For example, a question is would you inform the candidates -- or they're not candidates actually, the nominees beforehand, get their agreement that they would be nominated. And then start the process before coming to the Senate, or do you wait till after the Board of Trustees has approved these nominees, and then contact them? And of course, you know the obvious problem with either case. Nevertheless, we have the lack of process. The nominees have been contacted, and they have agreed to serve and to appear in our ceremony, and here we are. One other background, this committee, the way it is -- I think that in it's second year. Before that the committee used to be hand picked by the administration. Of course it was heavily included -- the faculty was included on that committee. But two years ago the governance shifted considerably. The committee is -- half of it or more than half of it appointed by the faculty, and definitely more than half of it is faculty -- are faculty members. And the committee considers this -- I was on the committee. You'll see my name shortly. We had several meetings, discussed all the recommendations. And the committee recommended the list to Senate Council. Senate Council also discussed it very thoroughly, and the Senate Council is now recommending these names with positive recommendation to the Senate. Here are -- Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of Graduate School, is also the chair of this committee. And we have -- here are the voting members. Half of it -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, I think, three or four appointed by Senate Council. The rest is -- the rest by the administration, provost/president, and there is a Board of Trustees liaison which, by the way, if you recall, it was last year you approved addition of this member. And we have two ex officios, Terry Mobley, and the Senate Council Chair, who happens to be myself right now. Okay. I'm going to switch to the presentation by Dean Blackwell. Please.

BLACKWELL: Good afternoon, everyone. Kaveh has just flashed up the names of our committee members that were appointed by -- by you all by the -- from the University Senate as well as those that were appointed by the President and Provost. And this committee takes -- accepts nominations from anyone in the Commonwealth or anywhere else who chooses to put forward a nomination. They are heavily, of course, nominated from -- from members of the University community are the ones who are usually the

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

nomiators, but that's not always the case. So let's proceed. And I hope I'm going to know how to do this. Here we go. They are Professor Emeritus Gifford Blyton who many of you all know; Governor Paul Patton; and Tubby Smith.

Gifford Blyton, as you all know, is simply without equal, to quote one of the letters of nomination, not only in the length but, more importantly, the depth and quality of his service on behalf of the university. As a faculty member, scholar, Senate Parliamentarian, community leader, mentor, and role model. He was the Senate Parliamentarian for 35 years, won a UK Great Teacher Award, faculty chair. A faculty chair was endowed in his honor in the College of Communications and he was named a Friend of the College of Communications. The debate -- as debate coach, his teams won over 700 trophies nationally. He was co-founder and former president of the American Forensic -- Forensic Foundation, and served overall in speech and debate for -- on behalf of the Commonwealth, high school students, as well as university students, and took our debate team to national prominence.

The second nominee, Governor Paul Patton --

Oh, and just to give you a brief heads up, Gifford was nominated by Kaveh but also that was seconded by many other people and bodies, the ombuds, the collective ombuds of the University, as well as Senate Council. So there were several different affirmations of his nomination.

Governor Patton was on nominated by The Pritchard Committee, among others. There was also a group nomination. He was the 59th Governor. A national leader on innovation in higher education, of course, a UK alum from our College of Engineering. His great commitment on behalf of the -- the community of higher education was -- led to the reformation of Kentucky's postsecondary education system, and recognized UK as the flagship institution for the state and helped set us on the course to becoming a top 20 university. He, in collaboration with the legislature, established the RCTF, the Research Challenge Trust Fund which provided funding for research. And as a result of this, the Bucks for Brains funding, we were able to raise the number of endowed chairs at the University from 22 to 95. The number of endowed professorships grew from 45 to 210, and UK has had access to 184 million in matching funds in escrow and continues to grow after this production of this PowerPoint. And among some of the outcomes

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

of the educational reform of 1997 was an almost 25 percent increase in public college and university enrollment between 1998 and 2003 and an increase in the number of Kentuckians -- Kentuckians holding bachelors degrees by 21.6 percent in that time period. A quote from Governor Patton: By the time I became Governor, I realized that education was the long-term key to economic development, and that jobs were the short term. You have to have jobs to keep the educated people in Kentucky. You have to have educated people to be able to create the jobs you have to create. You can't do one without the other.

And our third nominee is Tubby Smith. Tubby Smith, nominated by Professors -- Professor Everett McCorvey and Chester Grundy here from the University. Notwithstanding Tubby Smith's legendary successes on the court of athletic competition, it is the quality of selflessness and humanitarian commitment off the court which sets him apart. Tubby Smith founded the Tubby Smith Foundation, and with his wife, Donna, to support underprivileged, not only in Lexington but predominantly in Lexington and Fayette County. He launched Tubby's Clubhouses which continue to run to this day to help low income and high risk students develop skills in technology. And so far -- far, more than 700 Lexington children have graduated from computer classes in Tubby's Clubhouses. The foundation has donated more than 2.3 million dollars to 60 community projects over the last nine years and continues today. Tubby's Clubhouse was awarded the Outstanding Human Services Program award by the Northern Kentucky Area Development District in 2007. And this foundation continues to support projects such as our own Kentucky African-American Encyclopedia Project and in the City of Lexington, the Explorium which used to be called The Children's Museum back when I was young enough to have a child that age. He received the first -- the initial and namesake award of the United Way Donna and Tubby Smith Community Spirit Award and was named a Lifetime Ambassador for Education by the UK College of Education in 2002, as well as the Lauren K. Weinberg Humanitarian Award from the Kentucky Council for Community and Justice.

And those are -- oh, yeah, there was one other thing about him, he was the head coach of UK basketball in case you think -- thought I'd forgotten. He coached the NCAA Championship in '98, the assistant coach of the Olympic Team in 2000, and coached for five SEC Championships.

And that is -- those are the

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
three nominees that were brought forth from the Honorary Degree Committee for your consideration for the -- for the approval of University Senate.

By the rules of the University Senate, we are to put forward three nominees to you all, and in the meantime since our committee met, an opportunity arose to present another honorary degree to a prominent, a very prominent international leader. And this happened after we had done our deliberations. Kaveh brought this to my attention, and we accepted that nomination, not as part of our original package. We felt like that competition was a closed competition, and we wanted to put forward those names. But Kaveh is going to walk you now through the process and the presentation of a fourth possible nominee for your consideration. Because he gave it to me, I passed this on to the Honorary Degree Committee, and we considered whether or not we would make a further recommendation. And our committee made a unanimous choice to recommend further this fourth possible nominee, but it will be the Senate Council that will be putting forward that fourth nomination for your consideration. And I've got the information --

CHAIR: You have the information on there?

BLACKWELL: Yes, I do. Do you want me to go ahead?

All right. The possibility that we have is the immediately past former President of India is coming to Lexington and to the Bluegrass this spring. He is President Avul Pakir Jainulabdeen Abdul Kalam. President of India from 2002 to 2007. Dr. Kalam is renowned as a scientist, and is one of the leaders of the development of India's lurch forward in technology development in -- in the new world of India which many of us are familiar with because of our contact in India and with the -- with active admissions and colleagues and students from India. During his term as president, Dr. Kalam focused on the visionary task of transforming India into a developed nation -- nation by 2020. One of the most distinguished scientists of India, he's been awarded honorary doctorates from many universities and has received the highest civilian honors that the government of India can bestow. He made significant contributions as the project director in the development of India's first indigenous Satellite Launch Vehicle which launched the Rohini satellite in July 1980, and he served as the scientific adviser to the

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
Defense Minister and Secretary, the  
Department of the Defense and Research and  
Development from July '92 to December of  
'99.

And so with that, I'm going to  
turn it back over to Kaveh with a positive  
recommendation of our committee to the  
Senate Council.

CHAIR: If I could just add a little bit  
to the background. It's my  
understanding -- and Provost Subbaswamy, if  
I am mistaken, please correct me. It's my  
understanding that originally the  
president -- ex-president of India was  
supposed -- or will be visiting MIT. And  
the only other institution that is on his  
agenda, as far as I know, is UK. I think  
that this is a pretty good accomplishment  
on the part of whoever at UK arranged this,  
and this will definitely have very good  
publicity for UK. So if I could add just  
one minor, maybe not correction, but change  
to what Dr. Blackwell said. The rule  
allows three nominees per ceremony, but if  
there are more than one ceremony, you could  
have more than three nominees. What the  
rule actually limits in this case is that  
all the recipients should -- this is our  
own rule, our Senate rule, they should  
receive their degree during the ceremony.  
And of course, in this case you can see why  
we are asking you to -- to waive this rule  
of the Senate and recommend that Dr. --

BLACKWELL: Kalam.

CHAIR: -- Kalam. You were very brave to  
have said the whole name. Dr. Kalam would  
receive his honorary degree during his  
visit here. I should have had one extra  
slide which I now realize I do not, is  
Professor Blyton is recommended to receive  
an Honorary Doctor of Letters; Governor  
Patton, Doctor of Humanities; and Coach  
Smith, Doctor of Humanities; and President  
Kalam, Doctor of Sciences. There are only  
four of them. I'm sure you will remember,  
but if you don't remember, please ask me, I  
will repeat the specific doctorate --  
honorary doctorate names. Okay. Because  
of the little tidbit of three to four or  
waiving -- or sorry, not three to four,  
waiving the rule that all -- everybody  
should receive it during the ceremony, we  
have a two-part recommendation from the  
Senate Council. So here are the nominees  
in front of you. They have been  
recommended by a committee, the majority of  
the faculty, and they have further been  
recommended by the Senate Council and in  
front of you, here is a potential motion  
that I would like to solicit from the  
senators.

RANDALL: I move to first that we  
recommend that -- that we approve the

nomination of the three that were submitted by the nominating committee. Randall.

CHAIR: Randall. The first part is intended to cover all of four. Because of that, we have the second part, so this is one motion; is that what -- is that the way you --

RANDALL: Then the motion would continue with the second part.

CHAIR: Okay. So we have a motion. And as you can see on -- on the screen. Do I have a second?

JACKSON: I second. Jackson.

CHAIR: Okay. So you have the -- the bios. You -- you know the -- the three names. Are we ready to vote on this? Mr. Parliamentarian of the Day.

MICHAEL: As you have it down, the first of those two, the persons permitted to vote are only elected faculty senators (inaudible) --

CHAIR: Correct. As our Parliamentarian is emphasizing, the part of the motion that says elected faculty present. So having said that, yes.

GROSSMAN: I just -- I just have a comment.

BROTHERS: Name please?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman.

CHAIR: Bob Grossman.

GROSSMAN: I just have a comment. I -- I don't oppose the motion, and I'm going to vote for it -- for it, but I did -- last year I commented on the somewhat parochial nature of the nominations that everyone was from Kentucky, and a very strong connection to Kentucky. I see that this year it's more of the same. There is a world outside of Kentucky, a whole world, a very large one with lots of worthy people, and I would just encourage the nominations committee to open up their eyes a bit to the world outside our borders in the future.

CHAIR: Thank you. Well, I think India is a little bit outside Kentucky.

GROSSMAN: But that didn't go through the nomination committee.

CHAIR: Correct, correct. I was joking. But I do appreciate your -- your input, and if any of you have any other comment, you could submit them to me, and I will be sure to document it and give it to the next year's honorary committee. John Thelin.

THELIN: John Thelin. May I speak to Bob Grossman's comment because I think it's perceptive and -- and warranted. My impression is that the number and the quality of the nominees in this year's pool was exceptional. I think that -- that one of the guidelines is to -- to give some consideration some -- somewhere often to some connection with the Commonwealth or the University. But it was an excellent -- it was an excellent pool; it was an



Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
excellent group. And so I think that  
there's -- I have cautious optimism that  
before Bob retires, by choice or otherwise,  
that -- that we'll continue on that task.

CHAIR: Back there. Name? I -- I know  
you but please --

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell. Can I call for the  
vote now, call for --

CHAIR: Sure.

CHAPPELL: -- the vote?

CHAIR: We are ready. I think we're  
ready to vote. Let's do it the same way  
again. Hopefully, we don't have to count.  
All those in favor of this slate of  
nominations with the provision that the  
Senate is -- of course all of this is a  
recommendation to the Board. The Board has  
to give the degree. We are not giving a  
degree at this point, at this moment. With  
the exception that we waive our own rule  
that all four nominees or all of them have  
to accept the degree during our graduation  
ceremony. All those in favor of the  
motion, the double motion or two-part  
motion, I should say, please indicate so by  
raising your hand.

Opposed?

Abstain?

It's unanimous. The motion  
carries. Thank you again for your  
cooperation.

Next, we are going to go to  
discussion of principles of Gen Ed. I've  
been saying by 3:30 we should be able to  
get to that. You can see we have  
(inaudible) precision. It is exactly 3:30.

Discussion of principles of Gen  
Ed reform. This is a first reading. You  
guys all know what it means. Let me just  
remind you -- a very short introduction.  
Now during the -- of course, we have been  
doing this for, I think seven years. I  
think I'm correct. From the very first  
step in (inaudible) to now. Last fall  
there was a document, a proposal  
distributed among all faculty. We had  
four, if I'm not mistaken, maybe three or  
four forums that I know of, faculty forums.  
And based on the comments from the faculty  
it was decided that we were going to slow  
down. And comments were sent back to the  
-- to the committee. The Senate committee  
then forwarded a statement of principles.  
So this is the first step that we are  
taking. From the going forward document,  
by the way, which is not in your handout, I  
believe --

BROTHERS: It is.

CHAIR: It is in your handout.

BROTHERS: The last page.

CHAIR: Number 5, this is where we are  
right now. It says, the collated comments  
would be reviewed by the Senate Council and  
Page 9

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
also transmitted to the University Senate when the modified General Education Curriculum Proposal is placed on the Senate agenda for discussion on February 11, 2008, today. And for a vote to determine approval or lack thereof at the March 17, 2008 University Senate meeting. So this is where we are right now. At this point, I'd like to invite the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies if he wants to make a remark. By the way, this is the web site that has been dedicated to this. Those of you who have given your comments and all those comments, wonderful comments, are in your handouts. This is the web site, and these are the seven principles that we are discussing right now. We are not going to be voting on this now. It would be for March. This is just for discussion only because it's a very important proposal.

KRAEMER: Good afternoon. I will preface my comments by saying that all four of the honorary doctoral candidates have read and approved these principles.

Let me say this, it really is a very, I think, important process that we go through as a university, begin to think about general education. And I think I'm at least seeing an affirmation that the kind of deliberative process that was used to present ideas and seek input was a very productive one. I spent a lot of time reading the comments of the faculty, and I think they're -- if you have not so done, I encourage you to do that before the March meeting. I think there is some valuable insights, and I think we gain from exposing these kinds of ideas in this way, soliciting the input and then incorporating that input. So my sense of this set of principles is they still remain somewhat plastic. And we'd like to take the comments today, discussion, as well as the discussion that has occurred already in written form, and incorporate that and make appropriate modifications, and perhaps recirculate that to the Senate Council, to the Senate, and I'll ask the provost to comment on that process afterwards. That would be my hope because I think there's still room for improvement. And what I'd like to just briefly do is address a few issues that are coming through in the written comments that -- that I think begin to show the kinds of changes that we may want to make, and that way we can begin focusing on some other issues. So very briefly and somewhat quickly, if we go through -- I'll not comment on all of these, but certainly where -- the -- the hot points; the hot button issues. The first principle about inquiry, I think we didn't do a good enough job in describing

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

what we really intend by this principle. And we certainly did not intend to produce a false dichotomy or to place in opposition the idea of teaching students how to think versus knowledge or process versus content. I think the goal is really to present to our students how it is that we, as scholars, come to think about and produce knowledge. And it's a matter of balance, also recognizing that in many instances we already do this fairly well. And what we should try to do as a faculty would be to define the criteria that we would want for this particular principle, and then using those criteria to express, I think, that's the student learning outcomes. Then decide what courses already exist may realize that objective, be able to modify existing courses, but also be willing to create new courses that address the issue. So it really is designed to help us produce students very early on who gain a much greater appreciation for evidence-based thinking so that they are better prepared to progress in the rest of their curricular experience at UK. The emphasis on inquiry, on thinking, evidence-based thinking over content is not meant to imply we can possibly do this by ignoring content. It is about balance and emphasis, and I would hope that the faculty committee that would articulate the student learning outcomes would make it clear how we will arrive at that balance. We've heard a lot of the vetting of the actual proposal of colleagues who they felt that they were achieving these objectives. But what we want is a uniform commitment to these objectives so that all of our courses that are meant to satisfy this principle are consistent in addressing these concerns.

The thirty hour principle is really a design principle, not necessarily a principle of new curriculum. I don't see many curricula in which faculty brags about how many credit hours they require. But it is important to think in terms of design because this is something that we heard a lot from faculty about over the last several years, considered we have complex general education program that seems to some as being incoherent, and that we could simplify it. The word simplify has been a part of our discussions for more than the past three years.

The principle on facilitation of students into the college experience, I think -- I don't even want to publicly acknowledge that -- I think that's an important idea, but it is somewhat challenging to deal with logistically. I think that's one where we have to really consider the ways in which we can implement

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

that particular principle; that many of these, it really is -- the devil is in the details. But I think there are some effective ideas for how we can better do that.

One of the more hot button issues was the focus on writing and quantitative reasoning. And here I will acknowledge that I think some modification in principle is probably appropriate. We want to expand, perhaps, to consider how we could incorporate other literacies. A number of faculty are concerned that we say nothing about visual literacies. I think we have to be able to address information literacies, and I encourage us to think about a modification that is a bit more expansive in that respect.

The other part of this that we particularly need to focus on is the -- is the principle on quantitative reasoning. And we certainly weren't intending a statistics course. We're intending something that really is probably best thought of as a combination of statistical reasoning with the necessary computational skills to really learn how to think from an inferential perspective and how to draw conclusions. We would encourage faculties of appropriate departments that have something to contribute here, not only the Statistics Department, the Math Department, Computer Science and other fields in the sciences. We get to talk about what we want to mean by quantitative reasoning. In particular there was -- again, I encourage you to read through these comments. I was very impressed with the -- the reasoning presented, and in many cases, the quality of the writing, but there's one particular comment that addresses this issue of quantitative reasoning that really would be a role model that we may need to append the set of principles of that -- that was actually vetted in March. It really articulates what we should be looking for when we talk about the kinds of quantitative reasoning that a student should have with respect to general education. And I think that's a key concept to always keep in front of us. What do we mean by general education versus the kind of preparation our students will need in the major and the other fields that contribute to their learning in the major?

Just a few more broad comments, and then we open it up. We certainly want our emphasis on pluralism to -- to extend beyond the borders of this country. It really is about a global perspective. And I acknowledge that there were a number of colleagues who are concerned about the second language issue. And I think that's

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

one where we're going to have to -- to struggle with, and I would invite you to think more about that.

The assessment principle is really a very important part of what put forth. And here the notion is simply that we need, based on accountability that is coming at us from many places, including parents, who are wanting to be assured that the huge investment they're making in their sons and daughters through their tuition investments, that we're really educating well their sons and daughters, and the assessment principle is really nothing more than we should be able to provide evidence that our students are learning what we want them to learn. Okay. It isn't necessarily that assessment means tests and measurement. We have to be able to discern that our students have been changed by the curriculum. I think we can do that, but for some who believe that there are some kinds of learning that don't lend themselves to measurement, I suggest that we -- we have to find some way to know that a change has occurred. And if we can't articulate that, then we probably can't make the claim that that particular learning objective is -- is realistic.

And then, finally, I think there were a number of colleagues who felt that the proposals weren't written as well as they could have been. Not only language, some jargon out there, and I certainly take responsibility for those mistakes. The goal is really to focus on the substance of these ideas and generate the principles that we can really move forward with a vision.

And finally, we are not proposing what was part of that original proposal in the fall. And some colleagues, I think, were confused that we were continuing to propose, for example, an explicit curriculum, or that we were recommending a modular approach. I think we heard a lot of negativity from faculty about that issue. We've taken a step back, and we're offering a more general set of principles here. How those become implemented will be in the hands of the faculty through the implementation process hereafter. And with that, I'll just turn it back over, and if Provost wants to say anything.

CHAIR:

Nevertheless, Provost is here for -- as a resource. If there's any question directed to the Provost or administration, I'm sure -- a question that the answer to which he knows, I'm sure he clarify.

Before I go to Bob Grossman, I -- I should have done this, and I -- I have done it one other time and I have seen my predecessors do it. Before the honorary

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

degree names are given, I ask that please keep these confidential to yourself if it is possible, until and in deference to the Board. Of course, the Board is going to meet next -- next month. I have already mentioned this to my friend Art, although this is an open meeting and perhaps by tomorrow the fact that I asked this to be -- maybe even this afternoon, might be a moot point, but keep it to yourself for today, at least. Okay. I appreciate it.

A couple of comments. I want to make a distinction between the proposal which is, perhaps, not even shelved; it's delayed. We are not discussing the proposal. I would like to ask you to please focus on the principle. Now, I know sometime maybe the line is somewhat murky, but if I stop you and I say this is the proposal itself, please let's focus on the principle; that's the reason I'm doing that. Having said that, now --

So we can focus even better, I'm going to suggest we go one by one, if there are any comments regarding the principle. We have 45 minutes -- no, one hour, 45 minutes. So if we go all the way to seven, at that time you could -- you could go back to principle number one after we hear all seven. So here we are, principle number one, are there any comments? One more thing, Senate Council members are here, they want to hear you. Members of the Provost office, the administration, Dean, all the other faculty, they want to hear you. So this is an opportunity for you -- in addition to the wonderful comments, I'm very impressed by them, to let us know what you think. So now, back there, your name?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman. I think a lot of the outrage that I read in the comments on principle number one might have been allayed by simply deleting the last five words of that -- of that principle. The, than acquiring specific knowledge content, I think is what really got the goat of a lot of people. I would also change -- change -- will shift more to will emphasize. Will emphasize learning experiences. As -- if what you say is true that you didn't mean to set up a dichotomy between understanding the process of inquiry and -- and knowing the specifics in the subject, then why you put, than acquiring specific knowledge content, in there is, you know, well, let's just say it's contradictory to -- to what you said before. So I think deleting those five words will make -- will go a long way to calming people down.

CHAIR:

Would anybody like to respond to that? Okay. Would anybody like to agree with that?

UNIDENTIFIED:

I'm agreeing.

CHAIR:

Oh, you are agreeing.

Any more comments? Name please?

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson. I'm agreeing too

but I -- I like the first -- I'd like the part of the first part of the sentence to be will emphasize instead of shift more toward. I like that part too.

CHAIR:

By the way, we are not making -- a discussion only such as the -- there are no -- by Senate rules, not necessarily by Robert's Rules of Order, but by Senate rules, there is -- there is no motion in front of you so you cannot amend it. (Inaudible). I know you know that. I just want to mention to everybody, we are not amending anything here right now. Of course, these are going to be up for discussion, for perhaps amendment, in March. Anybody else want to talk regarding principle number one? Okay.

Principle number two, are there any comments specific to principle number two? Not that we want to go home early is it?

Okay. Principle number three.

Are there any comments on principle number three.

FINKEL:

Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering. Some students' major field of study might have connections to the general education course work. Other major fields of study might have little connection. So I don't know if we can generally suggest that the revised committee will always identify and strengthen such connections which might not always exist. When they do exist, going back to point two, perhaps, they will allow the students to use some of those 30 credit hours toward their major as well as towards the new general education curriculum. It makes sense that such a multiple use of the same credits should happen. It does disadvantage those students who are in fields where there's very little overlap so that they can hardly use any of the 30 credit hours of general education towards their major field of study. In particular, let me just take a not-completely-random example. Let's take someone who's majoring in physics and apparently is developing, the general education curriculum would not contain any physics at all because it doesn't have an emphasis on process of inquiry. It doesn't have an emphasis on statistics. It doesn't have an emphasis on any of the things it seems to be emphasizing. Therefore, it's unlikely that students in physics would be able to strengthen any connection.

CHAIR:

Okay. Back there. Yes.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences.  
I guess, I would just like to

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
disagree with my good friend from the College of Education. If principal number one is modified the way that I suggested and some others supported, I would imagine the laboratory class might actually fulfill principle number one and would provide connection to specific disciplines, physics and chemistry and -- and other laboratory sciences. So -- so I -- perhaps the -- the -- the specific example you chose was inept, but -- not inept.

But I -- I can see, you know, the -- that there would be many types of courses that -- the sorts of principles that are elaborated would apply to almost all majors in one way or another. And certainly there are some of the principles that don't; that won't apply to a particular subject, but there will be others that will.

CHAIR: Are there any other comments?  
Just to mention that in addition to writing to you all, I don't know how many times, I also wrote to every faculty council of every college. And we did receive some input from those. If you are here and you would like to speak on behalf of your council, by all means. Any other comments on principle number three? Yes.

HERTOG: Jim Hertog. My impression of the general education portion was that it should stand on its own as knowledge that all of our students should have. Isn't trying to adjust it to all the different potential ways that it could be stretched likely to distort that basic intention?

CHAIR: Anybody would like --  
KRAEMER: Could I respond to that? I think when you look at the national dialogue on general education, there's two points of emphasis. One is on a type of general knowledge, but also on a type of general skill. And clearly some of our majors are -- are really, within the nature of their mission, they are providing students very good ways of satisfying many of these skills. So in that sense, I think it would be foolish of us to not take advantage of that. To put students through separate skill-based courses just because we'd like them segregated. And I think the general trend again nationwide is that there is an effort to try to reunite the majors and redefine the undergraduate experience in a more holistic way so that there isn't this segregation of a major (inaudible). The extent to which we do that is, perhaps the issue. Some -- some areas of knowledge clearly will be out of a major, and that is an issue that we have to address again as faculty. You wouldn't want, I think, a student to be able to satisfy all requirements within a given major and never



Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

leave the engineering building. It's a nice building, but I think that's one of the issues that may arise. And I think that the -- to the extent that with some of these skill-based courses including, for example, writing, that's where physics may want to develop, and be in the process during all of this here, a writing-intensive courses. I can envision those courses being developed that would satisfy a particular physics course and also be a way of satisfying that writing-intensive part of the curriculum.

CHAIR: Any other comments on principle number three? Okay.

Let's now go to principle number four. Are there any comments? Questions?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, again. I -- I find the last clause ironic in -- in view of the number of faculty searches that were just frozen. You cannot involve full-time faculty unless we have full-time faculty to involve. And we're certainly not going to turn over teaching our junior- and senior-level courses to PTIs. But the -- it's -- it's a great sentiment, but I find it difficult to see that it's going to happen anytime in the near future or the middle future, for that matter.

SUBBASWAMY: Let me just comment --

CHAIR: Please comment, anytime.

SUBBASWAMY: -- on the faculty. I mean it's a very valid point. Obviously, you know, in light of what's going on in Frankfort right now, we can ask, how would you do this and so forth and it's perfectly valid. What -- what I'd like to say is that the design principles, as Kraemer read, is -- I -- I certainly think that as a research university, with the idea of evidence-based reasoning as an important element of general education, involving those full-time faculty as much as possible is a noble principle, and I think that's what the sentiment would suggest. Remember that the full context in which we're all operating, and certainly I'm operating, I'm an optimist, that's how I operate, is that there is a top 20 goal/mandate, in fact, given by the state. They haven't yet given us the money, but you know, it's not -- the battle is not over yet. And so what -- exactly to what extent you can implement this, remember we were talking in the context of adding on 500 faculty, so... It is absolutely the right thing to do to say that as a research university, the kind of experiences we will present to our students will have these elements into it. And I think in real terms we have multiple missions. Undergraduate education is one and -- and among them graduate education,

research, outreach, they're all elements of it. And in that balance how we deploy our faculty resources is something that obviously will be decided on availability bases and there are multiple options to go. I mean, you know, again no report has (inaudible) I suppose. I mean, at some point if the resources should become particularly significant, we would re-examine some of the top 20 business plan, the growth of undergraduate population and so forth. So I think that we would have to adjust it, but whatever we offer ultimately would have to have quality and some of the design...

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology. I also think that we haven't utilized faculty across the board in the different colleges who, I remember a number of years ago expressed a great willingness to get involved with teaching of students coming into the college. Faculty from the College of Medicine, for example, they were interested in having some of their faculty get involved in (inaudible) of students coming in. And we've not really tapped into that. We seem to -- we made suggestions to do it, they volunteered to do it, and were never taken up on it. I think basically, you know, there's enough faculty across the board in the different colleges who would be willing, I'm not talking about forced, who would be very willing to participate in this kind of project to see UK go forward, and I -- and I think it's a good one. And I think if -- if that -- if these borders are open, you know, I think we could fulfill whatever we have to do in terms of, you know, in -- in -- particularly in this area of smoothing the transition. We're -- I just don't -- I don't think we utilize that sufficiently. I think there's a willingness. I'm not saying we should force people to do what they don't want to do, but I think there's a willingness. I've heard it. I heard it in the (inaudible). Faculty would like to get more involved in this -- in this kind of transition, and I think we should tap into it more. I think it would help tremendously in terms of this kind of thing.

CHAIR: Yes.

YANARELLA: Over the course of the -- the forums that --

CHAIR: Ernie Yanarella.

YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella, pardon me. Over the course of the GERA forums that took place almost two years ago, there was a very loud and clear statement that was made by faculty, and that was that whatever general education reform we undertake, the one that was appropriate to a research one

university, that we should not focus our efforts or attention on duplicating what a Berea College or a Centre College might attempt to do in terms of providing general education to its students. I think in some respect, number four challenges us to -- to respond positively to that. I would also point out that in regard to the -- the last clause, the experience of the discovery seminar has demonstrated that full-time faculty, that research faculty can take their -- their particular research program or some aspect to it -- of it to first year students and through the -- the sort of the test of fire, of the first year, learn how to -- to convey that in an active learning environment and -- and in effect meet the -- the challenge that is presented by this particular -- particular principle. But I -- I think -- it seems to me there are -- there are many ways that we can do this; that we really must do this if we're going to honor the major thrust of remarks that emanated from the GERA forums. And that we do, indeed, have a model, though it may have to be scaled up considerably in context of being institutionalized.

CHAIR: Any other comment on number four?  
Let me go there and then I come over here.

CLARKE: Harry Clarke, Fine Arts. It seems like to me that the credibility of the entire structure of -- of -- of this curriculum depends on what we're talking about right now. If we can't have full-time faculty involved in this, then the credibility of the entire -- the entire program is -- is -- is moot; it seems to me. I just think it's awfully important that -- that we can guarantee students of involvement of full-time faculty to make this valid.

CHAIR: Over here, and then I go to you.

SOTTILE: Joe Sottile, Engineering. I'm not sure -- number four, I guess, could be interpreted several different ways. One of the things that we're -- we currently do in engineering, I think every program does it, is that -- and I know in my particular department, we make sure that a student every semester has a course in our department, and they don't lose touch with us while they're taking calculus, physics, chemistry, and so on. And of course, the full-time faculty they're involved with it, and it -- it lets them be in touch with us throughout the entire process because our retention is generally not what we would like it to be. And I don't know -- we have a professions course the first semester and we -- we have you know -- we tried a common freshmen experience for our students. It started probably 10 years. It's been refined and so on. But I think -- it's

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

something we've been working with a long time, and I'm wondering if something like that could fulfill the intent of -- of number four; where we have basically in each -- each department a course specifically for, you know, entering freshmen, and then we follow it up with a second course and so on, but we keep tabs on them with our full-time faculty.

KRAEMER: I think that's an excellent example of the way in which you begin trying to do that, and I think the collateral benefits are above and beyond general education, to just have contact with faculty, but for some of their majors, they do come into the University and -- and they are not taking major courses yet, so it's hard to feel identified with that college. The way you described your program, Joe, is exactly the way you can begin to make that (inaudible).

SUBBASWAMY: I think again, our -- the universal peer we worked with our (Inaudible) research university and quite a bit larger research universities, the Michigans, the Wisconsin and so forth. And all of them really do operate with a design principle such as this and achieve it to different extents. I think that, you know, some would follow the model that is suggested. There are smaller programs, such as discovery programs, you know, freshman seminars and so forth. The whole idea is a -- I think a -- a intentionality to have exposure of research faculty, full -- full-time faculty, to the freshmen students as much as possible. That is, if you go through the whole first year without coming into contact with a single faculty member of the sort that we talked about and brag about at research university, then how is that benefit tangible to a student and what -- how can we say we're -- we're trying to do that? So I think that there are different elements of it. Can -- can we guarantee that every class that every student takes would be taught with -- with a full-time faculty member? If you're in the physics department, you can. We actually do that in large lecture classes, so I think that it's going to be different in different programs and units but one works towards that hopefully.

ELDRED: Janet Eldred. I just wanted to add that it's more of a challenge for general education, but I think it's easier in the majors to have the full-time faculty, but to deliver our general education using full-time faculty has been the challenge and continues to be the challenge.

CHAIR: Now, I'm going to go back there.  
FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, Engineering.

When I first read this, I didn't see the connection between transition from high school and full-time faculty. Now, the discussions we've been hearing begins to clarify that, but it seems to me that there's more in transitioning from high school than seeing full-time faculty. A lot of the high school students come in with some sorts of deficiencies that need remediation, and certainly part of a curriculum designed to smooth the transition has got to worry about that. We certainly already are thinking about that as we say that there should be writing as a concentration. We would hope that students come from high school able to write well. We don't see that. Also, the emphasis on critical thinking, we would hope that students come with that; we don't always see it. So smoothing the transition from high school, perhaps should be a separate point from significant involvement of full-time faculty. I think they are both important, but perhaps for different reasons.

CHAIR: If you notice, I'm not going to our provost and associate provost after every question or comment or criticism. They are not here to defend this, and we are not here to attack it. I'm -- I'm taking the two of them as resource and another tool, colleague and, you know, professor. So having said that, are there any other questions or comments regarding principle number 4? Okay. Let's move to principle number 5. Yes. Back there.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, College of Ag. I'd like Phil Kraemer to maybe give -- you mentioned this point earlier, and you said there was a particular quote or statement that you thought was appropriate to really think about this -- this point, and I'd like to ask him to please, maybe, elaborate on that?

KRAEMER: You're testing me now, Joe.

ELDRED: I think it's probably page 7 or 8.

KRAEMER: Probably, yes, probably page 7.

ELDRED: The bottom of page 7 --

KRAEMER: It has a very -- Rich, is that --

ELDRED: Line 54, bottom of page 7.

KRAEMER: I want to get to this -- I mean, there's a lot of valuable quotes in here. I believe it's on page 8. Yes.

BROTHERS: That's page 23 of the handout, page 8 of just the comments.

KRAEMER: Page 8 of the comment section --

CHAIR: Do you have the line number?

KRAEMER: -- and I think it's 7.

CHAIR: Okay.

KRAEMER: Well, it's not a quote. It's a whole concept that's really described here fairly well. And -- and it references --

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

course is Math 111 that was an experimental course that, I think, captures a lot of what we really would intend. Carl, is that Math 111 the reference; does that make sense to you?

Why I'm looking to you, I'm going to you. I think Carl was involved in a -- in another group quite awhile ago now that began to look at our -- our quantitative reasoning, our math education, and I think some of the ideas that come from that mode of thinking, that set of ideas and I'd encourage to go through and read about, that the important point is to not define that quantitative reasoning necessarily the way we did in the proposal that we're not even talking about now. But rather to ask colleagues from appropriate fields to gather together to define what we mean by quantitative reasoning for general education. And that's (inaudible) along the way. What is it that one needs in the major is one thing, and it's something else to think about, what -- what do all of our students need as a baseline, and it really is a better appreciation in part of quantitative reasoning, shapes the world, and the skill part of that, it's a balancing act, how much computational skills do you need to get to that level of appreciation? And this is where we need broader input from a variety of faculty to hear about what is really necessary for the committee. I will say this as a final point that most of our students, by virtue of their majors, are taking considerable heavy duty math courses along the way, not just in the sciences, but those in BE, for example, they're taking calculus, et cetera. But there would be those that would argue that a calculus course isn't necessarily be an appropriate kind of course that we'd want for general education for students in which that particular set of skills is not being practiced all the time.

SUBBASWAMY: Again, along the -- the similar vein, I must have been sleeping when USP was passed. I was faculty member. I was even on the Senate at the time, I think, but I don't quite remember how we got to the notion of Calc 1 as the sinequanon of an educated mass quantitative education persons quantitative skills because that's essentially what we state as our quantitative skills as a general education requirement. A lot of universities don't do, okay, especially over the last 20 years. As in fact, both, I think what Math 111 tries to accomplish and what the Mathematical Association of America, you know, as you've seen in this -- in this content and so forth, it's -- it's a lot

more complex than that. In fact, I used to -- I've gone through my stage of thinking about what makes a human human. I used to think it was, you know, telling jokes, then being able to differentiate between an integration and (inaudible) their programs (inaudible) came out and now mathematics got all these things, they do it faster than, of course, human beings programming them. Nonetheless, that definition went away. In fact, nobody, I think, ever even remembers how to some of the differentiation and -- and integrations. But then so the question, you know, what is the next step, and you can ask what is the -- what do -- what do you mean by quantitative reasoning today in today's world? And if you ask for the generally educated individual, future citizen and so forth what quantitative skills you need, then certainly I think one could argue whether the current definition of Calculus is an equivalent (inaudible). That's really what this is trying to say. And I think that actually fleshing it out is going to be the responsibility of faculty committee, including mathematicians, statisticians, and others who are the recipients of such requirements; come together and look at what possibilities there are. And Math 111 certainly is a good example of a different sort of approach to quantitative reasoning.

CHAIR:  
ARNOLD:

Back here.  
Susanne Arnold, Medicine. I -- I think -- I read through the entire document, and I -- I think one of the things that is lost a little bit is the relevance of these principles to the individual, in that, I came from a system of my undergraduate training where there were no requirements, and yet everyone ended up taking general education requirements that were relevant to them. Do you envision a give and take in the students' ability to also direct their education -- maybe this has already been asked while I've been running back and forth answering beeper pages; I apologize. Give and take between the student and the committee in thinking outside the box and not having absolutely everything being written down, this is what you have to do. I -- I hope that's the case. I don't know who can answer that.

KRAEMER:

Well, I'll try to give you part of an answer. I think you make a very important point that one of the things we're going to have to accept that we have to do is do a much better job of talking to our entering students about the relevance of their general education and about how they need to think about navigating this complicated institution; that we can't take

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
for granted they will come in with the values in place, so to some extent it's that issue. And we hope we have enough flexibility in the curriculum as well that -- that they would be better informed and inspired to make appropriate choices with our guidance along the way. I don't think we can do a Brown like education with our students here which is fairly open.

UNI DENTI FIED: Did you ask Brown?

UNI DENTI FIED: We did.

ARNOLD: I -- I don't know that that's appropriate for a large state university either, but I think an art major and a person that wants to be a physician and an engineer and a historian all may choose to have exactly the same course work, and they may not come away with number one which is the most important thing, critical thinking so that's my point.

CHAIR: Do you want to speak to this?

GREISSMAN: Well, if I may, with respect to Joe's question. I think the question Joe asked about where the statement on quantitative reasoning began, I think starting on page 6 of 29, at the bottom page 21 of the Senate numbering, line 25 is the start.

UNI DENTI FIED: Line 45.

GREISSMAN: Line 45, page 6 of 29 at the bottom. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you. Go back there.

CIBULL: I believe we've already done this

--

CHAIR: Mike Cibull.

CIBULL: Mike Cibull, College of Medicine. When we ask, you know, what's going to be necessary for general education in the future, I mean, the people we should include asking are the people out in the community who our graduates are going to be interacting with to make a living, among other things. Do we -- do we query business and community leaders in terms of what they think would be general skills that -- that they would like to see our graduates have?

KRAEMER: We certainly have taken into account national -- that's a very important point. Organizations like AAC&U have been very explicit about soliciting that kind of information. There's a recent report that is on their website that describes the feedback that they're getting from private industry, at least as one dimension of the community. In our GERA process here at UK during the course of this we -- we had a very small session, but we did invite members of the outside community to get that perspective. It is imperative to do that, and I would encourage all the college deans to continue to do that through their college advisory board which are populated



Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

by folks who have a very good sense of the world beyond the university, but we're going to have to define our education in those terms. So relying somewhat on what is available as best practice, but then also localizing that here too and realizing things like service learning can go a long way toward helping us connect with that community and stay informed.

CHAIR:  
ELDRED:

Over there.  
Janet Eldred. One of the things that came of GERA that I found really helpful was the -- the distinction between things that you need for general ed and things that were a prerequisites for a major. I think sometimes it's very hard for us to give up on the notion of a certain skill or a certain thing because we think a major is going to have to -- to use this or need this so it was really useful for me sometimes when we do get to the sacred cows to kind of, okay, what does every student need to know and to keep in mind that we were never going to cut a prerequisite, that they were going to be -- that certain students have to have more than one semester of calculus. They have to have lots of calculus. And so what we're really asking when we get into some of these areas is what does every student need for general education whether they're the art major, pre-med, no matter what the -- where their major takes them.

CHAIR:  
SOTTILE:

Yes.  
Joe Sottile, Engineering. One of the things that we noticed in our own assessment of our program has been that oral communication is very important, and I notice that it's not here, and I know we have an suspension on oral communication right now and I was wondering -- my personal opinion is that it's extremely important, and it's -- and it's missing.

CHAIR:  
KRAEMER:

Anybody want to speak to that?  
I'm looking to my boss here  
for communication --

SUBBASWAMY:  
KRAEMER:  
SUBBASWAMY:

Again, I think --  
-- oral communication.  
I see my colleague Dave Johnson over there and I'm sure he would like to weigh in as well. I don't think anyone disagrees with the importance of oral communication. It's a question of how you deliver it and/or how to ensure that people have acquired that skill to a certain minimum level. I think that the notion of a rhetoric course and/or public speaking course followed by something is what we have followed, and -- I was in the Physics Department, and whether what did to follow up might (inaudible). I don't -- at least during my time we didn't really do anything to follow up, so take whatever, just Comm

181 was it? Some -- some -- I forgot the course number now. And frankly, I don't think we -- beyond making sure there were adequate number of graduate students supported in the College of Communication, I'm not sure what else we accomplished from that requirement. I mean, I'm giving you one perspective on this one. And I've been at other institutions where again there's been the issue of, for example, the business school at Indiana University decided that what we were doing in communication was inadequate and inappropriate. They didn't use enough PowerPoint. We need somebody who can make presentation of a business plan with all this rhetoric stuff about (inaudible) and what brings -- (inaudible) cares about. So there are disagreements about what is the best way of preparing our students for oral communication. I would simply argue that the logistics alone would -- would suggest that this idea of somehow you take a required course, and that's going to give you those skills. I mean, I would challenge us to think about whether in fact that's the only way to do it. So what isn't written here is that there are a lot of such things that really need to be incorporated more in terms of thinking of -- thinking of it as a four-year process rather than something that you take, you know, in one semester and move on, so that's really -- at least the thinking of the group is we reduce the number of required credit hours. One of the design principles is to go down from the 41 -- was it 41?

KRAEMER: Forty-one.

SUBBASWAMY: Thereabouts to 30, and then I think individual disciplines are probably -- will have the opportunity to then define different things. The Business School may still require, in fact, something from the College of Communication as -- as it currently does. Engineering may put up, you know, a program of their own, whether it's involving courses or you have to present ten seminars in a -- your junior year or senior year. There are various ways of us incorporating that. So that's what we were intending with the...

CHAIR: But you -- you mention you're not sure how it should be delivered, but isn't that obvious certainly from it's name?

JOHNSON: Dean Johnson.  
First of all, I'd like to thank my colleague in Engineering for supporting oral communication. The College of Engineering also is unique in having a chair in oral communication (inaudible) to help support us in our efforts to extend

oral communication instruction to Engineering. We also are one of the few parts of USP that has been very serious about assessment, going back to an earlier comment, so we do have some proof that oral communication has been effective the way it is taught here. It's clear to me that from working with a number of provosts that, not just this provost, but a number of other provosts have indicated there aren't the financial resources to teach oral communication in the way it needs to be taught for all the majors here at UK. I would like -- and I've indicated this in a number of different forums, if we're not going to have oral communication as a requirement, for us not to specify written communication. I would rather it just be writing because it was written an oral communication in the old USP curriculum and if we're not going to have both, oral and written, then I would prefer that communication be taken out of there. As the provost knows, a number of the big ten universities have programs in rhetoric that combine oral and written communication with the idea of students being able to make an impact in their efforts. If we're not going to do that here, I would prefer that it just be writing and not communication.

CHAIR: I noticed several hands but I don't remember now, so please raise your hands again. Over here.

HERTOG: Jim Hertog. I'd like to sort of support that in saying that the goal here seems to be excellence in expression or ability to communicate and not necessarily that it be through a written or even oral. The new technological changes we're seeing in communication, a number of our students become excellent in visual expression and a number of kinds of expression. If the goal is to essentially say that our students basically should be able to express themselves in a number of ways that are effective, then that's really what we should be presenting as a goal I think, or as a...

CHAIR: Over here.

ARNOLD: Susanne Arnold, Medicine. It strikes me that we're actually talking about in -- in terms of communication people being able to communicate well, in written and oral form and others, but that maybe what we need to target in that -- in that area is not all students because some of them will come in very, very well versed in written and oral communication, but to target some poor communicators as the people that may need class work in that. Is that a crazy thought or -- to have a minimum requirement or to be identified as someone that has a problem with

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
communication early in order to improve that, rather than trying to focus on everyone, and not only leaving that to the written but also oral and other communication skill sets, or whatever you want to call it.

CHAIR: Comments? Back there, yes.  
Dean Johnson.

JOHNSON: Just to clear up one misnomer. Right now the Communication Department doesn't fulfill all of the oral communication requirement. There's a (inaudible) course that can fulfill it. There's alternate pathways. So as it is now with the suspended requirement, there are a number of different ways of satisfying the oral communication requirement.

ARNOLD: And different people will have different needs for communication, and that again gets back to what is relevant to their field of study? So I guess my point being, again, relevance of the -- of the subject matter and that communication can be enhanced in many different ways, but that we need to identify the poor communicators.

SUBBASWAMY: One comment that -- I think that (inaudible) some repeat the themes here so it might be interesting to -- to tie them together.

I think that number 3 tries to speak to that. That, in fact, to the extent that we can define what's relevant, try to tie general education to the major.

But number 7 which is not there, which comes back to assessment, which, again, you know, whatever we might think about how -- what we are as assessment other than we can measure what's good learning and whether students learn, et cetera, et cetera. There's still the issue of if you were able to have some general expectations and then have an assessment tool of some sort, you could do what you suggested which is that if somebody already comes with all that -- all those skills, they can pass out of it, and then would not have to take the necessary courses or demonstrate the competence in some other way. So I think that number 7 if done right, if done well, may allow us a way of addressing it in the way you suggested.

CHAIR: Okay. Over here and then we go there.

Yes.  
ELDRED: Janet Eldred. What I've seen with those assessment programs in terms of assessing new students coming in is it's (a) it's very expensive, and (b) it's hard to even find a good assessment, and (c) it has this notion that if we can just kind of take care of it at the beginning, we never

have to take care of it all. And programs that have gone that route, have -- have found that it doesn't work particularly well. And in fact, what you see with programs like Stanford, is they're getting rid of any even AP credit; they're getting rid of any kind of exemptions coming in, and saying, you know what, writing and -- and visual communication and oral communication, digital communication, digital literacy, information literacy, these things are so important that they need to happen across four years, and you -- you don't excuse people from it. It's much too important, and they're -- they're taking in very high caliber students and still making those arguments.

CI BULL: That's true. Communication is part of every course and every curriculum. And it doesn't have to be written communication versus oral communication. I mean, we have done away, I think, with centralized oral communication courses and centralized English written communication courses with the idea of embedding those in the -- in the individual curricula. The -- as I recall we had this discussion in this body about that, and the -- the requirement was that each of those curricula sort of think along those lines and plan a program that would address those issues. So I -- I'm sort of confused as to why written communication, per se, is highlighted there and just not communication and quantitative reasoning skills.

UNI DENTI FIED: Effective communication.

CI BULL: Yeah, that would be good.

CHAIR: Any other comment on number 5? Of course, we can go to 6 and 7 even that we have a half an hour, but I -- I don't want to rush it. We can come back to any of these. Yes.

SOTTILE: Joseph Sottile, Engineering. I think that was a good point because we don't have to meet oral communication requirements by having a Comm 181 or a Comm 199. I think that for the same reason we think written communication is important, oral communication is important, and it can be fulfilled a number of different ways because I -- I mean, we all understand the -- the budgetary constraints. And as I say, I think that oral and written communication are both important, and there -- the fact that it's not mentioned seems that it's ignored more so than the logistics of offering a Comm course.

CHAIR: Are we ready to go to 6? Okay. So let's now discuss principle 6. Are there any comments specific to principle 6? Over here.

JANECEK: Jerry Janecek, Modern and

Classical Languages.

The concern with a lack of mentioning foreign languages in this item could possibly be solved by adding the word multilingual to interconnected world; to convey the observation that, yes, we do live in a world where other languages are needed and spoken and all. And then that would be turned into some specifics on a proposal for how to do that. But just adding that word, I think would -- would be nice.

CHAIR: Any other comment? Let me go here and then go here.

YANRELLA: Looking over the comments on number 6, I -- I was amazed at how much of free ride political science got. I think that -- that in part each of these principles should be a challenge, not merely to our vision of general education, but to our understanding of what disciplinary education is all about. It seems to me that what -- what is embedded in this, in the term effective citizenship, is the notion of civic education or civic virtue. There have been any number of really outstanding works that have been written within the field of political science, (inaudible) speaking, but very little of that gets -- gets brought into the undergraduate classroom. So it seems to me that when we think about each one of these principles, we ought to be thinking about them, not simply in terms of how they satisfy the general education curriculum, but the -- in the -- in the spirit of number 3, how these connections can be made through the student's major of study. I think if we expect anything less, and if the architecture of administration over this general education curriculum doesn't also seek to -- to press disciplines to find ways in which it can make important contribution to these -- these general education principles, then it seems to me we have not fulfilled our responsibility.

CHAIR: Anybody else?

ELDRED: Janet Eldred. I wanted to go back to the language issue that Jerry was speaking to. I was struck in the comments -- of course I can't find them now, but -- but someone said that it's the only -- only thing that we accept high school work for. In other words, you fulfill -- the requirement is there and visibly now, and would carry forward as opposed -- (inaudible) is what we're looking in some way, but it's the only thing we say, okay, if you've done your two years in high school, you're done. We -- we accept it. And then there was a mention in here of a placement test that can be offered. I don't know how I feel about that because I

don't -- I can't imagine that doing a placement test as you come in really means that when you graduate you're multilingual or bilingual, but anyway, those -- those comments struck me as something we need to ponder.

CHAIR: Any other comments on 6? Going once. Okay. What about assessment? Comments, principle number 7. Are there any comments?

FIN KEL: Raphael Finkel, Engineering. Two comments on this. One is, this principle is so different in spirit than the others, that maybe it isn't a principle at all. It's more a mechanism of governing, a mechanism of how you make sure what the others are supposed to do is actually happening. It's not a principle of curriculum. And secondly, I don't like it. And the reason I don't like it is because I'm worried that too much effort will be spent on specifying and measuring at the expense of doing.

KRAEMER: I guess I'd like to just respond to that. I mean, I can't address what you like and dislike, but I think it's important to think about this in terms of what we really are hoping for. Having it here, I would argue, makes sense because we want faculty to be very intentional about creating a learning experience to begin with. So it isn't a matter of simply defining a set of goals; that we often describe in terms of what we will do to students and then find a way to measure what they've learned from that. And I think what it's really embraced, the faculty, it helps us think about what it is we're trying to achieve in those particular courses, not with an emphasis on testing again, but what is the evidence that we would want to count that we have achieved the course objectives in terms of what students have learned, rather than what we've done to them. So -- so I would argue that it is an important design principle for that.

CHAIR: Let me go to Mike Cibull and then to Ernie Yanarella.

CI BULL: Yeah, I strongly support having number 7 as documented. I think that we tend not to assess the results of our processes, and we tend to think that what we're doing is fine, and 10 or 15 years down the road, find out that it's not so fine. So I think that continuous outcomes assessment leads to continuous attempts at improving what we're doing. So I don't think it's time wasted. I think it's time well spent. It also sort of hones your critical thinking as to what you want to do. And when you develop an assessment tool, you sort of have to understand what

it is exactly that you're -- you're attempting to do. And when you start trying to do that, maybe you find out, well, you're not really attempting to do very much.

CHAIR: Over here.

YANARELLA: First off, I say, amen.

CIBULL: That wasn't a religious --

YANARELLA: Praise and hallelujah.

I would agree with everything that -- that Mike just said. When -- when the whole process of external review and in the general education -- the GERA process was in full gear, it was clear that -- that more and more individuals who are pressing these things were seeing general education reform and assessment as -- as part of a neutrally reinforcing process. When we looked to schools that were doing general education right, we saw that they had a -- that they had a fundamental -- they made a fundamental effort at systematic assessment that fed back into the process of improving of general education reform. When my son went to Miami University, he was -- he was educated in the Miami plan, and that Miami plan, as -- as a number of us who went up to -- to view its institutionalization saw was that it was very much integrated into a process of continual and systematic assessment that fed back into efforts at improving sagging aspects of a -- of an evolving general education process.

ELDRED: Janet Eldred. The one thing I see missing from the statement in 7 is it should be faculty involvement. The assessment isn't something that's done to us, and so my preference -- I know we're not editing and doing it, but we need the faculty will specify learning outcomes. The faculty collectively speaking and that it's the faculty involvement in that assessment.

CIBULL: It's actually -- it's every -- I mean, it's not only the faculty, it's the students. What that sort of -- what that sort of is is lean -- is a lean process. And I think that lean processes can be applied to education probably very well, but it requires everybody's involvement, not just the faculty.

CHAIR: Back there.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell. I -- I very much agree with what Mike has just said, and -- and I guess my sense is that right now, having vested a large amount of my career in teaching activities, I'm kind of on the other end, and I need some other tools to help me advance how I'm doing my job. And so I think it does really -- I like number 7 down there as not only a learning outcomes tool for the students but for the faculty as well because I -- I definitely



Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

see that I need new mechanisms and tools to advance myself, my expectations for what I can teach, how I can teach, and so forth.

CHAIR: Any other comments on number 7? And all of -- all of the ones in front of you if you want to go back, we have 20 more minutes. Yes.

HALLMAN: Can I go back to 6? Diana Hallman, Fine Arts. And -- and just emphasize the need for language to be inserted in some way, maybe multilingual was the way to do it, but just to -- to make a personal statement, I feel that as Janet suggested, just accepting languages from high school may not be enough. I think in general students are very weak in language. They don't know how to use language in an oral capacity. They barely read it. And I think for a generally educated American, a college-educated American, there should be language skill other than English. I do a lot of research in -- in Europe, and I'm constantly running into Americans and American students who go over assuming that everyone should speak English. And -- and that -- that really affects their experience and the response to them in a very negative way. And I -- I think that there are a lot of majors that are diluting the language requirement. I -- I'm pretty sure that's the case, and we certainly should not dilute it. I think we should strengthen it in this new USP.

CHAIR: Any more comments? Bob.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman. On number 5, a lot of comments have been made about removing the word written from communication. I agree. I think it would -- it would also help -- there's a lot -- a lot of people commented on how the Arts were missing, but the Arts are a form of communication, and I think in developing number 5 -- I mean, elaborating on number 5, one thing that's been mentioned is that not just written, not just oral, but also someone mentioned visual and other -- other forms of representation can be included in that particular principle.

SUBBASWAMY: I think this is a very, you know, important point, one that a lot of people have, up to this point, I think, have paid service to, but not really embraced it in the sense that writing has always been privileged as has been math. This will be a statement that writing, as we conventionally understand it, is no longer privileged as a form of communication. Are we -- are we prepared to make that -- I'm too old fashioned, I'm asking, are we prepared to actually make that statement because that's essentially, I think, where -- where at least the committee started. And we all know, we started with

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
our traditional bias that writing is --  
written communication or writing is somehow  
privileged. I'd be curious to get a little  
more in that -- I think -- I think I see --  
I see a strong sentiment that we've got  
visual communication, oral communication,  
text, telephone texting communication.

CHAIR:

Let me go to Janet.

ELDRED:

Janet Eldred. Of course, I  
want to privilege written. I have to say  
I'm very much aware that as you're training  
students for the 21st century to teach them  
just flat print -- when I was talking with  
Dean Lester about a Center for Technical  
Communication, I was saying you really  
can't have just a Center for Technical  
Writing. It's training students for a  
world that no longer exists. But do I  
count text messaging as real communication?  
I'm not there yet.

CHAIR:

Let me go to the new Senator.

Yes.

HOPENHAYN:

Claudia Hopenhayn, College of  
Public Health.

I just want to stress what has  
been said already about the issue of  
language; I think it's really important,  
and I think also as part of that language  
and culture, encouraging students to spend  
a semester abroad should be really  
important in that sense too because you  
learn a lot more in the total (inaudible)  
in another country, in both culture and  
language, than you do in three or four or  
six semesters of classroom.

CHAIR:

Let me go there.

CIBULL:

Mike Cibull. I don't think we're  
de-emphasizing written communication. I  
think it is pre-eminent in many areas and  
will remain pre-eminent just by the nature  
of the course, of the curriculum. So I  
don't think we have to emphasize it in this  
document. It will be emphasized in the  
individual course or curriculum. And there  
are places where actually oral  
communication is much more important, and  
in those places that will be emphasized. I  
don't think we have to be so prescriptive.

CHAIR:

Over here.

STEINER:

I'm of favor of keeping written  
communication in, basically, because I  
think the base of the other communications  
is the ability to write, whether it's oral  
or -- or visual, you still -- I think the  
base of both of those is an ability to  
understand how to write and present.  
Usually what's presented is what's written.  
Be it on a PowerPoint or be it on -- those  
are skills, different skills, but the  
really core of the skills, in my view, is  
the ability to write correctly, to  
structure correctly. And so I think -- I  
think it's more fundamental than some of

the others, in my opinion.

CHAIR:

Over there.

MILLER:

Joe Miller, College of Communications. With number 5, as we've talk about the importance of writing, it seems that most writing depends on successful use of other information. And in some of the earlier GERA documents, there was more explicit mention of information literacy as an -- an idea that would also sort of stressed across the curriculum, you know, as writing would be and other forms of communication. Was that left out for some specific reason or was -- or I know there were comments in other places -- faculty comments that have highlighted that. I was just curious.

KRAEMER:

No. I think, Joe, when we talked about the original proposal, we had thought about it somehow being embedded in a number of ways, but it -- but it didn't surface in this. But -- but hearing, I think there's a real concern that we modify that particular principle. But at the same time, I do worry that if we modify it to be more inclusive, what are the implications of that? If it is that we're now going to offer the kinds of courses we would need to offer to have high levels of competency in all of these skills, I would say, including foreign languages, then we've got to be willing to recognize that that takes tremendous resources. It's not -- it's -- it's a very difficult thing. It's not a surprise that we struggled with the oral communication requirement because they're resources that must be invested in that, but if we can think creatively of how we can treat this as a four-year experience and work within majors and do perhaps little pieces along the way and really exploit the expertise we have on this campus. I mean, your college is -- is valuable in this regard. So are colleagues in Fine Arts, talking about what it means to have visual literacy and how one might be able to assess it and deliver that within a way that doesn't use the quantum approach which is, it's a course. If we do that, much of this ability is dead.

CHAIR:

Any other comments?

JANECEK:

Jerry Janecek, Modern and Classical Languages.

I have a question actually. Are these going to be presented to us again in exactly this form or revised on the basis of this discussion?

SUBBASWAMY:

Let me just speak to the process. No, obviously, not; otherwise, what's the point of having this whole back and forth? What -- what I've already assembled a committee of faculty this time, really the ones who have been prominent in the GERA

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

discussion, and then the USP review and so forth. And in fact, we're meeting on Thursday. We're already, you know, sum -- trying to summarize what's in -- in these and Richard Greissman has been taking copious notes, I think, at -- at this meeting as well, of course, we have the minutes as well. And so based on all of that, we're going to modify this to try to reflect the majority sentiment of what we've heard from the Senators, especially. And then that document will be presented to the Senate Council, and the Senate Council will then have its discussion, and then, hopefully, forward it to the Senate for its deliberations early enough for you to have yet another chance to look at the modified language and modified proposals, you know, hopefully, several weeks, two or three weeks before you have to actually vote on it at the March...

CHAIR: Any further comments? Back there.

WOOD: I was going to stay out of the discussion, but I'd really like to -- I can't do it. But I'd like to follow up on what -- the comments that Phil just made. Part of my concern, and I was around during the original swift proposal for the original USP, and the focus of that proposal was more so on 5 when it was much more inclusive in terms of the types of skills, be they rhetoric communication or oral, visual; perhaps, we didn't go far enough. But one of the things I'd really like to see here is that the resources that are available be prioritized toward number 5. This is, in and of itself, the key to a general education -- the basic skills, the basic knowledge, the basic tools that we are presenting our students with. I, as I said in my written comments, I would very much like to see an expanded version of number 5 which includes, perhaps, the foreign languages, mathematics, which is the universal language in the world, statistics, oral communication, et cetera, and so forth, and like to see 5 to be moved to a role of much more prominence. As we've had many discussions, principle aside, it's the implementation in -- that is the devil in the detail. And I would strongly urge the committee when they revise this to pay a great deal of attention to the basic skills that we are giving the incoming freshmen so that they can succeed in whatever major they choose to pursue.

CHAIR: Yes.

KRAEMER: I will say nothing in rebuttal to that, but you remind me, my esteemed colleague, that much to my chagrin, I actually saw my name referenced in some of

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt  
the comments. And I want to clarify the record. I hope Kraemer didn't say that anyone can teach statistics. If he did, he was being stupid.

WOOD: Well, you did.  
KRAEMER: That guy was stupid, but that's not the intent.  
UNIDENTIFIED: That's a different Phil.  
KRAEMER: That's a different Phil, yeah. But I would say -- I'm just trying to be honest. But I will say that we've got to be careful in defining the intellectual hegemony if we link it to departmental structure. With the expertise now -- we live in a world that is very interesting and very different. So we want to recognize where those expertise may be because we're going to need a lot of hands on deck for this kind of proposal. But I certainly would never think that anyone could teach statistics. I could, of course, but I'm a psychologist; we're trained to do everything. But I do want to apologize to Connie if that --

WOOD: No, it's --  
KRAEMER: -- if the other Phil said that or something was said that you read as that, or if something like that occurred.

CHAIR: Please, Connie.

WOOD: In rebuttal, my comments had absolutely nothing to do with who was teaching statistics. I think my comments were more directed at those skills, mathematical, language, oral, et cetera, and so forth, which are currently not included in 5, and that was the intent of my comment, Phil.

KRAEMER: Okay.

WOOD: And you and I can have the other discussion otherwise.

KRAEMER: I just wanted to publicly apologize for -- if that other Kraemer said something like that.

CHAIR: Okay, now, the most important principle, I'm ready whenever you are, but I don't want to rush anything.

CIBULL: Why don't we move number 5 up to number 1?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

CIBULL: And we read about -- we can read all the rest of them. Number 5.

CHAIR: Okay. Before more of you leave, let me remind you that our next Senate meeting is Monday, March 17. It's a week later than usual due to spring break. So rest well and be ready for the March 17 meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for February 11, 2008 was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

COUNTY OF FAYETTE )

STATE OF KENTUCKY )

Xcript 2-11-08 Senate.txt

I, LISA E. HOINKE, 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 at the time and place stated in said caption the UK Senate Council Meeting was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings which took place during said meeting.

My commission expires: January 26, 2011.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 2nd day of April, 2008.

LISA E. HOINKE  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
STATE-AT-LARGE  
K E N T U C K Y