

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

DECEMBER 8, 2008

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

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

* * * *

* * * *

DAVID RANDALL, CHAIR

STEPHANIE AKEN, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

CHAIR: Have we gotten all of the -- the
copies of the agenda over, Sheila --

BROTHERS: No, I'm sorry, we don't. They
are still running. They're a handful back
there, but --

CHAIR: They're still running, but we'll

get them to you as the meeting progresses and afterwards, but perhaps you can kind of share. I apologize for that, but it's a long -- a lot of documents. So I guess my first order of business is thank Dr. Tagavi for his having taken over for me last week. Kaveh, are you here? I don't think he is. Okay. Hopefully, he'll be here. I deeply appreciate his having taken over last week. We're bringing some documents up here. I think you can see the overall idea is to get the business that I hope will go fairly smoothly over the first hour done and then we'll launch into the discussion here on the general education issue. There we go. Okay, for right now. Okay.

Once again, welcome. Today, particularly important, I think, if you give your name and affiliation when you speak. And as a matter of fact, when we get towards the end of the program, I'm going to ask you to stand so we can make certain everyone hears what you have to say. And ask for, please, please, please, communicate with your constituency so we'll keep people informed here.

First item of business then is the minutes from November 10, 2008. They were distributed on the -- Wednesday, last Wednesday, December 2nd. There were a few minor changes, but I think nothing extraordinary. The recommendation is that the Senate approve the minutes from November 10 as distributed in your Agenda. I need a motion to that effect.

YANARELLA: So moved.

CHAIR: Say your name.

YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella, so moved.

CHAIR: And a second?

HAYES: Second. Jane Hayes, College of Engineering.

CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor, aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

(NO VERBAL RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.

We have some announcements.

There was a student with a Master's degree that was -- that -- whose name needed to added to the list as to the -- the Board of Trustees, so I approved that on behalf of Senate Council and on your behalf, so that it was sent with the December list. We also waived Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2 to

allow the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee to hear the requests made for a waiver of the two-year window. So that was -- that was done on your behalf and forwarded and allow the student to go to the Retroactive Withdrawal Commitment.

Announcements continued. We had approved a change to this rule that involved the removal of the word successfully. It did enhance clarity, but otherwise it's trivial, so we approved that without bringing it forward to this body.

And Senate Council officer elections nominations began on the 4th. They run through today. These are nominations from members of Senate Council. The election for Senate Council chair and vice chair will be next Monday at our Senate Council meeting. The Senate Council election, that is to say, members from this body to serve on Senate Council started at noon today, and they -- the election will run through Friday. Please vote in that. Please vote in that so that we'll have a good assessment of who -- who will be on the Senate Council.

Finally, Distance Learning Form and Senate Syllabi Standards, a set of standards has been approved by Senate Council, and it's going to be distributed to help people begin to plan to use it, and it will come to you for your formal approval in February. We just wanted to start the ball rolling so that this wouldn't be too much of a surprise. People that are developing these things could have a guide to work from even though we haven't yet had a chance to bring it forward to you for your approval.

Turnitin. We're -- we're continuing with an exploratory use of the Turnitin. We -- we have a license to use this next semester at a much reduced cost, and so we're going to be exploring the use of this. Professor Beattie is here, yes. Ruth, just stand up a moment and tell us about the -- the -- the training this week.

BEATTIE: This morning we had the first of three -- three training sessions for individuals that will rest (unintelligible), using Turnitin next semester. We have two more scheduled for Thursday, one at 11:00 in 319 Classroom Building and one at 3:00 in 405 Weddington

Building. Both training sessions just last an hour long, and they run through on how to use the -- use the main program.

CHAIR: Ruth and her committee have been working on this on our behalf. Thank you very much. Any questions for Ruth?

First order of business here is you have in your folder, you have the academic calendars as listed here which may seem perfunctory to you that we should do this, but this is one of those things that we absolutely must do. So I need a motion that the University Senate approve the calendars as submitted. Joe.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, College of Ag. Recommend that the University Senate approve the submitted calendar as illustrated here immediately.

CHAIR: And a second, please.

AKEN: Second.

CHAIR: Stephanie Aken.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. Second.

CHAIR: Any discussion? Yes.

ANDERSON: Heidi Anderson, Provost Office. Just a point of clarification on page 13, the 2009 fall semester it says February 1st. Is that supposed to say spring semester?

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, which page again?

ANDERSON: Page 13. And on page 14, the one that says fall, August 1st, that probably is correct --

CHAIR: I think it should.

ANDERSON: -- fall. And I would say --

UNIDENTIFIED: February is still in spring.

ANDERSON: We may want to make that correction.

BROTHERS: I think this information about the fall calendar. February 1st is deadline for fall semester.

UNIDENTIFIED: Application deadline --

UNIDENTIFIED: Application deadline.

UNIDENTIFIED: -- for freshmen.

BROTHERS: These are all deadlines that pertain to the fall 2009 semester.

ANDERSON: That's why I wanted clarification.

BROTHERS: Okay.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIR: Any other comments? All in favor of the motion, aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries.

Thank you.

The next issue has to do with proposed name change from the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology to the Department of Educational, School and Counseling Psychology. We have two guests, Drs. Danner and Sandidge. Would you please come up?

PROUT: Substituting for Dr. Danner, I'm Tom Prout.

CHAIR: And fill us in here on -- on what we're doing. We have the material for -- give us....

PROUT: Our department has had three strands within the department. And really the name change is just reflecting what we have been doing for a number of years. The counseling psych and school psych programs are separately accredited. And part of it is for recruitment and actually the -- the Colleges of Education, there's a number of universities that have very similar names just to reflect the programs that are within the -- within the unit. University of Missouri actually has exactly the same organization that we do, and it's actually the same name that we -- we changed the name to.

CHAIR: This comes to you with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council. I need a motion to the effect that the Senate approve this name change.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I recommend that we approve the name change to the Department of Educational, School and Counseling Psychology, effective immediately.

CHAIR: And a second, please.

JENSEN: Jane Jensen, College of Education. Second.

CHAIR: Thank you. Discussion or questions for either of our guests? Thank you, both. All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries.
The next is, again, a proposed name change from the Department of Diagnostic Radiology to the Department of Radiology. Again, this comes to you with positive recommendation from the Senate Council. Is Dr. Brooks here? Please fill us in quickly, if you would.

BROOKS: Sure. The purpose of this name change is likewise to reflect what we

actually do. We have for a number of years incorporated both diagnostic and interventional radiology and also this brings us in line with the titles of most of the departments of radiology around the country.

CHAIR: I need a motion to the effect of approval of this name change. Yes.

WERMELING: Wermeling, Pharmacy. Accept the motion.

CHAIR: And a second?

McCORMICK: James McCormick, Department of Medicine. I second that motion.

CHAIR: Discussion or questions for Dr. Brooks? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries. Thank you. This is good practice for what's coming, folks.

We have a proposed new University Scholars Program. You'll recall University Scholars is where an individual can be working on a Bachelor's degree, at the same time working towards a Master's or whatever. This has to do with a Bachelor of Science in Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering with a Masters in Biomedical Engineering. I hold an appointment in Biomedical Engineering, but I don't see that as a problem here, so I'm just going to go forward unless I hear rumblings. So our guests, Professor Shearer and Nokes.

SHEARER: My name is Scott Shearer, Chair of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering. In our undergraduate curriculum for some time we have had an option whereby students could prepare for graduate careers in Biomedical Engineering. Please recall the University of Kentucky does not have an undergraduate Biomedical Engineering program. However, there is a graduate program. We simply ask for approval of this program so that our students can move, at least during the senior year, double count some of those credits, but then stay here at the University of Kentucky to pursue the Master's work in Biomedical Engineering.

CHAIR: Okay. I need a motion to the effect of approving this program.

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture. I move that we accept the recommendation as stated.

CHAIR: A second? Stephanie. Just --

AKEN: Second.

CHAIR: Stephanie Aken. Discussion or questions? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries.
Thank you.

Again, another proposal to expand the University Scholars Program to include doctoral students, that is, this would be a combined Bachelor's and Ph.D. degree. Our guest is Dr. Jackson.

BLACKWELL: He's not here. I'm going to --

CHAIR: And are you going to stand in it for --

BLACKWELL: Yes.

CHAIR: -- Brian.

BLACKWELL: I'm Jeannine Blackwell, the Dean of the Graduate School. And the Graduate School has proposed that we expand the University Scholars Program which now goes from the Bachelor's to the Master's degree to go from the Bachelor's degree to the Doctoral degree, particularly for those programs that do not have a Master's step. They go straight into the Doctoral program. This is by program choice. You do not have to do this. A program has to apply with a certain curriculum that they would require for shared course work up to 12 hours, and that would count toward the doctoral degree. There's the GPA minimum requirement for those undergraduates. And this is for those disciplines for Doctoral programs and those disciplines where it is acceptable to have one's degrees from the same university. That does not apply to all disciplines. Varies from discipline to discipline. But this would make the choice available for university scholars for recruiting and keeping our brightest and best undergraduates continuing on in the Doctoral program. They can double dip up to 12 hours that have been pre-designated by the program and accepted by the -- the department and College Graduate Council and University Senate.

CHAIR: I neglected to mention in the others, but as with those, with this also it comes with a positive recommendation of Senate Council. I need a motion to the effect of accepting this.

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine.
I propose that we accept the recommendation.

CHAIR: And a second?

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts.

CHAIR: Discussion or questions for
Dr. Blackwell? Yes.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of
Nursing. I'm in favor of this, but I just
have a quick question. On the way to
obtain the Ph.D. degree, does the student
have a stop off point for a Master's
degree?

BLACKWELL: If -- if the program has a
Master's en passant on the books, then they
have the option of the stop out if they
need it. If the program does not have a
Master's, that would not be available.

ANDERSON: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR: Any other questions? All in
favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries.
A new program, Bachelor of
Science in Equine Management and Science,
and our guest is Professor Mike Mullen,
Associate Dean for Academic Programs. I
was going to show a picture of my three
ladies here and insist that you compliment
them.

MULLEN: I will compliment them regardless
of not having a picture.

CHAIR: Please.

MULLEN: Thank you, Dr. Randall. This is
a program where you -- the College of
Agriculture in 2005 started what we called
our equine initiative. And part of the --
the reason for doing this was a
perceived -- some perceptions that we have
not served in all ways the equine industry
which is so crucial to the State of
Kentucky. We've always had a very strong
research program through our Gluck Equine
Research Center, and we've also had equine
nutrition through our animal sciences
program and so forth, but we did not have
an undergraduate program in -- in equine
sciences. And there are some other large
programs at land grant universities. And
the question out there was, why not
Kentucky, if -- if -- if this is truly the
horse capital of the world, not just
thoroughbreds but for all horses, then we
should have an undergraduate program
that -- that matches that in caliber. So
we started those discussions. We had
listening groups throughout the state. We

talked to -- to professionals in the horse industry across the state. We had listening groups with students. Interest was very high. And we, as you can tell if you've looked through the program or the -- the proposal, one of the things we did is we test marketed this, if you will, through our individualized degree program. And without really advertising it, we ended up with 46 students the first semester. Sixty percent of whom were from out of state. And as soon as this word got around without actually announcing a degree program, we were getting actually inquiries from Switzerland, New Zealand and other places around the globe. So there was, obviously, interest in this particular program. The second year we had another 45 students come through the door, and we've had some transfer students who think they're working on an equine program. So we already have about 120 students who are focusing on equine. The college has made substantial reallocations within its own budget, hiring a number of new faculty, utilizing our development office to build a new facility at the Main Chance Farm, the horse research and teaching arena, if you will. And we have on the books through our prospecti with potential donors to also build a really nice teaching and education and outreach center at the Main Chance Farm, as well, assuming that we're able to continue to get donations from private -- from private donors for that. So we already know we have a winner here. We've got huge interest, about 60 percent out of state, thinking that this is the place they want to be to further their education with respect to equine science and management.

CHAIR: All right. We need a motion that the University Senate approve -- Senate approve Bachelor of Science in Equine Management and Science. Yes.

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture. I move that we accept the recommendation as stated.

CHAIR: And a second? Debra Anderson, second. Again, this comes with a positive recommendation from Senate Council. We looked at it quite carefully. We're establishing a new Bachelor's program. Questions for Dr. Mullen or comments? Yes, please.

SKEES: I'm not a senator. I'm Susan Skees from the College of Agriculture, but I believe the correct title is Bachelor of Science in Equine Science and Management.

MULLEN: Yeah, I noted that as I was standing up as well. The management and science are transposed up there.

CHAIR: Aw, that's my fault.

BROTHERS: So it should be Bachelor of Science -- Bachelor of Science in Equine Science and Management?

MULLEN: Yes. That's what's on the proposal.

BROTHERS: I will make sure Chris in the Provost's Office gets the correct name.

MULLEN: The prefix of EQM if that makes it...

CHAIR: Other questions, comments? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries. Thank you, Dr. Mullen.

MULLEN: Thank you.

CHAIR: All right. So this is the major issue today. I hadn't thought we'd get here quite this fast, but bless us we have. So Senate Council has two strong desires. Number one is that not one of you feel railroaded in to any decision we make today. We want everyone to have a chance to be heard. I'd love to come to a consensus here. It may not be possible, but at least I don't want anyone to go away with the feeling that your concerns weren't heard. Now, you're aware we had a call for concerns. Only two formal concerns were actually sent to us, and we're going to discuss those one at a time. Goal number one, no one feel that this thing has been railroaded. Number two is Senate Council absolutely does not want to have this thing amended on the fly. We've got individuals here whom I'll introduce to you in just a few moments that have spent four years working on this thing. And this is the culmination of that effort. They -- they've put a great deal of very, very careful discussion into this. And it seems unlikely to Senate Council that we could improve it on the fly by an amendment on the fly. So what we're going to do is Senate Council is going to introduce a motion to suspend the rules which means, effectually, we're going to disallow

amendments to the Learning Outcomes. Since it comes from Senate Council, that requires no second. So if that motion fails, then we'll go ahead and solicit a motion that the Learning Outcomes be approved, and we'll discuss them, but before we come to a vote or any amendments, we'll table it or we'll go on, but I -- I ask you as -- as much as I have a right to ask you that we -- we not vote to -- for that amendment to fail. I earnestly hope that the amendment to suspend the rules passes. And so we would then go on with a motion to approve the Learning Outcomes. And we'll consider both of the formal concerns. We'll have an open discussion and ultimately a vote. Hopefully, if things go this way -- if the motion fails, this will go back to the Steering Committee. Now, Susan loves 8:00 meetings with bagels. Lunch time we didn't even have bagels, but she loves 8:00 meetings, and I can't tell you how thrilled the Steering Committee would be to go back to a few more 8:00 meetings maybe with bran muffins instead of bagels; something instead of bagels. Anyway, but if this is fatally flawed, that's a perfectly legitimate option. If you feel after discussion that this thing ought not pass, we can -- we can send it back. We hope maybe not to, but we can do that. If the motion passes, the chair will seriously consider entertaining a motion to declare tomorrow a university holiday. Now, I don't know whether the chair has that authority or not. Remember, the rules are going to be suspended, so anything goes. No, no, I won't do that. I value my job, but the next step then is to put together some curriculum committees, and we'll start working on that almost immediately. And you will have a chance next spring to vote on the guidelines, the curriculum guidelines. And as they say, the devil is in the details or that's where the rubber will meet the road. That will be another serious consideration. So we're looking at the Learning Outcomes today.

Are there questions on how I would like to proceed? Okay. So the motion requires no second from -- because it comes from the Senate Council. And so here is, due to extensive prior opportunities for input into a new Gen Ed

program, the Senate Council moves to suspend the right to propose amendments to the Learning Outcomes during the Senate's discussion which is going to occur momentarily with the exception of friendly amendments to correct spelling, grammar, or factually inaccuracies in the text. Are there any questions about the nature of the motion? Okay. All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Motion carries. Thank you. All right. This is the second reading and the vote, and I'd like to ask each of these individuals to stand. The convener Dr. Carvalho, Susan. She writes e-mails day and night and the amount of work she's put in this is unbelievable. Ruth Beattie and Dr. Carl Lee, Pat Burkhart and Shawn Livingston. Dr. Eldred and Dr. Rayens, Dr. Feist-Price and Jeff Rogers, Dr. Rogers, Dr. Larry Grabau, and Dr. Deanna Sellnow, Dr. Jane Jensen, and Gerry Swan, Dr. Nancy Johnson and Dr. Bruce Walcott. And the Senate Council has had fairly extensive input, Ernie Yanarella is former chair. And Ben Withers, Dr. Withers and Dr. Tagavi and -- and myself were also involved. I don't think it would be inappropriate to give a round of applause. All right.

So the recommendation is that University Senate approves the Learning Outcomes. So what I would like is a motion to that effect with a second. That will put it on the floor, and then discussion will follow. So in making a motion, I mean, you could disapprove the motion and make it in all good conscience. So I need a motion that the University Senate approve the Learning Outcomes as distributed in your agenda.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I move that the University Senate approve the Learning Outcomes as distributed in the agenda.

CHAIR: I need a second.

WILLIAMS: Second.

CHAIR: David Williams. All right. Several concerns have been given. This one was distributed to -- to senators by e-mail on the 5th, and I am going to take some representative statements from this concern, but -- but they're print -- the full document is printed towards the

back of your handout here. And so we greatly appreciate the willingness of the Gen Ed Reform Steering Committee to listen to our arguments, this comes from the Department of Philosophy, in favor of explicitly incorporating training in logical reasoning (critical thinking) into the Learning Outcomes, and thus we agree that the new version of LO 3 -- this is -- this a week ago today, a very slight revision was made to the Learning Outcomes -- is a major improvement on the previous version, since logic is now at least mentioned by name. Unfortunately, it appears the revised version of Learning Outcome 3 continues to construe instruction in reasoning and inference narrowly as instruction in quantitative reasoning which remains the general heading of that Learning Outcome 3, despite the somewhat incongruous mention of logic in the text of Outcomes -- that's the change, -- and Assessment Framework and Curricular Framework. This continues. More peculiar still is the conception of a course (indeed of two courses) -- so there are two courses proposed in Learning Outcome 3, that will successfully combine instruction in logic, statistics, and mathematics. No one in the Philosophy Department has any idea what such course would look like, and we have serious doubts about our abilities to contribute to such a course were it to be instituted. Perhaps such a course in mathematics-statistics-logic could in fact be constructed and staffed. If so, we are quite willing to play a major role both in the initial planning and eventual staffing of the same. So if the Learning Outcomes are approved by the Senate in their present form, we will do our best to find a way to work within these Outcomes, despite our principled and practical reservations concerning the same. Is there anyone who's unclear about the nature of the concern? Actually, the individual who wrote the letter is here. And I can ask him to respond to any of your issues where it's not clear. Anyone needs clarification with the concern? Okay. So Dr. Carvalho has agreed to respond on -- on with the committee to this -- to this concern. So I'm going to effectively allow you to --

CARVALHO: Thank you.

CHAIR: -- take over the reins here.

CARVALHO: I just wanted to return to the rationales that were distributed before this last call for concerns and the discussion of the committee is fully reflected there, we would meet again and endorse that. But also I'd like to call on Carl Lee to address the question of what such a course would look like.

LEE: Do that now?

CARVALHO: Yes.

LEE: The question of what is -- well, first of all I wanted to mention that we were responding on the quantitative reasoning task force to address the design principle that the Senate gave to us on quantitative reasoning. This is why we were working with that. And we -- we looked at a variety of literature which has existed over the last 10 to 15, 20 years on quantitative reasoning, quantitative literacy, and numerous -- a number of institutions have been looking at -- at these issues as well. There have been principles developed by a number of our professional societies and their committees. And -- and so eventually textbook publishers decided that there was a market for such courses and -- and for such textbooks. So the first question is, can we envision such a course that -- that involves some elements of logic, mathematics and statistics, and I'd like to emphasize with the real focus and the drive on looking at real world problems so that we're not envisioning a course on algebra, on geometry, on statistics, per se, in isolation. We're looking at how students can come to face statements, and readings and arguments in mathematics and statistics that they might encounter, for example, in the newspaper and other places. So courses have been developed. Here's an example. I'm not saying I advocate this textbook, but this was an example of a textbook which begins with part one on what they call -- what -- what they call, and -- and I'm not saying that this is what necessarily we would all call, but they have -- their first chapter is on -- first unit is on critical reasoning and logic, and then they move into applications of mathematics and statistics. And the units are modular in form, so that they can be combined in

different combinations to create a semester-long course, and indeed there are courses like this taught at most of our benchmark institutions. I think that's -- that answers that particular question.

CHAIR: Is there anyone who wishes to address this issue? We'll have plenty of opportunity to open other issues, but is there anyone who wishes to speak for or against this particular concern? Yes.

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine. Just a question. The phrasing in there says, we feel this way. How many people is the we that has this disagreement with the phrasing and the expectation?

LEE: I couldn't hear what she said.

CHAIR: Could you come forward? Would you mind?

TAGAVI: Who is we? I think it's the Department of Philosophy.

SNOW: Philosophy. Was this letter written on behalf of the Department of Philosophy, and all of the faculty are making this statement together?

CHAIR: Well, it -- it was a statement made by the chair after full consultation with all of the -- all of the faculty.

BROTHERS: Of Philosophy.

CHAIR: Of Philosophy, of Philosophy. Dan, go ahead and if -- if you've got something you want to say. We restricted this to Senators, but I think that this is an issue and --

BREAZEALE: I'm Dan Breazeale. I'm chair -- I'm the author of the letter and the excerpts. The -- I'm not sure that this is germane or probably will be out of order if I am, but our concern is that the design principles have -- are not reflected in the Learning Outcomes. I've made this in all three of the memos that I've tried to circulate to the Senate. The design principles don't -- there are seven design principles, and four Learning Outcomes. So there are bound to be more than one design principle reflected in some or all of the Learning Outcomes. The committee seems to be operating under the assumption, since there's a design principle for quantitative reasoning, there has to be a single Learning Outcome for quantitative reasoning which we reject. We think that it would be wiser to have a Learning Outcome for

reasoning and inference which includes not just quantitative reasoning but also critical thinking and logic which is, I remind you, the very first of design principles, critical thinking. As we see it, the first principle is not adequately satisfied by the four Learning Outcomes. That's the main objection. That wasn't -- that wasn't reflected in any of the points expressed. That's all I want to say. Thank you.

CHAIR: Fine. Thank you. Any other? Yes.

GESUND: Hans Gesund, Engineering. I had a fair amount of mathematics in my career. I've always thought of mathematics as symbolic logic. That's how I was originally taught mathematics. And I have seen no reason to change my opinion. If it isn't symbolic logic, what is mathematics after all? I'll leave it at that.

CHAIR: Any other person wishing to speak to this issue? Now, we're not going to vote on individual issues. If you think this is a fatal flaw, then you'll vote against approval of the Learning Outcomes. Anyone else? Yes, Ernie.

YANARELLA: With all due respect to the person who wrote the letter, I would like to say that within the committee, and I think this was a consensus within the committee, our understanding of the design principle that incorporated critical thinking was -- was quite a bit broader than the way in which it has been operationalized in the letter that have been brought forward to the committee and to the chair of the Senate Council and the Senate Council, the Senate Council, itself. We have envisaged a critical-thinking perspective being brought to bear in at -- at least three of the Learning Outcomes and perhaps even the fourth. I will speak only for Learning Outcome number 4. I served as the chair of the Learning Outcome 4 of what's called citizenship subcommittee, and there in our effort to collaborate upon the specifics of Learning Outcome 4, we sought to incorporate a strong element of critical thinking. That effort was, in fact, abetted by the discussion that took place between Dan Breazeale as -- as chair of the Philosophy Department and the subcommittee

and the General Education Steering Committee itself. I think indeed if you have before you Learning Outcome 4 with the Outcomes and assessment framework and the curricular assessment, you will note that in -- in the former Outcomes and assessment framework, we speak about the importance of students recognizing and evaluating the ethical dilemmas, conflicts, and trade-offs involved in personal and collective decision-making. That is, we are -- we are not looking -- we are not looking to operationalize Learning Outcome 4 in such a way as to promote a kind of fundamentalist or moralistic orientation towards values, nor are we concerned with a kind of -- of civics textbook kind of approach. We are concerned, as -- as -- as well as Carl in -- in his discussion of Learning Outcome 3, to include real world examples that allow students to deal with those nuances, those conflicts, those dilemmas and trade-offs that we regard as part of a maturing mind. And so far from understanding critical thinking in a way that has been articulated well by -- by Dan Breazeale's letter, and as I assume, the strong support of the department itself, we understand critical thinking in a more expansive way.

CHAIR: Thank you. Other comments to this issue? Okay. A second concern was raised, and I have summarized it but it is in full on the last page of your handout. And this individual was concerned -- it's a senator, by the way -- is concerned with what he feels is a blank check that this proposal seems to contain. Faculty are asked to trust that there will be no increase in the number of credit hours required for graduation, but a (future) next group will provide details regarding specific courses. That is to say the next report in spring is going to present the outline for the courses that's coming. He requests assurance that the forthcoming Gen Ed reform will not lead to an increase in the credit hours needed for graduation for any and all UK programs that -- that already have more than 120 hours required to graduate. He would like that in writing. He would like a written assurance that the new Gen Ed will not cause an increase in the number of hours required

for any given major. Senate Council gave considerable time to discussing this. I am going to summarize our discussion here. We agree, this is an important and legitimate concern, but one that will be best dealt with in the spring of 2009 when we consider the approval of the curriculum outlines. The Senate will have an opportunity to approve or disprove the work of the curricular teams. And it looks like that does not -- or that does create a possibility of a gross extension or an extension of the required majors. We can deal with it when we know what we're dealing with, and that will be the appropriate time to consider -- consider any impact on satisfying major requirements. Is there anyone who doesn't understand the nature of the concern? All right.

Susan, is there anything you or your committee would like to say in response to this?

CARVALHO: No. I'll say only that the entire process relies on the participation of every department and college to watch the process, measure it against your own student's curriculum and let us know in a timely fashion so that we can respond. I was also going to ask Bruce Walcott from the College of Engineering to address this because he too has been watching it very closely on behalf of his college, and he's a member of the committee.

WALCOTT: Thank you, Susan. We in the College of Engineering have gone through a worst case scenario, and assuming that none of the current courses in the hardcore math and science, calculus, physics, chemistry, are not counted as part of this Gen Ed. And the concern has been raised that in three of our programs there's actually going to be an increase in the worst case, that's assuming that none of the hard sciences again make it through the Steering Committee or get modified in the curriculum. But the -- the worse case, I believe, and correct me, Scott, I think is four credit hours for the pharmaceutical engineering program so we are definitely in the same ballpark. And we are following the same procedures that we follow in the College of Engineering, that is, when we develop courses, we have to do Learning

Outcomes first. That's just necessitated by APEX so I think most of the engineering senators and faculty really applaud the process that Susan has led the committee through. We're just, I think, uncomfortable with this last little bit of leap of faith that this won't turn away students that are already in the program or students that are considering the program, with an excessive number of general ed credit hours. But it looks like we're -- we're very close to either scenario.

CHAIR: Is there any senator who wants to speak for or against this concern? Please stand. Yes, sir.

WERMELING: Similarly to engineering, since you mentioned (unintelligible) program, pharmacy has also considered this, so I raised the question actually at the last Senate meeting as to whether this would raise credit hour requirements. And since we have a two or three-year pre-pharmacy requirement in which students have to be eligible to graduate to actually be eligible for enrollment, so all the general study requirements have to be met, in addition to a certain minimum number of hours and a core curriculum has to be met at the same time for a student to be eligible for enrollment, after going through the admissions process. So we would share some of the same concerns that Dr. Walcott mentioned that the pre-pharmacy curriculum now is already 19 to 20 hours a semester. It includes a heavy dose of math and science and biology and chemistry and physics which have all these laboratories associated with those as well. And add another year onto what's, you know, on the books as a two-year pre-pharmacy program, most students now come in at three and half of our graduating class now enters with a baccalaureate degree before coming in to pharmacy school. That becomes a significant time and financial burden for students considering the program. So we're also looking at this in the same way. I consulted with our Associate Dean Bill Lubawy, and he basically had the same answer as what's been recommended here. It's the devil is in the details. We have to have some trust as to what's going to come out. So all I can do at the point of this meeting is to express the concern that

we can't burden our students a lot more.

CHAIR: Thank you. Did you say your name for the --

WERMELING: Wermeling in Pharmacy.

CHAIR: Any other with respect to this concern? Okay. We'll -- we'll consider any concern that anyone has, but we're going to discuss it concern by concern by concern so --

CARVALHO: Could I mention one --

CHAIR: I'm sorry.

CARVALHO: No, that's all right. The process has been very good. I did receive one e-mail concern late last week. In fact, it was Friday afternoon which I responded to via e-mail, and so that one hasn't been circulated, but didn't come through the official route. I just thought it was appropriate to bring it up from the College of -- the Department of History which had addressed an earlier issue, and we responded to it with changes in the Learning Outcome. You'll see it in your rationale. They came back and asked about the specific phrase, rights and responsibilities, why we had opted not to include that phrase in the citizenship outcome. And I responded that we had added a phrase which was somewhat broader than that which is, rather -- when we -- when we went back and considered the ethics issue, we broadened that sentence to say, the ethical dilemmas, conflicts, and trade-offs involved in personal and collective decision-making. And in our view that did encompass the concern raised by History about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship on an individual and a collective basis. I have not heard a response back from that except acknowledgment of receipt, but I just thought it was important for me to air that one as well since it didn't come through you, but it did come to me as head of the committee.

CHAIR: So any further comments on this issue? Yes, please.

STARR-LEBEAU: I'm Gretchen Starr-Lebeau in the Department of History, and I'm the author of the Friday afternoon e-mail. And -- and I've talked to people in the History Department. We remain very concerned. Actually, we were gratified that the notion of a historical context was added into

Learning Outcome 4, but actually this has been our main concern all along is that a broader notion of citizenship be incorporated into Learning Outcome number 4. We're concerned because it looks like as Learning Outcome 4 is written right now, a course on the Bill of Rights wouldn't qualify for Learning Outcome number 4 even though the design principle seems like it would allow it. And our concern is that Learning Outcome number 4 really focuses on one specific element of citizenship, that is sensitivity to diversity. Now, the History Department does not object to diversity. My own research is on the problems that come when you try and marginalize minorities. I -- I personally feel very strongly about that, but we do object to labeling everything that is important in learning about citizenship as being equated to diversity. In the letter that we wrote to the committee back in October, we addressed this issue again, the e-mail, and we -- I was present at Senate Council meeting on November 24th when this came up. The reason we like the phrase, rights and responsibilities of citizens, was that it hinted -- especially, of citizens or of citizenship, was the hint at the possibility that there are other aspects to citizenship beyond sensitivity to diversity. But the response that we got was that that excessively broadened the mandate of Learning Outcome number 4. They didn't want to allow too many courses through the gate of Learning Outcome number 4. We're concerned though that there's another problem with Learning Outcome number 4 as constructed, that when outsiders, particularly legislatures, learn that courses on citizenship, so-called, are going to deal with diversity and don't have any of the traditional topics that they might expect to see in a citizenship requirement, that they are going to see that as an example of left-wing political correctness, generating a certain amount of hostility that we think might be ill advised, given the current financial climate. It seems to us that there are a couple of ways to deal with this. If you don't want a citizenship requirement, if you want a diversity requirement, then you should call it a diversity requirement and

not say that it's going to deal with effective citizenship. If you want to return to the more general wording of the design principle that talks about engaged and effective citizenship, then I think it would be advised to include some kind of language that addresses the notion of citizenship beyond the notion of diversity, like the phrase, rights and responsibilities of citizens, or anything better that anyone wants to suggest. And I should mention as well that this is a concern, not only of History but people I've talked to in other Humanities including Modern and Classical Language and Philosophy and some others.

CHAIR: Thank you. Anyone else speak to this issue, Outcome 4, citizenship. Ernie.

YANARELLA: Either of my -- the other members of the task force could equally well speak to this. Jeff, I invite you if you're here, to also chime in on this. I think in terms of the evolution of this particular Learning Outcome and the Outcomes and assessment framework and curricular framework that was developed, I don't think any of us thought in terms of the idea of political correctness. I'm -- I'm hard put to imagine that legislators who are now weighted down with increasingly prodigious issues relating to budgetary considerations would pick out Learning Outcome 4 as a focus for their -- their scrutiny and animus. But if they did, I would, as a member of this committee, simply underline that as -- as we have -- we have sought to operationalize this particular Learning Outcome with two -- two courses. One focusing on -- on -- on diversity issues, but not diversity issues alone, and another focusing on local global -- global dynamics but not simply local global dynamics themselves. We have listed a number of other potential foci that include applied ethics which has been effectively incorporated into the Outcomes and assessment framework statement as well as change over time, comparative and national, I mean, across national and comparative issues, issues of civic engagement and power and resistance that suggest a very wide array of -- of additional issues that could and should be, in our view, incorporated into such courses as are

developed by the curriculum team that will be involved in -- in developing specific operational criteria for the acceptance of -- of potential courses. In some respects those are issues that we are handing -- we hope to be handing off to such curriculum teams, and we hope that they will -- they will operate in a way that sees the value and the importance of -- of both continuity and perhaps improvement on what we're trying to do. But I find it very strange, having been involved for, what, five or six months with this and me, being a veteran of almost four years on this entire general education framework, that -- that Learning Outcome 4 should be typified as focusing only on diversity. If -- if we have made that that misimpression, I -- I will apologize on behalf of the -- the subcommittee. It has been clear, I think, within the General Education Steering Committee that we've had a more, with a small C, catholic understanding of what Learning Outcome 4 is trying to do and its relationship to the other three Learning Outcomes that I see as part of the integrity and the coherence of this overall general education proposal.

CARVALHO: May I just make a brief comment, and then I'll ask Jeff to speak, but I think the way this is conceived a course on the Bill of Rights certainly would qualify. It would require a connection to the present day world. In other words, you might say the Bill of Rights -- the role of the Bill of Rights today. That's the piece that -- that it would need to include. In other words, as it relates to contemporary United States. That wouldn't change based on inclusion of rights and responsibilities or not. It certainly is the kind of course that we would envision. And I'll just let Jeff add any further comment.

ROGERS: I was -- I was basically going to

CARVALHO: Sorry.

ROGERS: -- say the exact same comment, that I see no preclusion of such classes and we specifically discussed examples along those lines. What we simply didn't want is courses that talk about the Bill of Rights in their historical context without any connection to the present, without any connection to people's lives today. That happens a lot when you -- when we get in

our disciplinary mode, we don't do that. We wanted -- we wanted to have an engaging curriculum in which students could have a forum to discuss those types of issues and engage with those issues and what rights can be extended to what groups and what times for what reasons. And we see that as a great class, and we have no problem with that. I see absolutely no way in which this would preclude such a thing. Those are the type of courses we discussed in our -- in our meetings.

CHAIR: Please.

STARR-LEBEAU: I guess the reason that we all thought that is because the first sentence says that students will recognize historical and cultural differences arising from issues such as ethnicity, gender, language, nationality, race, religion, sexuality, and socioeconomic class. That seems to be a sentence that suggests that what the course will do is look at differences arising from those factors. So

--

ROGERS: But I would argue that you can't look at the Bill of Rights and not look at the fact that -- mention rights were only extended to men at certain points in history. They weren't -- they weren't -- certain rights weren't extended to the (unintelligible) -- that's the -- the intent was that if you're going to talk about it, you don't talk about it in the abstract. We'll talk about it in relationship to the groups of really existing people in -- in terms of history. And so that's the way that I understood it.

CARVALHO: And --

CHAIR: Any -- please.

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts.

CHAIR: Stand up if you wouldn't mind.

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts. I just want to endorse everything that Gretchen Starr-LeBeau expressed, and I still, as I said last time, don't see why we can't refine the writing a little bit because the contention between these two speakers has to do with the way it's written. I just don't see why two sentences can't be rewritten to -- to honor those very good points that she made.

CHAIR: Any other? Dr. Yarnarella.

YANARELLA: David, you can't do that. It's Yarnarella. I -- eventually, assuming --

assuming that this body is willing to allow this Gen Ed proposal to go forward, a set of curricular teams will go on to refine these -- these starting points that we have tried to lay down in terms of the Outcomes and the curricular framework that has been set forth. I don't know what I can do to my -- my colleague in History to -- that hasn't been said already with regard to the particular language of rights and responsibilities. As the facilitator of the General Steering Committee has -- has underlined, the -- the language that we -- that we incorporated, that was in part an effort to accommodate concerns within the Philosophy Department relating to the evaluation of ethical dilemmas, conflicts and trade-offs involved in personal and collective decision-making subsumes the notion of rights and responsibilities. I could say as a political scientist that I don't particularly like the phrase rights and responsibilities. For me in my disciplinary -- from my disciplinary perspective, it tends to focus on -- on -- on ideas that I tend to associate with -- with civic -- a civics textbook kind of approach. Now, I'm sure that the -- the spokesman -- spokesperson from the History Department and -- and any number of her colleagues, as well as the spokesperson from Fine Arts, has concerns about this language from -- from other perspectives. I would simply underline once more that within the General Education Steering Committee, and as represented, I -- I believe, quite fairly by the facilitator of that committee, we see the -- the revised language under Outcomes and assessment framework as encompassing that particular phrase.

CHAIR: I think we've heard this issue.

SELLNOW: Can I say one thing?

CHAIR: Sure.

SELLNOW: Thank you. Deanna Sellnow from the Steering Committee. I'm going to the very bottom of what the concern was about which is the appropriate time to consider any impact on satisfying major requirements, and I just want to remind everybody that general education or USP, as it is right now, is a 45 credit thing, and what this is is a 30 credit thing. So with

all due respect to Engineering and Pharmacy, your real concerns, it seems to me, that that alone has been helped so that it doesn't impact drastically on major requirements as they exist right now.

CHAIR: Is there any other concern?
We'll address them one by one. Any other concern? Sir.

ROORDA: Randall Roorda, Arts and Sciences. I work in the Department of English and I'm the director of the writing program. And I'm sorry I didn't enter these in the format, traditional form, but I do have some concerns to express about what Learning Outcome number 2 may entail for writing instruction at the University, and I beg your indulgence, I've written this out in advance so that I could articulate expeditiously and yet be cogent about it.

Let me say first that I favor the Learning Outcome proposal and hope to see -- I applaud the Steering Committee for formulating it, and I hope to see Gen Ed reform proceed with all dispatch, perhaps in my lifetime. I hope this proposal is approved. Once it is, though, it's implementation is going to entail some issues for writing instruction here, and I know that these issues have been discussed to some extent, or at least I understand they have in the Steering Committee. And I want the Senate to be aware -- aware of them as well as we head down this road without being railroaded. I'm addressing, as I said, Learning Outcome number 2, written, oral and visual communication. You'll note that it calls for six credit hours, two courses in this area, one in writing particularly, a second in oral and visual communication along with writing. So the question is what's the change here from the present (unintelligible)? One difference between this requirement and the present requirement is that the first-year writing course will drop from four credit hours to three. This follows on the change instituted several years ago, from two writing courses, three hours each, to a single four-hour course.

The other difference is that the second of the two courses, the one on oral and visual communication effectually reinstates the oral communication

requirement dropped from USP some years back, but with this change, this course is also supposed to foster, and here I quote, continued development of written communication skills.

The thinking here, I think, is that the hour of instruction dropped from the first-year writing course will be made up in the second course and that the two courses together will constitute an integrated program of study in communications across modes and media. Let me say that those of us associated with writing instruction here think this is a great idea in principle. In principle, we're really interested in bringing together instruction in visual literacy, new media, oral presentation, and print literacy. In practice, though, we have no guarantee that this proposal will work. And there's reason to suspect that this change may actually make things worse.

For starters, it's hard to see how a truly integrated sequence of instruction in communications across modes could be designed and implemented -- implemented not just across departments but across two colleges, Arts and Sciences and Communications. Constructing a sequence of instruction will likely require a common administrative structure, ideally a department, charged with course design, articulation, staffing, and intellectual guidance. In the absence of such a structure, and the resources necessary to effect it, there's a strong chance the proposed Learning Outcome will merely reinstate the arrangement prevailing several years ago, a requirement in writing and a requirement in speaking, unconnected. It's the same difference only less so.

Creating a structure to administrate -- administer an integrated program of study in communications is a long-term proposition, clearly. In the near term, the most expeditious and effective route would be to continue to require a four-credit hour first-year writing course, as presently constituted. This would mean altering slightly the number of hours taken up by Gen Ed requirements, from 30 hours to 31, for most students. I realize we're not permitted to amend the Learning Outcome proposal before

us, and I don't really want to. I want to get it underway. But I do want to put this out for consideration by those who, assuming the proposal does get approved, are going to be enacting it or starting on it.

On the face of it, there doesn't seem to be much difference between a four-hour and a three-hour course in writing. Yet the difference is pronounced enough that a substantial and increasing number of colleges are making the change we made five years ago, from a two-course sequence to a single four-hour course in first-year writing. These include aspirational benchmarks such as Michigan, peer universities like Purdue, Connecticut and North Carolina State, and an assortment of regional state universities and four-year colleges.

The extra credit hours turns out to make a difference both in Learning Outcomes and in administrative logistics. In Learning Outcomes, as near as we can tell, we are succeeding in accomplishing in our four-hour course, English 104, what we used to accomplish in English 101 and 102, the preceding two-course sequence. We have reason, and precedent, to believe we would not accomplish as much or do as well for as many students in a single three-hour course. And in any case, there are administrative difficulties galore in dropping back to a single three-hour course. This single course could not be equivalent to the old English 101, which is defunct at UK but still offered as part of a 101-102 sequence at all sorts of universities and community colleges who send transfer students to us. The course would have to be equivalent to English 102, which we do still offer, mostly for transfer students. But not all our incoming students are ready for English 102. For those who are not, we need a preliminary course, which means we're right back to offering English 101 for some percentage of our students. Determining which students go where entails coming up with instruments for placement, a substantial and expensive undertaking. All told, this route would be both more expensive and less effective than -- than our present practices. And it would

necessitate for some students a longer time to degree. Thus what seems a small difference could ramify largely, with regressive effects.

Again, I just want to register these issues to make them a matter of record and to have the Senate hear them. I'd be happy to discuss them further with interested parties, and I know that Janet Eldred, my colleague, Writing Initiative Director and member of the Steering Committee, would be happy to talk about it too. I know that she's taken them up, as I said, with the committee in their proceedings. So, thanks.

CHAIR: I might ask you if it's convenient to forward the text to our office.

ROORDA: Happy to do it.

CHAIR: Comments on response to this issue?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. Speaking to the merit of what my colleague said is way above my head, so I'm not going to be able to speak that, but I 30 credit hour is one of design principle, and that's not open to discussion today. Just want to mention that. If you want to make it four hours, another course has to be two hours. We cannot go to 31 without going -- another hour -- one year back to last year, design principle again.

CHAIR: Susan.

CARVALHO: Briefly, I've looked at an awful lot of benchmarks, and I want to point out that when we went from the six-credit hour requirement to the four-credit class, we did also add the graduation writing requirement. So when we talk about three hours, we haven't gone from six to three; we've gone from six to three plus three instead of from six to four plus three. I lost my thought. Yeah, right now we have four plus three, and we're proposing three plus three. There may be students who need remediation, and the idea of reinstating 101 for those students is a possibility. Another possibility is a four-credit option for those students so that they wouldn't have to take six credits to make up the ground that they lack or rather for one single four-credit course. And I'll let Richard Greissman speak to the remediation issue. Did you --

ROORDA: I just want to say in that case
I -- I understand that. You still do have
a placement issue.

CARVALHO: We do.

ROORDA: Yeah.

CARVALHO: We do --

ROORDA: Which is substantial,
substantial.

CARVALHO: -- have a placement issue in so
many areas, and not just credit.
Richard.

CHAIR: Yes, please. Richard Greissman.

GREISSMAN: I want to be careful what I say
because I don't want to suggest that the
developmental ed mandate will entirely
address Dr. Randall's quite reasonable
concern.

ROORDA: Dr. Roorda.

GREISSMAN: Dr. Roorda, excuse me. I -- I
know that. Thank you. Quite reasonable
concern. But the state legislature has
mandated and the CPE has put into effect a
requirement that students as of the fall
2009 be tested for replacement if their ACT
scores in math, reading, and writing fall
below a certain score. So in fact, we
already have to put in place a rubric that
identifies those very students who would
likely benefit from what Dr. Roorda
suggests. We will test as of this spring
and summer every student whose English ACT
score is below the target score. Whether
or not that's every student Dr. Roorda is
talking about, I can't say now, in
fairness. But a substantial number of
students who are committed to UK, who need
the kind of work that Dr. Roorda suggests,
will be screened and will be placed in an
appropriate remedial intervention course
that will address the very thing he
suggests. For instance, we are discussing
adding an extra credit hour to the current
English writing course and perhaps, if Gen
Ed is approved and implemented, a future
Gen Ed course such that a large number of
students who currently benefit from the
four-credit course will continue to get a
four-credit course. So it's not true that
we don't have a rubric for placement. In
fact, we will put one in place as of fall
2009.

ROORDA: Okay. Can I respond to that
briefly?

CHAIR: Yes.

ROORDA: I don't want -- I don't want to take up everybody's time with this, but viz-a-viz the question of placement through the ACT scores, those of us in writing here who are acquainted with those instruments have got problems with them. For one thing, they don't really test writing, they test a whole lot of little mechanical things associated with writing. I don't want to belabor the point, but my -- my professional opinion, such as it is, it's a lousy instrument.

CHAIR: I think, Dr. Yanarella.

YANARELLA: Randall, I hope I'm not speaking out of school on this, and I'm not going to try to deal with some of the -- the practical questions that you have raised regarding -- regarding implementation, but what I did discern from your early part of your remarks was that you saw the innovative aspects of at least part this particular Learning Outcome. And it was not the task of this particular General Steering Committee to move to issues of implementation and operationalization. I think that in each case -- in -- in the case of each of these Learning Outcomes, there will be formidable challenges to the curricular teams who would take up those responsibilities, assuming that this body is willing to pass on this particular program. And I -- I think that part of the richness of the discussion that -- discussions that went on in General -- in the General Steering Committee are reflected in the kinds of issues that you -- you have raised. I -- I certainly am not going to volunteer to be on any curriculum team that tries to -- to meet the challenge that has been -- the challenges that have been posed by this particular Learning Outcome, but I do think that it is worthwhile for such a curriculum team to -- to take up the challenge and to seek to -- to advance an integrated communications framework for these three areas.

ROORDA: But one -- one part of that. Thanks, Ernie. I appreciate that. I think it's a great opportunity, and again, as I said, I'm going to vote for this, and I just want to put it on the radar.

CHAIR: I think we've heard this concern. Are there any other concerns? Davy.

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology. I just -- something has come to my mind here as I'm hearing some of the comments that they're each peripherally bumping into budgetary issues, an increased faculty staffing, (unintelligible) requirement, (unintelligible). I'm just going -- where on down the line here do we intersect admin -- let me back up. When a -- when a particular department is going to put forward a new degree, we ask them to put forward the academic proposal as well as an administrative feasibility assessment where it loops to the Provost Office to come back, yes, I've got a budget for this one; no, I don't. Where are we going to have that kind of intersection with this exercise?

CHAIR: I have spoken with Provost specifically about this issue and actually I'm going to let Richard give most of the response, but his response to me was it's preliminary at this time. The job of the Senate, or the faculty, is to design the best program we can and what it's going to cost -- what it's going to require. Once the courses are outlined, then he'll look at them. And we may implement things incrementally if there's an issue of budget or if we can do it all, we'll do it all. But his position -- and -- and would you care to second this? I think his position is that it's premature. Our job today is to get the best we can, what we think we need for our students. Richard. Okay.

GREISSMAN: Reluctantly. Davy, it's a great question. And I'll -- I'll play on your great point. The Provost Office offers what we call bureaucratically a feasibility statement. Once the Senate Council says, here's what we want to do -- we haven't yet determined what the Senate Council wants to do. So what we imagine is that, again, should this proposal be approved today, curricular teams will spend the rest of the fall and -- and the spring working on the particularities such that at some point, we hope in the spring, but we're not going to rush this, we hope in the spring the Senate can present to the Provost what it deems is an appropriate set of 10 courses to satisfy the new Gen Ed program. At which point, the Provost would give a full response, vet it, have lots of discussion and expect that

any final vote by the Senate on implementation would happen only after the Senate was satisfied that his resource request was (unintelligible).

CHAIR: Any other concerns? I'm seeing heads nodding, and I'm going to forward those names to the marshal.

YOST: I don't want -- I don't have a concern. Scott Yost from Engineering. But I want to just do a follow up on the credit hour requirement that we talked about. I actually wrote, on behalf of the College of Engineering, I wrote the -- the concern forwarded on. And I would agree as I received some responses back from the Senate Council. And by the way, I do want to thank the committee very much for all your work on this because it's -- in Engineering, as Dr. Walcott said, we do have Learning Outcomes and we like this coming to the University as a whole. But we are an organization that typically has a lot of extra hours, and it's not from our own doing. We have accredit agent -- accrediting agencies that require typically on the order of 130, 134 credit hours for graduation. And we do have significant double dipping going on right now, but the case in point being is that like in, we -- we dropped the communications requirement for whatever reasons we dropped it. I'm kind of new to this whole process. I'm, you know, I don't have a lot of history --

CARVALHO: It's not dropped; it's suspended.

YOST: Yeah.

CARVALHO: It's going to come back in play unless we can keep it suspended.

YOST: Suspended for you all, but our accreditation agency doesn't allow us to suspended it. We have to keep a communications component. Okay. So we have things like this going on, and -- and while it's, I guess, listening to my constituents in the College of Engineering who are very concerned, they have their own legitimate concerns. Maybe some are a little paranoid; some are whatever. I don't know. But from our standpoint when we already have 130-plus hours for our students, if we drop back 45 but add 20 -- or 30, but we double dip up to, say, 20 -- are we -- an additional five or six, or whatever the case may be, I do want to say that we are going to ask -- I'm sorry, I

will ask on behalf of the College of Engineering in the future that we actually get it in writing as a -- as a, I guess, a formality so that we can put a stipulation that this will not negatively affect programs above 120 hours, purely from the standpoint for the protection of the students. The students are already -- we advertise four-year programs folks, and we're at four-and-a-half. The reality is four-and-a-half or more. Okay. Maybe that's our fault. Okay. I won't -- I'm not going to dispute that right now, but part of my concern had nothing to do with Learning Outcomes, per se, okay, so we like them very much. But I do want to say that coming in the future before this is all put in place, we want to -- we would like to have a proposal passed who would make this limitation so that when other programs come back, we have a, I guess, a little bit of a leg to stand on, in other words, trying to let the next committee justify to us that even with our concerns or concerns that may come up, that we can be rest assured that they will take on some responsibility, not just saying, sorry, you guys go back to your own departments and handle it the way you handled the prior framework. And so I just wanted, again, thank you for the -- what the committee has done. But I will be asking in the future on behalf of the College of Engineering and other departments for a guideline to put that kind of cap on it, so at least it does give a little bit of checks and balances to the whole process for those people that are a little bit concerned about what's going on.

CHAIR: Any final comments? I appreciate your tolerating my plotting ways here, but I have a feeling everyone has had a chance to express themselves.

Michelle, I'm going to call for a show of hands. We'll -- we'll count unless it's overwhelming.

All in favor, raise your hand. It looks overwhelming to me. Down. All opposed, raise your hand. One opposed, two opposed. Motion carries.

Thank you. Steering Committee. All right. Thank you all. We meet in February.

* * * *

* * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky
Senate Council meeting for December 8, 2008 was
adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

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

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 7th day of
January, 2009.

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