

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * * * * * * * *

APRIL 13, 2009
3:00 P.M.

* * * * * * * * * *

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

* * * * * * * * * *

DAVE RANDALL, CHAIR
STEPHANIE AKEN, VICE-CHAIR
KATE SEAGO, ACTING PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

* * * * * * * * * *

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

* * * * * * * * * *

□ CHAIR: We have a full agenda today. If we had just the regular agenda items, it would be a full meeting. We could have put some of them on the web, but Senate Council felt they were -- these issues were important enough that they needed to come to live Senate. So I am going to be pretty Draconian today in -- in holding us to some kind of a schedule. My hope is that we can have almost a full hour for the discussion of the course templates. On the other hand, if you feel I'm rushing things

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

through too quickly, stop me. I'll be glad to stop, but I'm going to try and move things along in good fashion here. To demonstrate how serious I am, I'm going to skip the first slide and all the admonitions. So that's my commitment to this process.

Unfortunately, we have a matter here, I'm sure you're all aware that -- that Russ passed away. We will have a formal procedure for this and have it read into the minutes and so forth. But if you would, please, would you stand for a moment of silence now?

Thank you.

The minutes and announcements. We need minutes from March 9th approved. They've been sent to you. There were some changes that you can see by track changes, and this is a motion I need, and what I'm going to suggest is if someone would just say, so moved, that will kind of, I think, take care of it for us. So if someone would --

ANDERSON: So moved.
CHAIR: And second?
BROTHERS: I'm sorry, who was it?
ANDERSON: Anderson.
BROTHERS: Okay.
BOLLINGER: Second.
BROTHERS: I'm sorry, sorry, who was the second?
BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics.
CHAIR: All in favor, aye?
AUDIENCE: Aye.
CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries.
Minutes and Announcements.

Approval of the Senate Council, I approved creation of a new course in the Graduate School 680. This is simply a no credit, placeholder course. I simply need to inform you that -- that I did that on your behalf. We have been reviewing the new Strategic Plan. Folks, a lot of effort has gone into this. It's posted on the -- the web. I receive probably more comments on this issue and the AR revision than other things because it is that important. If you would look this through and if you have comments, please send them in by Friday, the 17th.

We have made some editorial changes to Governing Regulation IV describing the University Senate. The major effort was a change in the title of ex officio position which was previously the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. There were some grammatical fixes and so forth. None of these warranted, we felt, bringing them to full Senate. I am simply informing you that those changes have been made. We will, however, be

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

Looking at revisions to the Administrative Regulations II-1, so forth. These were sent to you in March. The Senate Council is looking at them and will continue to look at them. We will vote to endorse them or not at our May meeting. We simply didn't have time in today's meeting. So read them again very carefully, please. If you have issues, please get with Richard Greissman, and we will look at those in the May meeting.

Again, another AR having to do with the Faculty Practice Plan. This has been vetted for, I'm told, approximately three years. It's a very involved, complicated legal issue. The proposed changes have been sent to you. Again, look at this carefully, particularly if you're in an organization that -- that has part of the Practice Plan. We will -- we will discuss possible questions and -- and concerns, but frankly, this is involved enough that we may not even -- probably will not even vote to endorse or whatever, but we certainly will keep you informed as these issues comes forward.

So the first item here is the KCTCS December 2008 Candidates for Credentials. The list was sent to you April 7th, and I need a motion to this effect. Davy Jones.

JONES: Davy Jones, so -- so moved.

CHAIR: Second, please? Over here.

ZENTALL: Tom Zentall.

CHAIR: Discussion? Yes.

BOLLINGER: Is it December 2008 or December 2009?

BROTHERS: Sorry, December 2008.

BOLLINGER: Okay. So is that the motion then? Because it says 2009.

CHAIR: Yeah. I think I corrected that. Thank you for noticing that. All right. Further discussion? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries. All right. Again, UK 2009 Degree List, again, sent to you on the 7th. Folks, it's so important that we have our input to this. I know it's a tedious task, but it's critically important that -- that we have input to this, and -- and I want to thank those who have taken that care. Here is the recommended motion. Dr. Jones.

JONES: So moved for the May 19 -- May 2009 list.

CHAIR: Second, please?

REED: Second. Deborah Reed, College of Nursing.

CHAIR: Discussion?

All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries. August Degree List. Again?

JONES: So moved, for the August Degree
List.

CHAIR: Second, please?
CANTAGALLO: Cantagallo, Libraries. Second.
CHAIR: All in favor, aye?
AUDIENCE: Aye. Opposed, nay? Motion carries.

All right. A proposed new department of Gender and Women's Studies. Professor Crooks --

CROOKS: Yes.
CHAIR: If you would come up and -- and give us a summary of what we're -- we're doing here. I failed to note that all of these motions have come in with the positive recommendation of Senate Council.

CROOKS: I'm Deborah Crooks, the former interim director of Gender and Women's Studies. This is Pat Cooper, Patricia Cooper, the incoming interim -- or the real director. Susan Bordo who has been working on this this past year as interim director is not here; we are here in her stead. what we have proposed, and for those of you who have -- who have read this enormous document is the Department of Gender and Women's Studies. Pat, would you like to go through some of this very quickly?

COOPER: Sure. In the packet that you have first is a memorandum to Sue Humphrey with some responses to matters that the committee raised. We have a letter from Dean Harling to David Randall and from the committees supporting this. You'll see next the proposal for the department, followed by a copy of the five-year plan for Gender and Women's Studies. The proposal for the major follows that, and that has been approved. And finally, you can find the policies and procedures in Appendix IV. At the end there are letters of support.

CROOKS: The letters of support are from a variety of departments in which affiliated faculty reside as well as a number of commissions and other non-academic units that are providing support for this proposal.

CHAIR: Are there questions?
CROOKS: Any questions?
COOPER: And we hope we can answer them.
CHAIR: To my knowledge, this is the first time we've approved creation of -- or endorsed creation of a new department since I've been a part of this august body, so this is exciting.

CROOKS: It's an exciting moment.
COOPER: Yes, it is.
CHAIR: Yes.

BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics. I hate to be a naysayer, but given the fact this is a University that's woefully understaffed, woefully under-facultied,

woefully under-resourced in all respects, does creating a new department right now when we're in the middle of extreme budgetary crisis actually make sense?

CROOKS: well, I think that the -- the -- the document that -- that is here, and this question is not the first time this question has come up. It certainly came up at the council. Dean Harling has written a pretty extensive letter responding to that. The -- or the interdisciplinary program in Gender and Women's Studies is already functioning in -- in most respects as a department. We are not requesting any new resources at the moment. The resources were in the five-year plan, and -- and we recognize that in order to become fully functional with a graduate degree, which we're not asking for at this moment, will require additional faculty. But right now we are -- we've got an undergraduate degree. We have a business officer. We have faculty who are 100 percent in Gender and Women's Studies, who are located right now in another tenured home because they need to be. The resources are there. We already have our own budget, but that budget is -- there's no anticipation in any increase, as far as I know, in that budget -- Phil, I'm looking at you.

HARLING: That's right, no, it's -- I would simply -- Phil Harling, Dean of Arts & Sciences. And I simply underline the point that Deb Crooks made. Gender and Women's Studies already functions very much as a department. We have in place several individuals whose primary appointments would move to GWS as --

COOPER: Including mine.

HARLING: -- at such time the department came into existence. Pat Cooper would be one of them. The one thing that, I think, we're a little bit premature on right now is the doctoral program. We don't have the resources, I think, to be able to handle that at the moment.

COOPER: Correct.

HARLING: This is -- this will be a continuing discussion probably over the next several years realistically, given the budgetary scenario. But they have sufficient staff to handle the baccalaureate degree program plus some -- they already have a very robust certificate in Gender and Women's Studies which they've offered through programmatic status now for many, many years. They have something like 40 or 50 affiliated faculty --

CROOKS: Oh, yes.

COOPER: Yes.

HARLING: -- many of whom take part in the instructional rotation within GWS. Many of them can be relied upon to serve on

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

graduate committees at such time as the doctoral program comes into existence, but again, it's premature to speculate about that. What else? They're full staffed the way the department is. They have administrative assignments that mirror those of an academic environment already. So we feel that the day has -- has come, and I feel that A&S has already devoted the resources necessary to make this a department in good standing that is able to fulfill its mission quite effectively.

COOPER: No new resources.

CHAIR: Yes?

ROHR: How many members would this -- faculty members would this department have?

BROTHERS: Name, please? I'm sorry, your name, sir?

ROHR: Rohr, Jurgen Rohr.

CROOKS: Go ahead.

COOPER: Well, we have three full-time people now. That will soon move to five. My appointment will move on June 1st. Susan Bordo's, I'm not sure of the date yet, that it will be moving. We also have two joint appointments -- well, two joint appointments. I'm thinking of Jan Oaks and Ellen Riggle. We also have the -- an agreement with the College of Education for two courses per year from Karen Tice, with the Department of Educational Policy, Studies and Evaluation. And we have affiliated faculty who regularly teach in the program. When you compare our levels of faculty with those of our benchmarks that have Gender and Women Studies programs, we're in the middle of the pack.

CROOKS: So it's five-and-three-quarters right off the bat in terms of full and joint appointments and DOE assignment from the College of Education, 15 percent.

CHAIR: I might just note last Senate meeting -- I think it was last Senate meeting, the major was approved. And one thing we did rather carefully was to go through and make certain that there were adequate faculty to underwrite that. So in the sense of number of faculty, we have looked at that issue. Other questions. Thank you.

CROOKS: Thank you.

CHAIR: I need a motion that the Senate endorse. Sir.

SELLNOW: Tim Sellnow, Communications and Information Studies. I move approval of the motion.

CHAIR: Second?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Second.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?

All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

Page 6

BOLLINGER: Nay.
CHAIR: Motion obviously carries, and I don't think there's a necessity for us to show hands on that. Thank you very much.

CROOKS: Thank you.
CHAIR: There -- the next issue is Proposed Change to Graduation Standards for the Bachelor of Science in Merchandising, Apparel, and Techniques -- Textiles. Thank you, Dr. Jackson.

JACKSON: As it states in the program, the MAT department is attempting to increase the quality of students that we are getting in our department and -- by incorporating a standard of C or better in all the pre-major professional support and MAT -- excuse me, MAT major required courses. Therefore, no letter of a D would be accepted in the pre-major, professional support and MAT major requirement.

CHAIR: Questions for Professor Jackson?
Just stay here, if you would, please.

JACKSON: Yes.
CHAIR: All right, I need a motion, please. Dr. Jones.

JONES: So moved.
CHAIR: I need a second.
STEINER: Second. Shelly Steiner.
CHAIR: Discussion of the motion? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.
CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries. Next is Suspension, Proposed Suspension of a Minor.

JACKSON: In the department we presently have a minor requiring certain courses. And at this time, we do not have a chairperson who normally would handle the minor student advising. And typically we have between 25 to 30 students. A Chair is not in acquisition, so we do not have one. We presently have two untenured faculty, three full -- three faculty. And enrollment of approximately 280, which makes our advising quite high. So that's why we're asking for it. So it's a minor suspension, not for completely suspending a minor.

CHAIR: Questions?
BLACKWELL: Yes. How long will of the suspension of the minor be?

JACKSON: Indefinitely. We have no timeline. We're presently doing a great deal of revising or examining our curriculum to see if we need to make changes or looking at our benchmark institution and those kind of things to see if -- and then after that then....

CHAIR: Should that be incorporated in the motion; do you think or --

BLACKWELL: I don't think so.
CHAIR: All right. Other questions?
Dr. Jones.

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

JONES: What will happen to students who currently think they're in a minor?

JACKSON: Those that are already in a minor will be able to complete the minor, and we'll just not take any new ones in.

CHAIR: Further questions?
I need a motion, please.
Professor Jones.

JONES: So moved.

CHAIR: A second? Debra.

ANDERSON: Second.

CHAIR: Discussion of motion? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries.
Thank you.
New University Studies Program, a Bachelor of Science in Mining Engineering, Master's degree, Dean Sweigard, please.

SWEIGARD: This program mimics the other University scholars programs we have in the College of Engineering, similarly with mechanical engineering, civil engineering, electrical, chemical. At the time many of the other programs were establishing the joint -- the dual degree programs, there was not sufficient demand in mining engineering to warrant it at the time. The enrollment has increased. There's now sufficient demand, and we would like to initiate this program, similar to the ones that we already have existing in the College of Engineering.

CHAIR: Questions?

GREISSMAN: Can I just point that out, I think it's University Scholars, not University Studies.

SWEIGARD: Yes.

BLACKWELL: Right.

SWEIGARD: University Scholars.

CHAIR: Thank you. Questions? A motion?

VIELE: Kert Viele, Arts and Sciences.

CHAIR: Second?

YOST: Scott Yost, Engineering.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?
All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries.
Thank you.
New Graduate Certificate in Clinical and Translational Scientists -- Sciences. Dr. Kelly.

KELLY: So the University of Kentucky has established a new Center for Clinical and Translational Science. In our preparation for this Center, in the summer of 2006, we created a cross-college working group, representatives from the Associate Deans of Research and Education or their representatives participated. And we evaluated what the core competencies would be needed of individuals who are interested in participating in -- in Clinical and

Translational Research. The -- the outgrowth of that -- that working group was to identify a series of courses which are described in this new certificate program. The certificate program is designed as the entry level training for individuals who are interested in pursuing careers in Clinical and Translational Research. I'd be happy to answer any questions that -- that -- that folks may have.

CHAIR: Questions for Dr. Kelly? John.
THELIN: John Thelin, Policies. I believe that the -- the major NIH proposal emphasized and I think was required to have participation of every academic unit on campus. Correct?

KELLY: The -- I'm not sure that -- it was a -- it was an encouragement that the Clinical and Translational Science Center take a very broad approach to --

THELIN: Right. But that would greatly strengthen the proposal. Well -- and I believe the -- that an elevation of -- of, what, an associate provost or a vice provost with primary responsibility for this would be like University-wide? Perhaps the provost can speak to that?

PROVOST: Dr. Balke holds the dual title as director of the Center for Clinical Translational Science and Associate Provost for Clinical Translational Science.

THELIN: Right. So it's a University-wide --

PROVOST: The center is, in fact, a University-wide center; that's correct.

THELIN: Right. All right. If I look at the faculty and the courses with the exception of a statistics course, it seemed to be pretty much by and for faculty and professionals who staff the med center, as I read through the proposal here, which seems counter to the University-wide and multiple academic unit character the way the initiative has been presented.

PROVOST: May I respond to that.

CHAIR: Please.

PROVOST: The particular program, the Master's degree program that you're looking at, is, in fact, to broaden the education of medical professionals in order to be able to conduct translational science. And so it is, in fact, even though it's within that broad umbrella, for example, we'll have (unintelligible) degrees and various other things to follow, but that particular Master's degree is -- has, you know, many dual degrees that you'll see, MD and MD/MBA, and MD/PhDs, MDs/MS as a dual degree in which they will train both in the medical professional -- profession and then be able to help with translational practices that are driving research onto the practice field. So that's, in fact,

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt
specifically one -- one aspect of the
broader thrust on Clinical and
Translational Science.

CHAIR: Did you want to identify yourself
so we know who you are?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah. I need you to do that,
especially.

BLACKWELL: Clarify, it's a graduate
certificate, not an MS.

PROVOST: I'm sorry, right. I speak for...

GESUND: Is this going to concentrate on
translation, or is it also going to include
interpreters? Translation, meaning
document translations. Interpreters
meaning conversation --

PROVOST: No.

GESUND: -- facilitators?

PROVOST: Professor Gesund, unfortunately,
this is one of those jargon terms. I
apologize. This is not jargon of our
invention, but of the National Institute
for Health. Translation here in the
science -- in the sense of the physics
translation, taking it from here over to
there. That translation. So taking
clinical research, clinical and medical
research into translating it into practice.
So it's the term translation used in that
sense.

CHAIR: I can attest that this is
essential for our university to become very
active in this arena. It's going to mean a
great deal to those who work in this area.

Further questions?

A motion, please?

GESUND: So moved.

CHAIR: All right. Hans, so moved and
second?

EFFGEN: Susan Effgen, Health Sciences.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?

All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Thank you.

Change in proposed dead
week. If -- Tyler would you come forward
with your colleagues. I do want to say
what a pleasure it's been to work with the
SGA people this year. In fact, I really
wish you could hang around for another
year. And then it occurred to me, we need
to make just one small change in that list
that we just approved.

BOLLINGER: So moved.

MONTELL: I wasn't ready for that.

UNIDENTIFIED: You could reap the benefits of
Dead week.

MONTELL: I'm going to stick around to make
sure -- my name is Tyler Montell. I'm a
senior from Shelby County. I'm a political
science major. We want to talk to you a
little bit about a proposal that has been
discussed at great lengths both in student
communities and faculty communities within

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

the Senate Council. This is something that we're really proud of. This is -- the proposal has been through a lot of refining processes, both through -- again through faculty community and -- and circles, and then of course, the student circles and communities. This is something that we bring to you with a lot of pride and a lot of hard work behind it. And on that note, I'd like to introduce you to two of the -- really the real ring leaders from the student side and two of my colleagues and two of my favorite people in the world. This is Joe Quinn. Joe is a sophomore Economics and Finance major. And then Kara Sutton is a -- is a junior Economics and Political Science major. Two people I'm very proud of; two students that are two of the best at University of Kentucky. So thank you all so much, and Joe.

QUINN:

All right. I want to thank you all for your time today. And with that said, I'll give you a history of the creation of the proposal. Back in October, November, the idea was brought forth to have a reading period (unintelligible) before finals. And the ad hoc committee that discussed that decided that that really wasn't a feasible work with our calendar and with the other things the University had going on. So someone brought up the idea in conversation, oh, what if we look at changing Dead week policy? And so I took that back to Tyler. And from there, we created the Dead week workgroup with Kara and I co-chair. The workgroup was made up of some senators from the Student Senate, as well as some non-senators and other students around campus and had a graduate teaching assistant as well. The policy that we set forth -- we came; we met and brought research, ideas, and everything together. And vetted those through different listservs that we had and different meetings on campus with student body, and the kernel, and other things so that we could -- from the best ideas the students were behind, that students supported. From there, we took it to the Student Senate, and it was passed unanimously. And from then we took to the Faculty Senate Council, which we worked with them and had some revisions. And that is where we are today in the current state. We're going to -- for the sake of time, we're going to breeze through these. I'll let Kara explain these a little bit, and then we'll get back to that.

SUTTON:

we just changed different things in a few -- a few of the proposal, the current proposal, because we thought that the current proposal is kind of just dead by name, and we wanted to make it more of

there's regulations, so that students are having enough time to complete all their assignments during a semester and also prepare well for finals. We also said that there is going to be no quizzes during Dead week, just so that students can have ample time to prepare for finals. The biggest change we made was to point E. We added a special section so that classes with a lab component can still have their lab practicals during Dead week. And also we kept the policy that makeup exams and quizzes will be allowed to be made up during Dead week. And then we added a final G, that class participation and attendance grades are permitted during Dead week. That way we can assure that students are still attending class and encourage faculty to maybe have in-class assignments to make sure that students are coming to class, and that they are learning any new material that is taught during Dead week.

QUINN:

Okay. We did a little bit of research as far as where the top 20 institutions and benchmarks, and what some of them were doing with their time before finals. And the trend was actually that they were giving reading days. And for those -- those basically are days with no classes, no instruction, no nothing before finals, so the students can catch up, study, read, do whatever they need to do to prepare for finals. And so, you know, we saw that as they're giving that extra time to study for finals, and it's something that we should look into and try to go down that road ourselves. I'll let Kara explain some of the student feedback we got.

SUTTON:

One of our process of creating this policy was we vetted it through different campus listservs. We hosted a Dead week forum for students to attend. And we also encouraged students to e-mail student government about how they felt. And we actually had an overwhelming amount of response that we weren't expecting. We found that many students were very passionate about changing the current policy and also that they really liked the policy that we had created and thought that it could be better for them. One of the responses we had was from a volunteer tutor who said that not having assignments during Dead week would give her more time to tutor students as well as offer students more time to seek tutoring. And that way during finals, they will be able to be adequately prepared. Another student shared her story with us. She told us how because of a project and final, one, her project due during Dead week and her final due during finals week, her GPA suffered pretty severely because of the amount of work she

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

had to do. Also, a nontraditional evening student expressed the amount of work they had during Dead week, and this is just kind of a way that we saw that it wasn't just like typical undergraduate students that are being affected by the current Dead week policy, but it's also even nontraditional students. And then finally a graduate student shared with us about how their -- where they did the undergrad work, it was very different from how our Dead week is. And they felt that if our Dead week was actually -- had regulations and was actually dead, that it could improve the student scores.

QUINN:

Okay. Now, we'll both have -- give our personal relation to this. Growing up I always heard reference -- references to and stories about Dead week, and when I arrived at UK, I found out Dead week wasn't dead. It seems like it's dead by name only. With a large assortment of projects and assignments due during Dead week, it makes it very difficult, if not impossible, sometimes to study for finals. I'm a 4.0 Singletary Scholar who's involved with tons of things around campus, and I've seen and felt the strain and stress both mentally and physically that students can have during these two weeks. I'm confident that students will be able to excel and perform better on their final exams if they have ample time to study for final exams. Some may ask, well, why can't the students do this before this Dead week if they know the deadline is coming up? And our response: In an ideal world, this would be, quote, happening, but the world that we live in is anything but ideal. Students are now having to work more hours so they can pay for tuition with the increases. In a competitive job market, people will always say, you have to be involved in all those things around campus so that you're competitive for grad programs, so that you're competitive for great jobs. And so while it does make the student more well rounded, we find that sometimes this can hinder doing things ahead of time. This is not an issue of student time management. You know, Kara and I are both highly involved. We have succeeded in the classroom, and we both know how to manage our time. It's just a reality of how the students' lives are -- are affected and shaped by the expectations of being involved and doing everything that so that later on down the road, we can be successful and get into great jobs and grad programs. Student Government has worked very hard with students and faculty to create what we feel is a proposal that will address the academic needs of the students.

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

We don't want to try to dictate how faculty members teaches in the classroom. We both have the students' best interest at heart and want to see them succeed academically.

SUTTON: In getting to know Joe throughout this year, I can say that both of us are students that typically go beyond the normal expectations of a college student. I'm currently a junior with a 4.0 and I'm seeking a double degree as well as a minor. I'm also enrolled in various leadership positions across campus. I find out with this current Dead Week policy, however, it's often difficult for me to do well during Dead Week and also my finals. For example, this semester during Dead Week, I have one in-class assignment due that week. I have to write two papers and complete an empirical project, all while trying to prepare for the upcoming finals week. Not only do I have these assignments due, but in three out of my five classes over 50 percent of my entire grade is determined within two weeks. I worked really hard over the entire semester, and I would hate to see my grades go down the drain because of the plethora assignments I have due during Dead Week. In no way are we asking faculty to rid their classes of these assignments, but we simply want help having them spread out throughout the semester. Our proposal -- or sorry -- I believe that -- I believe myself to be an organized and hard-working student, and I know that if I have difficulty completing these assignments during Dead Week while preparing for finals, there are other students that have the same problems. With the proposed Dead Week, students will have ample time to complete their class assignments, along with prepare adequately for their final examinations. As students are allowed more preparation for their finals, they will not only learn the material instead of simply cramming, but they will also do better in their classes. I believe with this enhanced student performance, students will not only walk away learning more, but retention will be increased, and UK will also be able to accomplish their top 20 goals.

MONTELL: And I don't have a 4.0. But -- but what I do have is I've had the fortunate opportunity to serve on the Board of Trustees this year as well, right here with Dr. Yanarella. We're both on board and -- and being on the Student Affairs Committee, I've been immersed with the information that I'm sure so many of you have known and have been immersed with about the -- the economic condition of our state and the challenges that we face with the education that we get as Kentucky

students from our high schools. And then on top of that, the -- the challenge for Kentucky families to send their children to school and receive an education so that we can leave our Commonwealth to -- to a better tomorrow. So what that means for us at the end of the day is that more students, like Joe said, are working. More students have to -- to work 20-plus hours a week because it's harder to get financial aid now than it has been before. And so what we're asking is that you don't make it easier for us as far as the academic schedule; just make it more predictable. The truth is about our generation is that we look at our schedule: what do we have to do next? We just do really what we can do next. We have to go to work; we have to be involved in this organization so that -- and we're encouraged on top of that, by the way, being in that organization, so we'll come back next semester so our retention rates will improve. And I understand that. I think that that's important. It's important to us that we have a good degree and a good job. So I think at the end of the day, we're not asking you, faculty, to fix a broken system. We're saying as students we have a solution that can make this University better. And we're asking you to help us. Now, we're also saying that you've already established Dead week. We're not asking you to establish something that isn't there. You've already given us Dead week. We're just now asking you to make it real. So anyway, thank you all so much.

CHAIR: Questions for any of the three?

Yes.

SOTTILE: Joe Sottile, Engineering. I've always been sympathetic to students because I was a student for about nine years. That -- that's for three degrees. One thing -- one thing is just a comment, and that is invariably I have had students who have a final scheduled for Friday beg me to give them the final during Dead week so that they can get off campus early. That has to end, you know, I mean, the students sometimes are their own worse enemy. And I'm sure many in this room have had the same type of request. And I have never, ever done it regardless of how many students beg me, if it's unanimous. The second thing is, I've always felt that we should start on Monday, finish on Wednesday, and have two reading days that would give you even more time to prepare for finals, and it hasn't met with a lot of success, and I'm not certain why. I understand in the fall there's some orientation that goes on. But in the spring, most people are on campus during

that weekend, we could start on Monday, finish Wednesday, and have two reading days, and -- and even if you want to extend Dead Week to -- to -- to that Wednesday before, to the following Wednesday, make it a full five days, that would be fine and even help you out more.

CHAIR: This is our proposal we have before us.

SOTTILE: And I know that's too much to change today, but I think it would help the students. I always had -- where I went to school, we always -- we never finished Friday and had finals on Monday. I think it's absurd myself. Finish on Wednesday, and start finals on Monday is much, much better. Then the Dead Week -- the whole problem with Dead Week is minimized beyond that. And it could be -- you could test drive it on the spring semester very easily and not upset the activities in the fall.

CHAIR: Thank you. Questions, additional questions?

JANECEK: Jerry Janecek, Modern and Classical Languages. A number of my courses I give require a substantial paper at the end. When is it supposed to be due?

MONTELL: The week before Dead Week.

JANECEK: The week before. You think that would be preferable among students then?

MONTELL: Yes.

JANECEK: Okay.

CHAIR: Yes.

VIELE: Kert Viele, Arts and Sciences. A couple questions, does Dead Week apply to graduate students?

QUINN: Yes.

VIELE: So this would say that graduate students, their projects have to end as well, et cetera. The second question is, it's not explicitly in here, I've had an answer, you can -- regularly scheduled homework assignments, et cetera, can continue during Dead Week?

QUINN: Yes.

VIELE: The last thing is, one thing that I have with students is if I teach during that last week any kind of material, and I put it on the final, the main complaint I will get from students is that we haven't had any review or any kind of feedback on this material. By taking Dead Week back, in a lot of ways your saying that there will be a week or two less of actual instruction time. And I'm not saying -- I'm saying you're allowed to do it, I'm

just saying in practice that's not the way it works.

SUTTON: Yeah. We don't -- we don't want to eliminate at all instruction during Dead Week. That's why we added G, to make sure -- it's a way for professors to make

sure their students are coming to class if they take like in-class attendance or possibly like an in-class assignment or just some way to like encourage professors to make sure their students are still coming to class because we don't want to take away that extra week of learning. We know -- we recognize that that is important. And I mean, possibly even telling your students like at the beginning of the semester, including something in the schedule possibly about how that material during Dead Week is still covered. We want Dead Week just to be a week of where students, outside of class, can prepare for finals and study, but also they can study the new material they're learning.

CHAIR:

Dr. Jones.

JONES:

Yes, a follow up on his question about reports that -- that he's had due on the last Friday of the last week. Am I correct, the literal reading of this is that you want the professors to give the students less time to do it?

Like the first day of class, say okay, we're going to have the lecture material you're going to be responsible for, but you're going to do an outside project. You're going to go research in the -- the library. And the last Friday, it's due. It helps you to actually force us to give you one week less to do it.

MONTELL:

It does because the idea is not to give more time for the project. And it is to -- is to really reserve more time just for studying for the final.

JONES:

Oh, but I'm saying students can hand it in any time early if they want, but -- but you don't want that?

MONTELL:

Really, I mean, what we found is that really students now -- if you say it's due on this date, they're going to give it to you that date. Now, there may be -- there may be some that give it to you early, but if we say, you know, it's due the -- the week before finals week so they don't have the option of putting off to the last minute. We're just trying to make sure that that week is reserved strictly for studying, if you will.

CHAIR:

Yes.

STARR-LEBEAU:

Gretchen Starr-LeBeau, Arts and Sciences. I -- I support this, and I doubt there's -- that anyone in the front can answer this question for me, but I agree with you, I -- I think it's bizarre that we don't have reading days, and I don't understand why we have a 17-week fall semester. I mean, I'm all for instruction, but the minimum required is much, much less. Fifteen is standard. And -- and it's true that it would be easier to do in the spring than the fall because spring is

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

16 weeks and the fall is 17. It seems like we could squeeze a reading day in but I don't expect you to answer that. I just voice my support for it.

CHAIR: Further questions?

GORRINGE: Tim Gorringer, Physics. _Can you clarify again, on pop quizzes or concept quizzes during that last week in class; are those allowed or not allowed?

QUINN: I mean, it depends on how they're set up. If they're set up as a quiz, that would not be permitted.

GORRINGE: Any -- so any quiz --

QUINN: Any quiz no, (unintelligible) participation or in-class assignment from that would be okay.

CHAIR: Hans.

GESUND: Hans Gesund, Engineering. As I read this what you're going to do is I'm going to be forced to tell the students they have to hand in their final project the Friday before Dead Week, and then they'll have their exam at the regularly scheduled time. Until now, I've given them until the exam time to hand in their projects. I don't think they're going to like this.

CHAIR: Further questions? Please.

MENDIONDO: Marta Mendiondo, College of Public Health.
They still can hand out work on final's day, can they? Project on final's day? A project and a final, (unintelligible) (unintelligible) can they be handed in final's day?

SUTTON: If it -- if your final is set up so that it's a final project and the exam, if it's set up that way where it's all one grade, then I wouldn't see a problem with that.

MENDIONDO: Okay. (Unintelligible).

YOST: Scott Yost, Engineering. A question for you: If you had total control where you're going to set a policy that the University is going to abide by, would you choose this Dead Week or would you choose reading days? Which one would be more beneficial to the students? And why?

BLACKWELL: Ten pages or less.

MONTELL: Do you want that double spaced or single spaced? Well, I tell you this is -- and you'll have to clarify with me on this, because I think we looked at the schedule and the reading days would conflict with our current schedule, is it gets in the way of K week. Now, as far as undergraduate -- really, the entire University is concerned, I believe that K week is one of the most important things that -- that we do at the University, because it lets students become acclimated with the entire University community. And so if -- if reading days are going to conflict with that, then by no

means, do we want to -- to -- to even go down that road? You know, in an ideal world, with world peace and all that, I would like to have reading days, but I don't want to take -- I don't want to take the power out of the instructor's hand to educate students with the days that they've already been given them. And that's what this -- this -- this policy let's -- let's teaching still go on so....

CHAIR: We -- I will -- I will simply say, we have explored rather rigorously the possibility of changing the calendar to where we can include reading days, and it's a very, very difficult issue as you can imagine. Additional questions? I need a motion.

SELLNOW: Tim Sellnow, Communications and Information Studies. I move approval of the motion.

CHAIR: Second?

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, second, Arts and Sciences.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?

YANARELLA: I have a great deal of respect for Tyler and for Kara and Joe. The latter two have certainly carried the bucket very well in discussions in the Senate Council. I think -- I think the Senate Council was more or less split on this particular issue, and towards the end of the discussion, I -- I began to discover that after 40 years, I'm becoming an academic conservative on this issue. I really think that in some respects this policy does impinge on the -- the right of faculty to make reasoned decisions on when requirements are due. I think that the longer that one -- that one teaches, the more one gets a sense of -- of how students tend -- tend to prepare. I saw a

contradiction, Tyler, in -- in your saying that students only think a week or two ahead. And yet you want -- you want us to shift things back by a -- by a week. That's -- that is a problem of time management. It is a problem of student time management because we -- over the years I had -- increasingly had to put in interim deadlines for particular activities so that students would not wait until the very latest part of the semester to -- to proceed. I think if there is a solution to the legitimate concerns that you have, it is reading -- it is -- it is reading days as -- as all of those Universities that you point to have one. It is not -- it is not a policy that impinges on the academic rights of a faculty member to organize a course and to do so to the best of -- of her or his ability. So I'm -- I'm -- I'm planning to vote against this.

STEINER: I think after the modifications
were made at the Senate Council, I think
there was overwhelming support -- support.
I don't think it was split. Virtually all
the -- by the time it was done, almost
everybody in the Senate Council thought it
was a good idea. So I disagree with your
interpretation of what went on in Senate
Council. I also think it's fine for --
(INTERRUPTION)

STEINER: This is a good --
(INTERRUPTION)

STEINER: This to -- read -- anyway....
(INTERRUPTION)

STEINER: I think it's good for students --
(INTERRUPTION)

STEINER: I think students taking this
kind of responsibility, working this
project through is -- is a great lesson. I
think -- I fully support what they're
doing. If they make any mistakes, that's
fine; they'll learn about it and modify it.
I'm very much in support of it. I like the
initiative. I think what -- what -- they
were very, very reasonable in the kinds of
changes that they made at the Senate
Council. And I -- I supported it then, and
I strongly support it now.

CHAIR: Further discussion of the motion?
I'm going to try a voice vote,
and if there's any question, we'll do a
show of hands. Before we vote, let me tell
you my crystal ball tells me one of these
three is going to be Governor someday.
All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIR: Michelle --

NADEL: Point of order --

MONTELL: I think that was a yes.

NADEL: Point of order. Will you please
call for abstentions on votes?

CHAIR: I'm sorry. I absolutely should.
Abstain? One abstention. All
right. Michelle, we're going to take a
hand vote.

MICHELLE: Okay.

CHAIR: All in favor, please raise your
hand?

MICHELLE: Thirty-one. Did you have 31?

CHAIR: I got 26, but I couldn't --

MONTELL: I like her's better.

CHAIR: Opposed?

MICHELLE: Seventeen.

CHAIR: Yeah. Abstain?

MICHELLE: Four.

CHAIR: There's one down here that you
might not have -- he -- I think it's 5.
Motion carries. Thank you.

MONTELL: Thank you all.

CHAIR: We made it. We have more than an
hour to -- for the first reading of the --

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

BROTHERS: Not yet.
CHAIR: -- curriculum --
BROTHERS: Not yet.
CHAIR: Am I missing something?
CARVALHO: Proposal to change Foreign
Language Requirement. Is -- is in the
agenda.
CHAIR: I missed it.
BLACKWELL: But you're on.
CARVALHO: I'm on. Let me speak briefly to
the context of this proposal. As we worked
through the GenEd proposal, we found that
of the class of roughly 4,000 freshmen, all
but about 26 come in having met the foreign
language requirement that UK had in USP
which is two semesters of college language
or two units, two years of high school
language. 3,900 and X were coming in with
two years or more of high school foreign
language. Yet it was the feeling across
campus that -- and across the state, that
this was not getting them to a competency
level that they ought to have as college
graduates and world citizens.
We had two choices then: To
institute a third semester of study, in
other words, 201, across the board which
would require students to get to that
level. But that generally would require
them to take 101 and 102 to get to the
level to be able to take 201.
Another option was competence
based outcomes focused testing to say that
students have to get to a certain level of
competency, no matter how they get there.
Hopefully, they will come in with it. And
if they don't, they can take a one-semester
intensive course or a two-semester sequence
once they arrive. We've been in touch with
the State Department of Education, and
we've learned that when -- there is a test
from the State of Oregon called the Stamp
test, and that has been instituted in
various districts across the state. Within
two years of instituting that test, foreign
language competence improves markedly, as
measured by the test, you know, the
(unintelligible). But we do feel that
instituting this would, both, improve the
level of foreign language secondary
schools' instruction in the state in
measurable ways, and ensure the competence
of our students when they come in and be
advised when they go out. So the proposal
is that as part of their advising process,
they would take this proficiency test and
be placed into language classes if
necessary. The test will also be given
through their high school year, and if they
can show a passing score on that test when
they apply or when they come to advising
week, they would be exempted from the test.
There will be districts that don't give the

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt
test until it's mandated. If it were mandated statewide, they would all come with a test result. But if not, they can take it when they come here. Is that clear? So the students would have a competency-based language requirement rather than a credit hour based language requirement. We do need to eventually make this part of the task of the new GenEd because we've had several comments from observers at state universities who say, I see that you dropped the language requirement, and that was not the intent or the vision of the GenEd. So this is a parallel proposal. It followed a different route because it's a change in the admissions requirement from a seat-based kind, even if it's a high school language, to a competency-based standard. But that is now brought forward as the first reading and to be voted on in May, so I'm here to answer questions and feedback on that.

CHAIR: Questions?

BOLLINGER: In your experience, in your colleagues' experience, do you have any sense for whether students getting these kinds of scores on Stamp test have the kind of written, spoken, and cultural knowledge that you're expecting when -- or that students who have been through courses in our language departments exhibit when they're done?

CARVALHO: Yes. We're also instituting this testing in our first-year courses to ensure scale. And the proposal is that we would institute testing in fall 2010, but that we would not institute remediation until we're confident as a -- as a University that we have the data to start doing that. But we would report results back to school districts immediately, and that will create the kind of change that we need.

ROHR: Well, then in addition to his question, would -- would -- would your test also include cultural things, not just understanding and speaking abilities?

CARVALHO: It includes some cultural measurement, but it is primarily ability based. Yes.

ZENTALL: Tom Zentall, Psychology. Do you have any sense of how many students would not pass this test and if so, do we have the staff to give the remediation that would be necessary? I'm concerned about that.

CARVALHO: Right. The data is hard to get. But in -- we assume right now that half of them at least would not pass, but the data has shown that in districts that institute this testing and that take action based on the results, that fraction drops significantly. So we would not want to

institute it until we have a better measure of -- of how many students it would involve and then make sure you have your classroom. A large number of our students are in majors that require an additional layer of language study, for example, Arts and Sciences. All of those students would be completely unaffected by this. So this would affect the group of students who currently have no further language requirement. So it wouldn't affect all 4,000.

- BLACKWELL: Jeannine Blackwell, Graduate School. I just wanted to reiterate that this kind of testing parallels to some extent what we already do in math placement testing here at the University, where students come to the University and either based on their ACT math scores or the placement test that they take during advising week, that determines their placement here rather than seat time here in math and algebra courses.
- CHAIR: Further questions?
- STEINER: Aside from math and foreign language --
- BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name, please?
- STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology, Arts and Sciences. -- is a competency in English and Biology and -- why are you selecting language?
- CARVALHO: This is the only admissions requirement that doesn't have a competency standard attached to it.
- STEINER: That's good.
- CARVALHO: And that's based on the state high school decision. I think one reason we haven't gotten a lot of opposition to this is that you all -- many of you have had kids in language classes on high school in the state.
- CHAIR: Sue Humphrey.
- HUMPHREY: Humphrey, Dentistry. Will this be for all language divisions because I have a son who tried to be placed in Latin, and there was not an exam, and this was five years ago, and it would be nice if they're going to use that as their language background, that this would be available.
- CARVALHO: We would. We would have a test in -- in whatever language the student presented. Native speakers of other languages also have other routes for that.
- CHAIR: Please.
- PETERSON: Peterson, College of Medicine. Is there a cost for this test?
- CARVALHO: There is. We're working on that. It's not -- is it \$15?
- BLACKWELL: I think it's \$15, and if we have a state site license, it will be cheaper, I think.
- CARVALHO: And we are hoping that if

students take language in their freshmen and sophomore year, they will push to have the test closer to the time that they took the language rather than waiting until the summer before coming to UK, and that will help push the cost down.

CHAIR: All right, thank you. Kaveh, one last.

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi. Maybe I'm missing something but it says here that -- one of the bullets says is acceptable in lieu of English competency is TOEFL. TOEFL is English; is that true? Am I reading this wrong? It says, students may demonstrate competency in any of the following ways. One of them is the TOEFL score.

CARVALHO: The TOEFL is required for native speakers of another language, and so if they -- they -- they may present their TOEFL and be exempted from the foreign language requirement.

TAGAVI: So then English is accepted as a foreign language for students whose native language is not English?

CARVALHO: Yes.

TAGAVI: I've got it. Thank you.

CHAIR: All right. And we will move on. We'll deal with this in May. So we're now going to -- to look at the curricular templates. We'll have a quick update on the 11th curricular team by Erica Caton.

CATON: Hello, I'm Erica Caton. I'm the new director of advising for the College of Arts and Sciences. And I'm here to just briefly tell you where the 11th team, the mysterious 11th team has been hiding. We are 11 members from across the student affairs and student life area of the University. We have been using your student learning outcomes or the new GenEd, as well as wonderful reports that came out of over a hundred folks getting together at two different points, in '07 and '08 to develop new programs, new ideas, new initiatives that might help to grow and enhance student life community here. So with those reports, with your learning outcomes, and some of us have even been flies on the wall in some of your faculty member teams, we think that we have developed ideas and programs that would help students to more meaningfully move toward meeting those learning outcomes. So from the co-curricular side of the campus, we appreciate being a part of the conversation, and hopefully you will actually joint us in the co-curricular discussion and how we might further support you in seeing GenEd come to fruition. Thank you.

CHAIR: And your material is on the website; is it not?

CATON: Yes.

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

CHAIR: So if they can go to --

CATON: We are also on SharePoint, on
the GenEd SharePoint site.

CHAIR: Questions? Thank you.
Now, Susan will give us a quick
overview. If I can recognize the Provost
from the audience, we'll have an Academic
Resources, and then I hope that we can give
adequate time to all 10 of the teams. So
Susan --

CARVALHO: My role throughout this process
has -- has been to guard the process of
discussion and vetting and feedback. And
so assuming you have a great familiarity
with the documents you have in front of
you, I'm just going to run through the key
points about -- that have to do with the
March vetting process. This is the
schedule of meetings that we've had and --
and are yet to be had, in addition to, I
would say, five to ten meetings by each
curricular team. Each curricular team has
about 12 members. There are 10 teams. You
count the meetings. So there has been
broad faculty input. In the month of
March -- I'm sorry, I guess I don't have
it set; it will gradually show up.
These were the three highlights of
discussion. The three points that were
raised by multiple constituencies, and that
were addressed very seriously by the
curricular teams. The first has to do with
the setup of the intellectual inquiry
categories. You know those are four
categories: Humanities, Social Sciences,
Natural/Physical/Mathematical Sciences, and
the Arts and Creativity. And comments were
raised from several units that are pushing
towards multi-disciplinary, being away from
that kind of division. We looked back at
the -- the conversation over the past few
years, and we found substantial assistance
on students becoming literate in the broad
knowledge areas. That's why we opted for
this approach. But we have appended or
created an umbrella statement, which now
precedes the intellectual inquiry documents
in your packet, that specifically invites
multi-disciplinary approaches and that
allows for the possibility that a course
could be presented to meet more than one of
the categories. In other words, Humanities
and Social Sciences, or Social Sciences and
Natural/Physical/Mathematical Sciences,
assuming that the course can meet the
learning outcomes of both categories. A
student could not take that course to
fulfill both categories. Students still
have to take four courses. But they --
APEX can handle the work of tracking which
requirement a student chooses to apply that
course to. So that is our recognition of
the need to invite and accommodate

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt
multi-disciplinary.

The second piece is citizenship, generated an awful lot of discussion ever since the inception of this category, and the reason for that is that we're very familiar with the discipline-based distribution and the skills courses of communication and -- and quantitative reasoning, and this is a new animal. And so we have struggled as a faculty with how to configure a range of courses that has cohesion, but that does not just invite us to teach the same courses we've always taught in the same ways we've always taught them. If we have a different set of outcomes, then we need to think about courses that meet those outcomes. In -- because the fact that departmental conversations were contentious, we had an open forum to discuss the citizenship categories. And it was really very productive, both for those speaking and those listening. And the committees went

back and made substantial revisions. I just want to point out what the revisions were to the citizenship category. So I'm not sure what page it is in your document, but Conceptions of Community, Culture and Citizenship in a Diverse U.S. Society. One of the key issues, very problematic, has been the use of the word citizenship. If you take it in isolation and you interpret that to mean participation in -- in governmental political processes, then becomes a very narrow category, and one that doesn't jive with the outcomes that have been laid forth. But if you consider that term in its broader context as engaged, educated participants in a social community, it's hard to find a substitute for that word. However, to accommodate the feedback, you'll notice that the word doesn't appear very much in the document anymore. Substitutes were found that, I hope, convey more clearly what it is we were after without distracting. For example, make informed choices in the complex or unpredictable cultural context that can arise in U.S. communities. Citizen was a shortcut for that, but this -- if this is more accurate, that is appropriate. The push back had to do with the diversity emphasis, and that is still in Outcome A. And understanding historical, societal and cultural differences, but -- but polarizing the word diversity or -- or the idea that we're imposing a particular agenda on faculty has been backed away from. You'll see from the last sentence, participation in a diverse society, but not the word citizenship.

In the second category, Global

Dynamics, you'll notice the new word dynamics which is equally descriptive of what we were after and doesn't seem to have the problems around it that the word citizen did because of nation, state, et cetera. Key issues here involved the question of ethics and the 21st Century relevancy, and we really worked with those terms and worked with the groups that had problems with the explicit tie to the 21st Century. We reworked this in terms of what we hope students will be able to do. We do hope students will be able to make the ties with the 21st Century context and the decisions and (unintelligible) that they will face. As long as we can guarantee that students are doing that, we leave it to the faculty to figure out how they're going to make sure that their students can do that. These are assessable outcomes. They'll be assessed, and faculty have a -- a wide range of ways to ensure that that happens. We're going to be discussing these one by one. I just wanted to highlight that because it was a major theme in faculty discussion.

And the third piece has to do with the communication area, learning outcome 2. And just as a reminder, this is the document that was approved in December. We are still with the outcomes and assessment framework. The curricular framework specified one three-hour course on writing, and one three-hour integrated course focusing on oral and visual but also with writing. The idea there was that that fourth hour of writing that currently is present in English 104 would travel across to the second course which would be the integrated course. And we thought we could make that work. But there was some assumptions that -- that didn't bear out. We thought the two committees would naturally work more in sync with each other. And disciplinary difference turned out to make that very difficult. The result of their work is a document that I think you received as the original version. What was that called?

BROTHERS: That is --
CARVALHO: First iteration?
BROTHERS: -- in the handout at the front line. Yes.

CARVALHO: And if you read that, you will see two courses that look very much like courses you know and love, writing and then oral com. And the feedback we got from the faculty was: why are we going back to something that we have done and maybe didn't work that well? In addition, the oral communication requirement has been in suspension for some time, partly because it wasn't a course that was easy to teach

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

across the campus, and we don't have the capacity to teach it all in one place. And we -- the vision of the new GenEd is that it would have cross-campus involvement and the invitation to involvement by different colleges. So we had significant feedback that this wasn't the designed outcome. And as the conveners got together with some of the committee members, they agreed that we could do something much more exciting, that would get our students farther in the skills that we all know they need, and that could become a model for this type of course across the country. There are some models that we're basing it on, including the North Carolina GenEd model. So they created the kind of simulate of what this might look like. But that was just last week. And so I need to be transparent with you all through the process, that that -- what you have as part of your packet is very new and still embryonic, but the vision is what we need your feedback on today. The vision is two courses that integrate writing, oral skills, and the use of visual supporting material in a six-hour sequence that gets our students where we want them to be. The specifics have yet to be fleshed out. The committees should not be rushed in that, so we're -- we're presenting that for your feedback today, and then we're going to let the committees go back and work on the specifics of the content. I just needed you to have that context.

And finally, we faced a lot of implementation questions, and this is something we need to talk about before May because one thing does not necessarily wait until the prior thing was completed. And there are a lot of units who want to know how courses will count or be counted or be evaluated before they know if they throw their full support behind the proposal. And so these are Senate Council questions and require a lot of discussion before we can give answers. And we'll figure out what kinds of answers we can and can't give by the May voting deadline. But it's hard to see how colleges can make their level of divisions until we've made some of these. So that's the gist of the feedback. Oh, no. Now -- and any questions about anything I said will come up during the 10 -- during the discussion of the templates. And I did forget to ask that all the members of the curricular teams, if you're here, would you please stand up and be recognized for your many hours of work. Thank you.

(AUDIENCE APPLAUDS)

CARVALHO: (Inaudible) the discussion of each of the templates.

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

CHAIR: The Provost has very graciously agreed to give us preliminary estimate of -- of the cost factor.

PROVOST: The bean counter. Plus, I really want to say that I do not know of another time in the history of this University -- I have a history with this University going back to 1978, when the University has been as focused on improving undergraduate education as it has been now. I'll go beyond that and say, I don't know of another research university -- I've been involved in four different research universities, that has been as focused at any time on improving undergraduate education as this University has been, including the past two years. And so I want to thank all the faculty. There were nearly 100 faculty members involved in these curricular teams who spent an intense amount of time during this spring semester working on how do we make a better General Education curriculum? And we -- we should all be very proud of our faculty here, and I -- and I couldn't be more proud of the faculty. This, in a year when we're going through all these financial issues, they have been focused -- focused singularly on helping me make this a better undergraduate program. My -- my -- I offer my personal thanks and thanks on behalf of the University Provost.

I want you to know that this picture here is from the Study which is on South Campus. And we have students who work awfully hard. And -- and you saw three of our best students come here and make an argument for more study time. That is wonderful. So that's what we're talking about here. I want to just outline for you the salient features of new General Education delivery models because that was one of the tasks we gave the faculty teams, is tell us how do you think these can be offered without actually turning it -- turning this into a giveaway to either the auto companies or, worse yet, to the finance company, the financial institutions? And they were very good about it. They worked hard to see, you know, what -- what -- what would be the minimalist but adequate ways of approaching, given all the financial situations? They were very realistic, because I did ask them, that they needed to be realistic about the financial commitments we could possibly make. And based on that, I'm trying to give you a rough differential cost estimate. We now have a USP University Studies Program, so we were to make a differential estimate of how much additional it might cost, to give

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

you a -- one assumptions on how.... Then we need to talk about budget implications and choices we have to make and then -- then implications for implementation timeline. And with that, then you can go back to looking at the templates themselves. For those of you who looked at this carefully, you know, that the salient features of the delivery models is that if passed, is every course in the new General Education foundation curriculum will either be conducted as a small class or at least incorporate a small group breakout session. That is not the case currently of our courses. So this is a tremendous improvement already. If this comes to pass, each -- each class taken as a part of General Education will at least have a small breakout session. It will have defined outcomes and an embedded assessable product. So this is not simply saying, well, hopefully they all just get generally educated. There will be specific outcomes that you have approved and that the curricular teams have worked very hard to incorporate. And they will be assessable products that will then be assessed and so we will know whether we are achieving it or not, we go back and rework. So a really significant change from what we've been doing.

The assumptions in the cost estimate are as follows: where appropriate, existing large-lecture classes with recitation or lab breakout sessions will be modified to comply with the General Education template. So there will be, of course, a one-time cost associated with modification, that I've not gotten into, because we can handle one-time cost relatively easily.

The second part is that -- second assumption is that we will need to convert to lecture/recitation, that is, two large lecture and one large recitation session with, say, 30 -- 30 students, for those large-lecture courses such as BIO 102/103, Political Science 101 which currently do not have a breakout session. Also, General Chemistry is another one. But could otherwise be modified to comply with template.

The third assumption is that breakout sessions will be led by a combination of teaching assistants and full-time lecturers depending on graduate capacity of the field and department. Okay.

New courses, there's new courses will have to be developed as you see from the curricular templates. For Community, Culture and Citizenship which would -- we are assuming, based on the -- what the

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

faculty -- this is not my assumption, this is what the faculty teams have suggested. 125 student lecture and 30 student breakout. Arts and Creativity would be covered again in 125 student lectures and 22 student breakout. Integrated Communication II, would be 22 per class. Foundations of Quantitative Reasoning, lectures of 130 with 25 student breakout, and Statistical Reasoning in 130 lecture and 25 breakouts. This is what comes out from the discussions of -- of the faculty groups.

Continuing the assumptions. For the most part, current faculty will be unavailable to teach new course sections. That's the assumption, because I wanted a conservative estimate. This is not true. In fact, many of the faculty will, in fact, redistribute and will be available, but let's assume that. For the most part, I'm going to assume that new lecture classes will be taught by a cadre of career-track, full-time professional lecturers at 50,000 salary, roughly, and full benefits and the equivalent of nine credit courses for 30 hours per semester. And I want to point out that this is, in fact, what most of our benchmarks do. If you look at benchmark universities that are big research universities, a great many professional series lecturers are involved in the lowest division teaching. They're career-track, they have acute interest in those particular skills and/or subject matters. And in fact, here are the English classes, certainly, there are a cohort of lecturers involved. The Math department has started moving in that direction. So this isn't anything new that we're inventing. But that's certainly the assumption here. And of course, as you move forward, you can look at a mix of both lecturers and additional faculty members, depending on the graduate capacity and other issues.

I'm also assuming that there's no cost offset in going from the current USP to the new GenEd, 44 credits to 30 credits. That's because there's still going to be electives necessary, and so the assumption here is that there's not a whole lot of cost estimate. Again, that's not going to be true. We will have, in fact, offsets, but that's not included here.

Okay. The details of the calculation will be posted on the web. So I'll give it to the Senate Council, and -- and it can be posted. There's a spreadsheet that gives the assumptions and how that comes about. The number is 4.4 million annually. This would be the additional cost under these assumptions to implement this particular approach, under

the assumptions that I've made. So for budget implications, I want to put it in context. This is the Reaganist comparisons. So 4.4 million is approximately 1.5 percent of the State Appropriation after all the reductions are taken out -- before the next set of reductions. 4.4 million is also approximately 1.8 percent of the tuition

revenue that we currently have. 4.4 million is also approximately, if you were just to levy it as a charge, about \$160 per head for the year. And I left a blank there. You can fill it to any athletic program comparison you want to. 4.4 million dollars on the other hand -- this is serious folks, it is about 1.26 percent of the salary increase for faculty and staff, which for two years in a row now we're looking at being that. But I want -- I want those comparison numbers out there for you. So it's about 1.5 percent of the State Appropriation, so in a normal year if we had increases from the state, you know, we've had years when we've had as high as 5 percent increase, 5 1/2 percent increase, you -- you can skim off some of it, and you can do it over two years if you wanted to and just have it not be real -- real, you know, bank -- bank breaker. You could do it with a 1.8 percent tuition increase. For the sake of argument, if we put -- convinced the Board of Trustees that in a given year we needed to go to 6 percent, let's say, for our normal business and say: Can we tack on another 1.8 percent? And take that money, capture it, and give it back to the students in the form of a far better General Education program. And in fact, I'll have some other ways of doing that if you'd like. But then, as I said, there is looming over all of this, the fact that this is also, in fact, competes with other critical imperatives for the University.

Okay. So as I was saying, you could fold in a 1.5 percent increase in the 2010-2012 State Appropriation request. This would be one way of funding it. Requesting a one percent tuition surcharge in each of FY11 and FY12. You could call it that. Many universities have done this, by the way. When you tie it to a specific outcome, a specific expenditure, not just sort of it goes into a big pot of money that the Provost then wastes. Then it's a hard -- harder thing to sell. But if you say every penny of this additional surcharge will go towards an educational program that directly pays back, those are sellable. Other universities have done so. Request internally reallocate four percent

of the total general fund budget in each of FY10 and FY11 through slightly deeper cuts. We're going through cuts anyway. We're going through presumably another two percent certainly, or maybe four percent. Could we cheat a little and cut a little deeper and reallocate? We've talked -- too much blood letting? I don't know. But that's certainly among the options you might consider. Combination of all three? And do nothing? I would argue that we really don't have that choice for various reasons, including it is so little money to get such better outcomes, in my opinion. And there are other reasons as well.

I want to briefly speak to the implications for the implementation timeline. I guess my message is, it's not an insurmountable amount of money, so that for financial reasons, we absolutely can go there. If it was a hundred million, that would be the answer. And of course, May (unintelligible) the answer would not be. Assuming that May 2009 approval by the Senate, and it is a -- all things that still need to be done. We still have a lot of preparatory work. We need to set up approval processes for General Education courses, the job of the Senate. That question was raised by Susan. A lot of the departments want to know, who is going to make this determination and how will my course count, and will all my TAs go away? Develop and test-drive the new courses. There are four new courses involved. They need to be developed and test driven. Evaluate and modify existing courses to be General Education compliant. So some of the courses, like we talked about, BIO 102/103 would have to be modified, some other courses as well. Adjust the college and department degree requirements because the GenEd has changed, which means that how does that then help inform your degree program. The College of Arts and Sciences has to completely redo its requirements; Engineering has to adjust; Nursing has already started thinking about adjusting, and so forth. Begin to recruit a cohort of lecturers, faculty, TAs, this combination that we need to meet the (unintelligible) required by this, for the small class offerings. And then we have to work out the classroom logistics, especially because we have lots -- a lot more breakout sessions. That may require us to, heaven forbid, actually teach all five days of the week. And those are all adjustments to be made.

And we have to select a catchy name for this program. I think we should run a competition, but I don't want to be without a candidate -- candidates for this

competition. I have two offerings: UK*LEAP goes back to a white paper I wrote about two years ago borrowing from the AAC&U acronym LEAP, and LEAP here would stand for Liberal Education for All Programs. And of course, immediately FOX news will take over this and say, UK is teaching liberal education, and I'm not sure we want to go there. Therefore, I offer you another one, which I thought was less political, but after what I heard about citizenship, obviously, this too will -- UK*CORE, Citizenship-oriented, Outcomes-based Rigorous Education, (unintelligible) education, take what you want. The R has many possibilities. So anyway, we do need a name. We can't just keep calling it GenEd, GenEd.

So the proposed timeline then, if you get all that done, and we agree to fund this in one form or another, then we have -- if the course templates, again, are approved by you in May, then we have to use summer '09 through spring of '10 to develop new courses, modify existing courses. Again, I have set aside some one-time money for the summer -- those who would be able to participate in developing the new courses and so forth so, we would certainly compensate you for that time. Fall of '09 and spring '10, adjust degree requirements for all majors and obtain approvals. That needs -- that's a pretty tough task. Fall '10, spring '11, we would have to offer pilot sections of the new course and the modified courses for USP credit. So -- and in other words, we have to make some alterations, and say you can take this instead of this, and then with that we can accumulate results and data and analyze. And you have to conduct searches for lecturers, recruit more qualified TAs and all that. Summer '10 onward, conduct training for faculty teaching in General Education. And we've talked about a summer institute for that, since there is outcomes-based assessment products, and so forth, this is new stuff. I mean, if I were teaching Physics 150 -- where is Tim? I can't see him. Are you still here, yeah, hi, Tim. If I were teaching Physics 150, I wouldn't know how to do it under the new rubrics and so forth, so I would have to be retrained. And so we're in the early plans already, and in fact, in GERA and others there was call for having a summer institute where faculty would be compensated for this summer work and be trained to make sure that this is done right. And then, I believe, we could begin implementation, with the Senate's approval, in the fall '11 as completely over to the new UK*CORE, with my.... That said, I'm

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt

happy to answer any questions or we can go on to further discussion.

CHAIR:
ZOOK:

Yes.
Matthew Zook, College of Arts and Sciences. Why are we moving right to a lecturer model rather than moving to a tenure-track model? Because if you say 4.4 million dollars is not a whole lot of money, 50 percent more, 6.6 million dollars, we could actually increase both the GenEd department and actually move towards the research aspect of UK as well.

PROVOST:

I couldn't agree more. I -- I think that should be the goal. So here -- here are some of the issues: one is in some of the fields, for example, in teaching those 22 section communication -- integrated communication courses, there's a good bit of drill involved in -- in those courses. That's why they're broken down into small classes. Just looking back on our experience with foreign language instruction, the Spanish 101, Spanish 102 level courses are really never taught by literature faculty members. Maybe linguistics folks, but no literature faculty member would teach it. So a lot of those lower division -- and you know, by the same token, in our calc courses and so forth, the model has been thousands of TAs, and I'm exaggerating, but in English if you went back 20 years ago, there used to be 400 TAs and all, in fact, getting their Ph.D. degrees, and driving cabs as -- as at least the jokes went, and then therefore the -- the size of graduate programs were determined by the demands of lower division classes. So the transition over the last 20 years has been to having the right combination for the multiple missions. We have multiple missions at a university like this, to have the right combination of faculty who are, you know, all the way to the extreme, of 80 percent research, so be it, all the way to at the very low -- lower, you know, lower division courses having a cadre of professionalized instructors. In composition right now that's, in fact, the model that even we have to a significant -- to some extent, it's significant, not being that much and not having the kind of career path we've talked about, that's a change we need to make. So I think that you can gradually transition into the right mixture. So, if tomorrow you ask me, you know, cheating and getting above 4.4 million poses a challenge, but if you wanted to say tomorrow can I carve out 10 million? I can't.

CHAIR:
NADEL:

Yes.
Alan Nadel, A&S. I have two

questions. The first is, am I correct in assuming that all of this modeling is based on our current TA salaries and TA workloads which are both far below the benchmark schools? And if this is the model for our GenEd, won't this make us less competitive for the best graduate students and move us further away from top 20 status? And the second question I have is, if it's so easy to carve out 4.4 million, can we carve out 4.4 million for raises or how can you keep on saying that this is not being paid for out of our salaries?

PROVOST: I didn't say that. In fact, that's why I put that up there.

NADEL: Yeah.

PROVOST: And the decision hasn't been made. That will be a part of the decision we're going to have to make as a University. We're going to have to make that decision.

NADEL: Good.

PROVOST: And -- and -- and that's why I put that up there because, indeed, it competes with everything else we need to do. In terms of the TA stipends and workload, the workload is assumed to be the -- the -- I think, 9 credit hours equivalent that currently exist, and no 6, actually, I'm sorry, 6 -- 6 credit hours (unintelligible) assumes, and in terms of the stipend, it's an average number, including 15,000 and including a tuition scholarship of approximately 10,000. So it's about calculated as 25,000. Give or take. Yeah.

NADEL: About the TAs, very quickly, I know there are a lot of other questions. The TA workload in the English Department is drastically higher than that in any of the schools we compete with. I don't care about calculating hours or not. I can just tell you it's a slam dunk. And the salaries are lower. So when you look at TA salaries and move them up, we're also getting in many cases twice or three times as much work for that. And saying this is equivalent to a certain number of hours isn't really the point. What are they actually doing in the classroom? There's no way, if English is similar to any of the other departments, that one can compete for the best graduate students with that kind of TA load unless they're stupid enough to want to work twice as much for less money.

PROVOST: I'm going to just have to say then, that's where the balance -- if we needed to reduce the -- the load of TAs, which you can, I mean, I think that you have to go to this combination with TAs and lecturers. There's no way to do just simply in terms of the number of TAs. This I -- I claim allows us that opportunity to

re-balance teaching loads for teaching assistants.

ELDRED: Janet Eldred, Arts and Sciences and English. I -- I want to say one thing about full-time lecturers. I was glad to see the workload and the salary questions addressed, and I agree with you about that professional track. I am still concerned that we're creating a group of faculty who aren't involved in governance process. It's probably more a comment for the Senate than it is for the (unintelligible), which is that somewhere in that fine line there needs to be some effort made at revisiting their -- they -- it seems to me that they should have a place on this body, that their -- that they would be actively involved in the governance.

PROVOST: I mean, again, you know, I don't want to put the cart before the horse and -- and indeed, it is a Senate matter. If you look at benchmarks, Big Tens and UCLA, and so forth, there's a lot of debate about that cohort and -- and where it fits in, and -- and you know, we're not going to be reinventing the wheel. That's all -- that's all I'll say is that we will be joining a national debate on those issues, and we will not be reinventing anything here.

CHAIR: Please talk with me about that issue at some time. Other questions? Thank you so -- I'm sorry. Connie Wood.

WOOD: This is in regard to your timeline because one of your very creative solutions was to go back for -- the budget for year '10 through '12 and to have an -- basically, a line item increase in tuition for this program. I assume from your timeline, are you assuming that we will be admitting students into a new program if approved only for fall '11, and that will allow you time to fund this proposal? Is that -- is that the gist of what I'm seeing here?

PROVOST: Absolutely. But let me -- let me go farther than that. I would -- I will explicitly come to this body for giving the green light on when implementation would occur. Until you are satisfied that the budget has been put in place, and that we can actually move ahead, this will not be implemented. It will not be implemented piecemeal. It will not be implemented in anything less than at least this level, but whatever is ultimately approved, so yes. No, this is -- when you approve -- what we'll be approving in May is simply the templates and the green light to go ahead with the development of the new courses, and the vetting process for which courses will be available and not available. But to actually suspend the USP and introduce

UK*CORE, that's a Senate prerogative. It's not my prerogative.

WOOD: And so --

CHAIR: Please.

WOOD: And so you're saying that you are suggesting that this is -- probably would be a separate action by this body?

PROVOST: It -- it -- it will have to be a separate action, yes. Because I -- I, too, would want to make sure that it was offered with integrity and you shouldn't simply trust a Provost to do that.

CHAIR: All right. Thank you. I'd like to give now at least a few minutes to each of the templates. If you would, Dr. Carvalho. Please confine your questions, comments to substantive issues. We're not trying to fix grammar here.

CARVALHO: I think in the interest of time if we can talk about the four intellectual inquiry templates. We'll just open the floor for discussion of those four templates or the interdisciplinary piece. And any conveners of those committees here, Humanities team; is someone here from Humanities? Here for the team? Thank you, Gretchen Starr-Lebeau. Physical/Natural/Mathematical Sciences, Ruth Beattie. Social Sciences, Jim Hougland. Arts and Creativity, Ben Withers. So if you will take questions in the area of your (unintelligible).

CHAIR: Questions for either one of those four.

CARVALHO: Okay. Thank you. For the Communications area, we have the convener of -- of the two committees which henceforth will be meeting as one committee, and that's Roxanne Mountford and Deanna Sellnow. Questions, comments, feedback? That's brand new what -- what you have in your packets about the integrated courses, and we'd like your go ahead on that. Questions, comments, doubts?

CHAIR: well, folks, this is kind of a trial run. We would hope now in May then, not -- if you've got problems, now is the time to let us know.

ARNOLD: Susan Arnold, Medicine. Both of these -- and I've only gotten to read this -- this -- this afternoon -- are -- are -- are asking for a written and oral delivery project; is that correct? Who am I talking to?

SELLNOW: Yes. And ultimately their personal communication in a small group.

ARNOLD: Okay. That -- that was the part of the -- I guess that's being vetted in --

SELLNOW: It's more -- it's information in the first place, but it's more extensive --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, excuse me, who are

you, please?

SELLNOW: I'm sorry, Deanna Sellnow.
ARNOLD: So it will be written and oral delivery, small group interaction and no -- no like online Internet type of interaction will be incorporated unless the course specifically wants that; is that correct?

MOUNTFORD: That is -- the digital part -- the digital part will probably --

BROTHERS: Sorry, name, please?
MOUNTFORD: -- depend on the faculty --
BROTHERS: Name?
MOUNTFORD: Roxanne Mountford, English.
ARNOLD: And that will be what? I'm sorry, could you say that again?

MOUNTFORD: There will be some freedom of --
ARNOLD: Okay.
MOUNTFORD: -- of the faculty as they feel comfort levels with the digital world. There's certainly great opportunities for, you know, for some creative usage of --

ARNOLD: I think it almost should be a requirement, but that's just be my sentiment.

SELLNOW: Well, the second course is much broader a focus.
ARNOLD: Thank you, great.
CARVALHO: And we will have them, in their future meetings, look at that question and -- and --

SELLNOW: The first course is still a writing course but it introduces the other --

ARNOLD: Great. Thank you.
CARVALHO: Further comments on the Communications' piece? Yes.

JENSEN: Rob Jensen, Fine Arts. I'm a member of this committee, and I must say that I now no longer know where the -- where the -- this program is going to be housed. So if you could talk about the housing of the program, I think that would be useful.

SELLNOW: Well, we've been talking about --
CARVALHO: We have -- we have --
SELLNOW: The things that we've been talking about in terms of -- and you know this from being on the committee, in order to really pull off this integrated sequential nature of these courses that we're proposing at this point, but is still a new principal, we've got to flesh it out a little bit more, is to house -- house the instruction, training, and assessment of these courses in some form of a center, where there would be representatives from visual comm, oral comm, and written comm, English -- I can't think of the comm name. At any rate, there will be --

UNIDENTIFIED: (Unintelligible).
SELLNOW: That would be actually helping with the training of part-time faculty, full-time faculty, teaching assistants and

those teaching -- teaching assistants could come from other fields that are similar in terms of what they -- how they -- those TAs are trained. They could come to us. So somebody in Art History -- I'm just going to give you an example; I work better with examples, a TA in Art History might come and teach for us in the center in one of these two courses, but would be trained to teach those courses in a way that are skill based and have integrity which would be a benefit to the Art History program because they could fund TAs that they couldn't otherwise fund.

BLACKWELL: Are these two courses sequential? Do they have to be taken in that order?

SELLNOW: Right now, the proposal that we're drafting would be sequential. That's a good question. It started out they were going to just be separate courses. And the draft they have now proposes that the first course would be a writing course that introduces the other concepts of communication. And the second one would be much broader scope.

JENSEN: Rob Jensen, again, Fine Arts. Does that mean then that we would offer fewer sections of the commun -- of the communications, the second part in the fall? Because I'm just sort of -- just general implementation, are we going to assume a heavier cycle so most of our students will be taking the -- the writing one in the fall, and then the communications one in the spring?

SELLNOW: I think that it would just be in the first year that we have to get the balance going, and then --

JENSEN: And then you think it would be even all the way along from there.

CARVALHO: And then there would be students who would take it fall and fall or spring and fall, and it would even out.

SELLNOW: Good question, though.

CHAIR: Go on.

CARVALHO: The Quantitative Foundations in the Statistical Inquiry section, any comments? I'm sorry, we have Bill Rayens and Carl Lee. Carl is the convener of Foundations and Bill is the convener of S-I-R, SIR. Great.

PROVOST: Can we take a vote now?

CARVALHO: (Unintelligible) should be fine. I have no objections, just carry forward today.

CHAIR: Spent a lot of sleepless nights for nothing.

CARVALHO: We wore them out.

BOLLINGER: No, just wait till May.

CARVALHO: Feel free with your comments, feel free to use the website or on the e-mail box. Yes.

SELLNOW: Deanna Sellnow from

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt
Communication. How'd I do? Please -- I think I speak for Roxanne as well, if you have concerns or questions or ideas regarding the sequence of the two communication type courses, would you be please e-mail us so that we can vet that in our committees before the May meeting. Thank you.

CARVALHO: The citizenship category.
Questions?

ROBERTSON: Yes.

CARVALHO: Sue.

ROBERTS: Susan Roberts, from Arts and Sciences. I just want to say again, I've said this before, but would like it recorded, that I oppose number 6 of the student learning outcomes, also I don't think that it's wise to that have the course -- guidelines for course designers be so specified.

CARVALHO: That's 6 on the Global Dynamics template.

ROBERTS: I'm sorry, yes, Global Dynamics.

UNIDENTIFIED: You say you opposed it?

ROBERTS: Yes.

CARVALHO: Ernie Yanarella is here, convener of that -- that committee.

BLACKWELL: would you read that out loud?

CARVALHO: I will. Number 6 says, and this is an element of both the US and the global courses. It's one of the pieces that kept the two of them coherent. Demonstrate an understanding of at least two of the following as they pertain to the subject matter of the course: A. Societal, cultural, and institutional change over time. B. Civic engagement. C. Cross-national and/or comparative issues. D. Power and resistance. So the course would have to address two of those four schematic areas.

TAGAVI: What page were you reading from?

AUDIENCE: 205.

ROBERTS: I just wanted to say that I should give some reason.

YANARELLA: Yeah.

ROBERTS: It -- it is not that I'm opposed to any of these things, right. These are interesting things to teach, but it's -- but they seem to be redundant because they've already -- I think these things have already been covered. These things were already covered in diversity and in equality, for example, during number one. And I just feel like it's a trend to over specify and then -- and then that might -- I worry that that might lead to kind of an over policing of course content and trying to measure percentages exactly.

YANARELLA: We are not in to the percentages game, by any means. In fact, over the -- over the course of this semester, I've -- I've really had a feeling that we moved

from fights to games to debates to conversations. Well towards the end we had a -- we had two, I thought, excellent forums: one with the -- the languages people and then with the History, Political Science, Sociology, and -- and Geography folks. We listened; we explained; we learned, and I -- I think we tried to blend in and recognize what it was that really irritated faculty. From the -- the Languages people, we -- we really got a keen sense that -- that putting percentages into the -- the course templates was going too far. That it was far better to utilize learning outcomes, and that puts the burden on the students, and it still puts the burden on the faculty to justify or to demonstrate how that's done. But we don't begin to split hairs. If you look at, for example, number 4. I will get to 6 in just a second. If you look at number 4, the language is substantially changed. David Olster argued this very passionately that the need to bring the course substance into the 21st century was overly specific and overly defined what needed to be done in every single course. We -- adhering to the notion of waiting, what we tried to do is say, well, the equivalent of -- of -- of one week of classes. And that didn't go over as well. And so shifting from percentages to learning -- to course learning outcomes really overcame, I thought, a -- a big hurdle. With regard to number 6, we were really bound by the statement of -- of learning outcome number 4. If you look at learning outcome number 4 which was passed by this particular body, it essentially says exactly -- uses exactly this language. Now, clearly the -- the language in the Global Dynamics course template has evolved, and we were very sensitive to -- to those different elements that are delineated in number 6. And I

think if -- if, however, you look at the student learning outcomes and the guidelines for course designers, recognizing that the preamble will -- will -- will tend to get lost in the shuffle as we move towards some kind of implementation committees, I -- I think that -- that number 6 -- number 6 still has an important role to play in here, and that in any case, we felt bound by the -- the learning outcome that was passed by this particular body to incorporate it into it.

CHAIR: Other issues with respect to 9 and 10? Yes.

ARNOLD: About that question, could you -- had you considered incorporating parts of 6 into other learning outcomes as examples or as exemplary points, rather than require

number 6 to be the stand alone? Susan Arnold, Medicine.

YANARELLA: Have we --

ARNOLD: Have you or would you consider that?

YANARELLA: Have we or would we consider doing that?

ARNOLD: Because it does --

YANARELLA: I think we would still get caught up in the problem of what learning outcome number 4 required, and that is that two out of the four of the subject matter be -- be incorporated into the course itself. I don't know an easy way of -- of translating a learning -- these different elements into other parts of this learning outcome without having to still say either or or this or that or two out of these four. I just don't see how that can be done. I think that 6 may not be the happiest of language for identifying these four themes. But it's probably the -- the best reductionist way to do it without -- without trying to engage in a -- a wholesale reformulation of this -- of the learning outcome language that we presently have.

ARNOLD: The answer to my question then was no?

YANARELLA: The answer to your question -- I've given you a more extended answer. The short answer is no.

ARNOLD: Just checking.

CHAIR: All right. Other issues?

JENSEN: I -- I have a question, but it's not on this outcome. Is that okay?

CHAIR: Yes, please.

JENSEN: Jane Jensen, College of Education.

I -- I carry this question actually from a number of our students in ed policy studies who are members of the faculty of the KCTCS system statewide, and they are watching this very closely. And I think maybe this is a question/suggestion of where in our implementation timeline do we address the issue of transfer?

YANARELLA: I -- I would just pass it off to Richard. I -- he has spoken several times to -- to different bodies about this particular issue of transfer. Richard.

If you've got your answer. I'll tell -- I'll give it.

BLACKWELL: And you're going to hand it off to me.

UNIDENTIFIED: We may not have an answer yet. That's okay too.

GREISSMAN: No, we do have. I'm just keeping it a secret.

UNIDENTIFIED: Well --

GREISSMAN: That's fine. It's actually -- no, it's not fine. The conversations has

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt
gone along these lines, and I think it's really probably a question for the Senate in terms of how it decides, because really it's a Senate question; it's not a curricular team question. GenEd is, first and foremost, what we do for our students who begin and end here. You know, that -- it's -- that's the integrity of the program. A student who starts here, finishes here, and has the full effect of UK, both from -- in all three levels, GenEd, college requirements, and major requirements. Already we have to remove ourselves from a purist model, in that, a transfer student by state law is protected from having any university, never mind UK, impose additional GenEd requirements if the student completes his or her GenEd at another institution. So the student comes from the KCTCS system, from Northern, from Eastern, from Western, et cetera, and finishes GenEd at that institution, we can impose no more additional GenEd. A graduation writing requirement, yes, but not more GenEd. So already there's an issue. So the conversation has been along these lines: Let's be very liberal about how we translate transfer courses for USP -- for GenEd, rather, because we already make a huge concession by state law and be rather vigilant about what we do with our own, begin and end here. So on the SharePoint site, you know, the truth is a lot of people said it's a real pain to get onto the SharePoint site, so when we move to the GenEd website a spreadsheet that we have as a -- as a guideline, but with draft written all over it because it's -- there's no committee other than the Senate that can decide on an admissions requirements, you'll see it's a very liberal interpretation of transfer credit. It takes into account you already have a gaping hole in terms of how we deal with transfer students because we can't not accept transfer credit. So thank you for reminding me. I promised to move it over to the GenEd site, make a little navigation link so you can see it. Thank you. Did that help?

GREISSMAN: Great. Thanks.

CARVALHO: Scott.

YOST: Scott Yost from Engineering. I'm just curious. I had another question I was going to go over, but this brought up an issue to me, and that is: if we're allowing transfer students to have a looser, shall we say, requirement, for lack of a better word, I don't know a better terminology, you know, why are we -- why are we making it such that our students are to be -- are treated at a higher standard, if you will, because we have very stringent requirements

here -- I mean, I have seen that where people say, look, under current transfer rules, and we tried to do the math and stuff like this, why do we treat our students more rigidly than the ones that are coming in? What -- isn't this going to promote -- tell our students, don't come here for the first two years. Let's make us a three- and four-year program and let's -- let the transfer students go somewhere else first because they don't have the same stringent requirements that we have.

CARVALHO: I'd like to address that. I think, first, that we wouldn't want to want to judge the quality of the courses that students come in. We're talking about whether they match up bullet point for bullet point. But we wouldn't want to say necessarily that they're less rigorous. The second piece is that the other state universities are watching very closely, and we are hoping that this will be a model, as the foreign language piece, that will have ripple effects across the state. As the flagship institution, we ought to put a rigorous model out there, and I -- and as in line as it is with national trends and current research, they would be foolish not to be following in their own ways. So I -- I think the cohesion will come over time. But what we don't want to do is turn students away from transferring to UK because we've made it impossible for them to count the year or two that they've spent at another institution. Is it a balance and -- and each major is going to have to figure out if a student comes in with this many courses taken elsewhere, what will he or she lack that will have to be made up here? But different majors have very different baskets for how to manage that. And so we couldn't campus-wide create a safety net for that. Does that --

CHAIR: At least to some degree, some of the other state schools are looking into what we are doing, and I think they're -- they're seeing how they might alter their programs up, create something like we have.

YOST: As a follow up question there, and that is: But if we are the flagship, and we are setting the example, why not lead and say specifically, unless you have this loophole where you have your GenEd required somewhere else, you will -- right out of the gate -- our students have to do it, they will satisfy our GenEd requirements if they do not fit into that particular loophole. Why do we make this exception because they don't quite fit in there. A liberal interpretation of transfer credits, why can't we step up and say, look, it's going to be a painful process for a few years. We will probably

lose students. We'll lose tuition dollars. Sorry, Provost. Okay. But these things, I mean, if -- why don't we just step up to the plate and do it if we're going to do it that way?

CHAIR: That loophole is kind of enshrined in law.

PROVOST: In law, I was going to say that. I -- I -- I -- you know, in fact, there are those in the council on post secondary education, I don't want to pick on anyone, but that's a body, for example, that tries to make -- streamline all of this. We have been discouraged continuously in doing anything radical, anything that our faculty wants to do. So say -- the -- won't this get -- I mean, you know, it's a question of the tail wagging the dog. So I think the choice you make is to say, fine, for -- we'll comply with the law and have a liberal interpretation there. But you know, for the bulk of the students who start here and finish there, I would -- I would hope that as a flagship and as having a nationally competitive undergraduate program really puts students, and I -- I mean by that, you know, regard to financial situation, would, in fact, choose to come here and therefore we will, in fact, have a larger proportion of students who start here and finish here. I -- I really think this is the compromise you make for the streamline --

CARVALHO: And in the end, that will be a Senate -- Senate Council decision --

PROVOST: Right.

CARVALHO: -- separate from this vote, for that particular department.

CHAIR: Please.

MENDIONDO: About what is the proportion of the students that transfer without (unintelligible) GenEd? How many students are we talking about? I mean, is it one percent or 30 percent?

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, very small.

PROVOST: I think, let's see, I think that -- I'll try to recall the numbers. Connie, you're here so you can tell me. The number that we get is about 700 each year. So for two years, so it's something like about 1,500, call -- call it 2,000 out of the 20 -- 20,000 undergraduate students. About 10 percent.

MENDIONDO: Without GenEd.

PROVOST: Oh, no, that's the total number of transfer -- transfer students, I think. But -- but it's a smaller fraction than that. I don't want to be quoted on this, but -- but because our vice president for Institutional Research is going like this. I -- I don't think I'm off by a magnitude. It's less than 10 percent and somewhere around there.

CHAIR:

Other questions?

YOST:

I'll go back to my original question which was in addition to this, and that is a reconciliation I see here, because in the Provost's discussion he talked about 22 students per class and classes of 130. As I read through some of these, for instance, intellectual inquiry, they talk about capping no more than -- it's imperative -- I'm not sure they used that word, but something similar to that, that our -- if we had to go to larger classes, they'd be capped at 60 and then 20 per breakout session discussion. And I'm -- I'm curious now, because if the Provost comes back and says: well, we're only going to fund this at 130 students for big sections, with 22 students for breakout, but we have the -- the -- the direction of the committees coming forth to say: Look, it's imperative that we have this limited class size. We've already got a conflict, internal conflict between what we're trying to do and what the Provost -- the stipulations we're under from there. And I guess I'm wondering if we have to stay with

the Provost numbers, does this make these proposals that these committees put together, does this create a problem?

CARVALHO:

Let me answer the first part of

that, and then I'll get the Provost --

PROVOST:

No, in fact, just answer the whole --

CARVALHO:

-- to answer the second. The first part is that those calculations were based on the new courses that would be offered, and those were listed. And the Humanities' courses was not among them. We have very few courses in those Humanities' areas that are taught in large format without breakouts. So it was assumed that they would not need significant new costs in that area. The significant new costs were in the Natural/Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Social Sciences. And those did have the option of delivery models for the larger lecture, smaller breakout.

YOST:

So in other words, it's -- I mean, it's not inconsistent --

PROVOST:

To the best of my knowledge. My instruction to the people who did the calculation was to follow the letter if not the spirit of what was proposed.

YOST:

Okay, okay. And I'm just -- but your 22 looks like 20 (unintelligible) --

PROVOST:

Oh, come on.

YOST:

It's 10 percent. It's 10 percent across the board. So....

CHAIR:

And we really hadn't planned --

YOST:

I understand.

PROVOST:

There's an -- there's an

attribution rate -- I can't have empty seats.

CARVALHO: I mean, we have a list of courses that are taught with large enrollment without recitation, and there's a Russian class and -- two classes, classes in that format. Because most of them are -- are sciences and social sciences.

CHAIR: Final thoughts? Please if you have thoughts over the next month, as early as you can.

PROVOST: Remind you about one thing. We are accredited by the Southern Association for accreditation of Colleges, SACS, Colleges and Schools. And right now we're in a somewhat precarious situation. We declared that we have a particular General Education program which is called USP. And oral communication is a component of it. It has been under suspension because we can't make -- meet the logistics of it for three years now. Is it three? I think it's three. I hope it's no longer than three.

UNIDENTIFIED: Four years

BLACKWELL: Longer.

PROVOST: Longer. Oh, please. And you know, we -- and then there is another aspect, we are supposed to be tracking outcomes and reporting on how well we are doing and how well we have a whole loop of improving our curriculum based on the assessment we do. Our accreditation visit is going to be 20 --

UNIDENTIFIED: 12.

PROVOST: -- 12. And --

UNIDENTIFIED: 12/13.

PROVOST: 12/13, 2012, 13. And by that time you're supposed to have two cycles of assessment results in hand to show how well you're doing. Folks, let me tell you that if we drag our feet any longer on where we are, the -- our accreditation -- SACS is known to be really quite strict compared to NCA and other -- maybe we ought to shift from Southern to North Central, but absent that, we -- you have in your hands the ability to either get us compliant as quickly as possible -- no pressure, but....

CARVALHO: I just want to recognize the -- the goodwill in all of the faculty input because for all of those meetings and all of my lamenting about the work of the curricular teams, all of you have been the audience at those meetings, and it's been one more meeting on top of a meeting. And then the -- it was -- been extremely constructive, so we're bringing forward something on May 4th that is meaningful.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. Motion to adjourn? So moved. Second. We adjourned.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky

Xcript 4-13-09 Senate.txt
Senate Council meeting for April 13, 2009 was
adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

* * * * *
COUNTY OF FAYETTE) STATE OF KENTUCKY)

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 18th day of May, 2009.

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