

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

NOVEMBER 10, 2008

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

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

* * * *

* * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, ACTING CHAIR

STEPHANIE AKEN, VICE-CHAIR

DOUG MICHAEL, ACTING PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

CHAIR: I'm going to call the meeting to order. The reason I'm standing here is because our Senate Council Chair is teaching in Arizona, and the Vice Chair was unable to attend the beginning of the meeting or the first part of the meeting,

so I was asked to sit in, and I'm -- I'm glad I'm here. Okay.

Welcome, and a reminder that please give your name and your affiliation when you -- when you speak because of the court -- or the -- the --

COURT REPORTER: Court reporter.

CHAIR: -- court reporter has to take all the notes, so please make sure your name and your college and your affiliation.

And I was told by David, please communicate with your constituents on a daily, weekly, monthly basis. This is why you are here, to represent them and to take back information to them.

By Senate Rule when the Senate Council Chair or the Senate Council waives a rule on behalf of the Senate under certain circumstances, one of the conditions is it has to be reported to you. So due to presidential election day holiday, the Senate agenda was sent out five days prior to meeting and not six days. So that's what the rule requires. So I need a motion from a Senator to waive the rule, and I need a second.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I move that we waive Senate Rule 1.2.3 because of the presidential election holiday.

CHAIR: I need a second.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Second that 1.2.3.

CHAIR: Okay. Any discussion? All those in favor of this motion, please indicate so by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: All opposed nay or same sign actually.

AUDIENCE: (NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: Okay. It was unanimous so the Senate Rule has been waived, and now we can have a meeting.

Did you know that if you had voted down maybe we couldn't have a meeting and we could have just --

UNIDENTIFIED: I vote no.

CHAIR: Okay. Minutes and announcements. The minutes from October 13 were distributed Wednesday, November 5th. We have received no changes; therefore there are no changes in your handouts. And are there any changes at this point or any questions regarding minutes? Otherwise, I

have to do it David's way. I need a motion as recommended here, please. Please just go ahead.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I move that the minutes from October 13th be approved as distributed.

CHAIR: And a second.

HOUTZ: Bob Houtz, Agriculture. I second.

CHAIR: Thank you for seconding and making the motion. All those in favor of the motion, please indicate so by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Those opposed same sign, please.

AUDIENCE: (NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: Okay. It's unanimous, minutes are approved.

There are a couple of announcements. I've already mentioned about the Chair being in Arizona. And nominations run for Senate Council election begin -- began actually today at noon, and it's going to go until Friday. Senate Council is the executive committee of the Senate. It is the most rewarding experience I've ever had, and I recommend it to you guys. Please nominate yourself. I don't know whether you could vote for yourself or not or ask your friend to nominate you and vote. Please attend to this election.

We have a temporary parliamentarian who is not sitting where the parliamentarian usually sit. Doug Michael, my -- my colleague here, chair of the Rules and Election Committee will be helping me to put everything in order.

Another announcement is Academic Approval Workgroup which will look into streamlining all of our procedures for academic approval are to begin meeting in December. So want to let you guys know because they are working on your behalf.

This is an announcement regarding the next action -- not action item, the next agenda item, and that's Big Blue Blood Crush blood donation opportunity. Last year we had as part of this, we had the competition with UK Staff Senate, and we were crushed by them. I think about four Senators voted and one -- or gave blood, and one of them was Sheila. And I don't know whether she counted herself part of

the University Senate or part of Staff Senate. We always have one-third of Senators, and they're about -- see, about what, 33 or something, and I refer to them -- I usually refer to them as fresh blood. You get the connection? Okay. So Big Blue Crush is our -- our next agenda item. I would like to ask Bill Reed, Kentucky Blood Center CEO, to come, please, and give us an introduction and discussion.

REED: Thank you for the opportunity today. My name is Bill Reed, and I'm president and chief executive officer of the Kentucky Blood Center. We'll get to Big Blue Crush and answer any of your questions in a moment. I did want to spend just a moment to talk about the Blood Center. Every year when we do this event, people have lots of questions about who we are and what we do. We are a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization. We currently employ 220 employees here, and we also have smaller operations in Pikeville and Somerset. We draw almost two-thirds of our blood from blood drives just like those that we have here on campus. We do have sites, three sites, Pikeville, Somerset, as well as our new facility here in Beaumont where two-thirds of all the blood that we draw comes from the -- the buses that you see and the blood drives that go on in your churches and your organizations. We love partnering with groups like this because it's our strong experience that when we have support of administrators, certainly of faculty, blood drives do better. Two examples of this, we sat down with the folks at UK Health Care and really tried to put a push on the blood drives from this year. Right now year to date, we are -- have increased 43 percent what we've done at the health care facilities over last year's, primarily due to support of top people just like you. We've incorporated a similar kind of thing in blood drives up -- up in the Toyota Plant in Georgetown and are over 30 percent year over year there. So it does make a difference when you go back to your constituency, when you do support them going out to these types of blood drives. I know you know what Big Blue Crush is. I can tell you we need a win. It's been a while, and it was not a good last year for us. And we're certainly

comfortable with -- with your help that we'll do better this year. We have a brand new video that we unveiled at our 40th anniversary celebration last week. I believe that's going to be sent to you. And that's one of those things with e-mail, send it everywhere; send it to everybody in your contact book. It's a video of about eight minutes that really when you watch it, there -- it really leaves every question -- it answers every question, specifically tells and shows you people who have benefitted by these life-saving donations. We certainly appreciate the support of this body. We appreciate the opportunity to be on campus next week. It does begin next Monday. And with a little bit of turnout, we can certainly beat what we did last year. And I'm certainly willing now to take any questions this group might have. Thank you.

CHAIR: I was supposed to remind you that if you go to give blood -- no, when you go to give blood, please mention that you are a University Senator as opposed to Staff Senator or faculty member, so we will get the count.

The next agenda item is Degree List, the UK 2008 Degree List. We have -- those of you who have been here more than a year or even a year, you know that we do this several times a semester, several -- several times a year. The list is in your -- is it in the handout, or was it on the Web?

BROTHERS: The list is in the handout but

--

CHAIR: The list is in the handout. We had a rough estimate of changes to the Degree List. We had a handful of students, we removed them. Three undergraduate students were added to the list and these were after we went through all the steps that are necessary. And two names' spellings were corrected, and two clerical typos were fixed. In addition, there was one very late name added from College of Law. It has been verified by the registrar, by all those who are supposed to verify. We didn't want to kill more trees by redoing the handout; therefore the name is flashed in front of you of the person we added.

Okay. We need a recommendation

that elected faculty senators approve UK
December 2008 Degree List with the added
student JNO from the College of Law for
submission to the presidential Board of
Trustees as -- as recommended -- as a
recommended degree to be conferred by the
Board. Connie Wood.

WOOD: So moved. Connie Wood, Arts and
Sciences.

CHAIR: Any second? John Thelin.

THELIN: Second. John Thelin, Education.

CHAIR: Are there any discussion?
Questions? Okay. All those in favor of
the motion in front of you, please state so
by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, same sign.

AUDIENCE: (NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: It's unanimous. Thank you. It's
approved. Okay. Next -- first -- I -- I
believe this action require your approval.
It's a proposal for nursing early
provisional admission. It has been
approved by HCC, which is the proper
council, with a positive recommendation,
and it was approved by the Senate
Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
and Senate Council, and now it's in front
of you. Proposal was approved for one
year, trial period last -- last year, and
now it's in front of you. So I would like
to ask Pat Burkhart, College of Nursing,
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies
to -- I saw her earlier. Where -- where
are you, Pat? Would you like to come over,
or would you like just to say something
from there? Is there anything you want to
add, any brief summary or --

BURKHART: I think it's pretty clear, you
know, that nursing programs nationwide are
very competitive, and most of the -- the
schools have a pre-requisite year where
students complete their pre-requisite
courses before coming into the professional
programs. And many of our benchmark
schools and -- and the University of
Louisville have begun a guaranteed early
admission, and that's so that we can
attract the top high school students into
the program, so we have a higher ACT
requirement and higher GPA for those
students, and then they have to maintain a
high grade point average during the
freshman year, but we can attract these

students into our programs. So I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR: Are there any questions for representative from College of Nursing? Yes, over there.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I guess I'm just curious if you have any idea how many students this might help you attract?

BURKHART: That's a great question. We actually don't have a perfect handle on that because we just doubled our enrollment which began last year. So we're attracting a whole lot more students. We'll -- we'll have a better idea after this year the kinds of students that -- the students that we'll be capturing that we didn't before. But we do know anecdotally that several students who have a guarantee to come into the professional program that are top students want that guarantee up front so...

CHAIR: Any other questions? Okay. Then I think we are ready to vote. May I please ask -- the recommendation or a sample recommendation is on the screen. Do I have a motion on that agenda item? John Thelin.

THELIN: John Thelin, Education. I move that the Senate approve College of Nursing's proposed early provisional admissions effective immediately.

CHAIR: Any second?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I second that motion.

CHAIR: Are there any last discussion, last minute anything? Okay. Then we are ready to vote. All those in favor of the proposal, the motion as in -- in front of you, please indicate so by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Those opposed, same sign.

AUDIENCE: (NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: It's unanimous. Motion is approved.

The next action item is proposed New Kentucky Diabetes and Obesity Center.

BROTHERS: Business and --

CHAIR: Okay. Proposal to change Business and Economics College Standards. This also requires your approval. It cannot be done without your approval. Two aspects of the proposal: We're already approved for a one-year trial period in spring of 2008. It has been approved by the Undergraduate Council, approved with

positive recommendation by Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and by Senate Council, and now it's in front of you. Let me ask Associate Dean Nancy Johnson to please -- where -- where is she? Is she here? Do you want to add anything before I open up to Senators for discussion?

JOHNSON: No, these are fairly straight-forward changes. There's nothing probably really earth-shattering here. The first requirement, the 60-hour credit hour rule rather than 50 percent, what we were finding is students, accounting students often take 150 hours for the CPA exam. So every time they took a class inside the college, they had to take one outside of the college, and that it actually increased the number of hours. We would like to include UK 101 towards graduation credit. We haven't been doing that. It will help with our retention efforts. The communications course, we've been offering that, and so we'd just like to count it towards the student's communications requirements. And English 203, effectively students could not get into English 203, in order to get into upper divisions, so we were having to make lots of exceptions in order to do -- to do this. So this is just reflecting reality. They will still need an upper -- obviously, they'll need the graduation writing requirement. They just won't need it before they get admitted into upper division.

CHAIR: Okay. Why don't we open it up to Senators for questions or comments? Are there any questions for our guest? Okay. Then we have a suggested recommendation in front of you. I need a motion for that.

HULSE: David Hulse, College of Business and Economics. I move that we approve this recommendation.

CHAIR: Any second? Name?

HATCHER: Jenna Hatcher, College of Nursing.

CHAIR: Okay. All of those in favor of this recommendation, please indicate so by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, same sign.

AUDIENCE: (NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: It's unanimous. Motion is approved.

The next action item is proposed
New Kentucky Diabetic and Obesity Center.
It has been approved by all the usual
suspects. You can see the list in front of
you. Let me go directly to Lisa Tannock,
MD, and Assistant Provost Richard Greissman
for any introduction that they might have
regarding this. Please, if you want to
approach the podium.

TANNOCK: Thank you. I'm Lisa Tannock, the
division chief of endocrinology in the
College of Medicine. And essentially what
we're trying to do here is create a
multi-disciplinary research center in
diabetes and obesity that will also
comprise a clinical center of excellence
and partner with a number of existing
programs to facilitate the education. So
during the course of developing the center,
we identified over 60 faculty from a total
of 11 different colleges on campus who are
doing various facets of diabetes and
obesity research, whether it's basic
biomedical models or whether it's public
health communications issues and so on.
We're also partnering with a number of
different allied health providers with most
of the health care colleges who provide the
clinical care to patients with diabetes and
obesity. And so at this time, we're now
requesting to be recognized as a formal
center.

The funding for the center is
going to come from UK Healthcare enterprise
for the clinical side. The research side
is funded by a mixture of NIH and other
grant funding and also by endowment funding
that Dr. Karpf has secured. And sort of as
an example, Lisa Cassis, who is the head of
the Graduate Center for Nutritional
Sciences, was just recently awarded a ten-
and-a-half million dollar NIH grant for the
Center of Biomedical Research Excellence in
Obesity and Cardiovascular Disease. So
that's the kind of thing that we're trying
to do is recognize a formal center to
facilitate further funding in this type of
way. Any questions?

CHAIR: Yes, please.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of
Engineering. I have a couple of questions.
The first is just to -- so I can understand
where it is. Is this where Joan Griffith
used to work, that area with the obesity

research?

TANNOCK: Okay. So that's a question about space. At this time, it's a virtual center. There is, as you guys all know, limitations of space on campus, so at this point it's a virtual center, and ultimately our goal is to sort of expand and develop and build it, but currently healthcare for diabetics and obese individuals are provided at so many different places on campus, it's not really feasible to have a single clinical site at this time.

HAYES: Okay. The second question is, will all the people participating in this be required to go through the IRB training?

TANNOCK: No. The difference -- some people who are participating in the center are pure basic scientists, so you only have to go through IRB training if your research involves human subjects, and it's required as per the IRB guideline.

HAYES: Okay. And the final question, and please don't take this personally, but I guess I'm a little worried since you're an assistant professor, is that going to cause some problem for you when you have to kind of go up against associates and fulls?

TANNOCK: In terms of leadership; is that your question?

HAYES: Well, just in general, I mean, right now it appears that you're the acting director, so I just --

TANNOCK: I am the acting --

HAYES: -- see it might be a slight risk.

TANNOCK: Thank you for your concern. I am the acting director. We actually have a very prominent physician scientist at full professor level who we managed to recruit to UK, and we are envisioning that he would be the director of the center. He's already agreed to come. He'll be arriving on campus in February and our plan, per Dean Perman, is probably to appoint him as the director.

HAYES: And I hope that they'll take into consideration that you're doing this as an assistant professor.

TANNOCK: Yeah. My dean is here.

PERMAN: We admire Dr. Tannock greatly. She has a great future.

CHAIR: Okay, back here.

RIESKE-KINNEY: I'm Lynn Rieske-Kinney from the College of Agriculture. I would like to

share some concerns from -- that were expressed by my constituency on the restricted inclusiveness of this proposal. The lack -- there is -- public health implications are identified as a goal of the center, but there's no health -- public health member on the team nor is anyone listed in either appendices associated with that. The center is based on med center model and NIH acknowledges that med center -- med center model has not been successful for reducing incidents of obesity. There are several other points that have been raised by my constituency, and I think that the general consensus was that there are key players in the University community that were not invited to the table to participate in the concept of the center. And I think the College of Agriculture feels somewhat strongly that they have some -- something to offer for this, and we're not in -- in any way included in the concept.

CHAIR: Just as a note, this is perfectly in order type of comment, but -- and I don't know whether this reached the Senate Council. It would be better if this type of concern come to the Senate Committee or to the Senate Council, and of course, this is perfectly all right. Please go ahead and respond.

TANNOCK: Do you want to answer, Dr. Perman, first?

PERMAN: Well, I -- I appreciate the comments and feel terrible about them. But I must tell you that when this was being germinated, we circulated this idea to all of the deans, and it's been discussed with -- with your dean and your associate dean of research. We would have gladly taken up those concerns and nobody -- most important point I can make is that there was certainly not an intention to exclude anybody. Anybody who wants to step up to the plate and participate in this center is more than welcome. That's the whole idea of the center. The center does have approaches to obesity prevention. I might add, that I have an NIH grant which is focused on prevention of diabetes in schools. I have colleagues from -- from your college. So there's absolutely no intent to exclude anybody, and I must say that we did make a bona fide attempt to

consult everybody in all the colleges.

TANNOCK: If I can answer that, I'm going to address your points in reverse order. We actually do now have some faculty members from College of Public Health that have -- have become involved in this. And partly, as I said, as I've been taking this around to different groups to try to raise awareness and -- and generate the interest and participation. It's been just -- this is where I'm an assistant professor, learning my way around campus, learning the different groups and trying to raise awareness. So nobody is excluded from the center. We are actually really actively seeking to have very diverse inclusion of people who have very diverse interests in diabetes and obesity, and not strictly the medical center model. That's been the focus here.

RIESKE-KINNEY: Perhaps I can share the individuals, and you can approach them?

TANNOCK: Absolutely.

RIESKE-KINNEY: And realizing that it -- it fell on deaf ears for whatever reason the first time. I'm not public health or in that area at all, but I do notice that this proposal does fail to take advantage of the College of Agriculture's network in the state. There are 120 extension offices in this state, and I -- I don't know that -- that this is realized in this -- in this proposal, but it certainly would provide you with a very effective venue for disseminating your work.

TANNOCK: And thank you. I -- I didn't know that.

RIESKE-KINNEY: Yeah.

TANNOCK: But you're -- you're right. What we're really trying to do is -- is partner with people in different colleges who have different studies in communication, studies in education, studies in outreach to really reach out statewide. This is -- this is really trying to be a goal there so that's a great resource for us to know. And I'll contact those -- if you want to meet with me and let me know some other names, I'd love to increase the involvement. And that actually goes for anybody here. If there's people -- yourselves or colleagues, people in your colleges that you think are appropriate to be included, please contact me and let me know their names. I've been

taking this around to different groups to try to raise awareness. The idea here is really, as I said, to go above and beyond the medical center approach and really make that a true multi-disciplinary center. And in part for that we're actually really trying to partner with the different educational programs that exist out there because we also need to train the next generation of the physicians, the researchers, the educators, and so on, and -- and really partner with all of your education programs as well.

CHAIR: Go ahead, yes.

WERMELING: Dan Wermeling in Pharmacy. One of the things that your proposal might benefit from is integration with the clinical and translational science grant that's pending. So this would be the CTSA award that was submitted to NIH, and it serves to address, I think, part of these concerns is that the CTSA award actually has all of this networking already mapped out. And so the parties who probably would have been involved on a clinical or translational research or epidemiologic research, depending on where you're heading whether this is T1 or T2 kind of proposals, I think an alignment with that would probably serve the institution and your proposal well and probably also help the CCTS if things that are, you know, following in with that kind of effort are also described in similar terms.

TANNOCK: Thank you.

CHAIR: There was somebody else right there.

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine. Lisa, can you comment on how the external advisory board was selected and what you hope they bring to this, why these people and not others.

TANNOCK: So the -- the external advisory board, one of the things we -- we wanted to do was really have physicians and scientists of national repute provide evaluation. So to be honest, this is a list of people that -- that myself, Dr. Debeer, the individual that we're considering being the director, several other people recognized as prominent leaders, most of them are leaders of their own diabetes center at their own institutions, and that's really where our

-- our duplication is. None of these individuals are yet confirmed. Obviously, the center doesn't exist; we can't have an external advisory board. So we welcome other suggestions as well. At present, they are very skewed to College of Medicine type people, and that might be something we need to address.

CHAIR: Okay. Are we ready for a motion? The suggested motion is on the screen. I would like to invite the motion from the Senate.

SAWAYA: I move to accept the --

CHAIR: Name and college?

SAWAYA: Peter Sawaya from Medicine.

HUMPHREY: I second. It's Humphrey, Dentistry. I second the motion.

CHAIR: Okay. It's seems we are ready to -- to vote. All those in favor of the proposal in front of you, indicate so by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, same sign.

AUDIENCE: (NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: It's unanimous, and motion is approved.

Next, you are familiar with Gen Ed, I am sure. I will not bore you with the entire history, so I will bore you with half a history. From the time that this body approved design principles -- you're familiar with them? Are the -- the design principles in the handout?

BROTHERS: They are on the Web --

CHAIR: You can get it on the Web if you want to, but the design principle was approved last year by the Senate, and then it was handed to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is a joint provost Senate Council Committee and received a very specific charge. And I'd like to -- Sheila, could you get the Website and put the charge on the screen, please? This is the charge of the Steering Committee.

Specifically, the Steering Committee was charged to come up with learning outcome and a curricular framework, among other charges. In short, the associate provost will -- will discuss this in more detail. But -- and that's what is in front of you, the learning outcomes and -- and curricular frame -- framework. Learning outcome and curricular framework were introduced to you in the

Senate during September meeting. It is somewhat FYI, heads-up type of notification, and a procedure introduced to you or mentioned to you that the Steering Committee would go to the faculty, would go to any department that would invite them. They have gone, actually, to every single college that has an undergraduate degree, and based on your comments, faculty comments, departmental college comments, they have now brought in front of you the modified learning outcome and curricular framework. These two, learning outcome, curricular framework, they need Senate approval. They cannot be implemented or adopted without the approval of this body. I just want to mention to you that the learning outcome at this stage, there are outcome based. I don't understand myself Gen Ed too much, but I understand this much to say that they were not like, what courses should be taught? So we are not discussing today what courses should be taught, but rather what learning outcomes should a assembly of courses achieve, and that's what's in front of you. I want to tell you that today is discussion only. According to Senate Rules, any important proposal -- and certainly this is an important proposal, should first be discussed -- discussion only, and then the next meeting will be up for approval. So I want to give you a notice, this is not like sky -- pie in the sky type of something called discussion. This has consequences. We're going to discuss it today, and then approve it or not approve it or modify it or whatever next month. So please, no motion. There are no motions necessary. So please do not make any motion. We are just going to discuss. In the December meeting, as I said, it's going to be the second reading, and then approval. I would like to ask you again to introduce yourself. If you are not a Senator, I would like to ask you to mention your affiliation and ask permission or privilege of the floor from the chair. And in all likelihood, I will give you permission of the -- permission to speak. Okay. One last thing before I hand it to the Associate Provost Susan Carvalho, design principles, as important as they are, they are not, in fact, apparently not even

literally in front of you, but they are virtually also not in front of you. They have already been approved. This body has approved it, and I kind of recall, perhaps, unanimously, if not near unanimously. So please, it's my job to make -- facilitate this so that you could discuss the important issue which is learning outcome and curricular framework. So it's my job that if you start discussing the merit of the design principle itself, I will say, please, this is -- this is out of order, and let's move on to discussion of learning outcome and curricular framework. Of course, this will be totally appropriate if somebody wants to say, learning outcome number 3 contradicts design principle number 4. That is totally appropriate, and in fact, that's your job. Having said all that, Susan, please come over and we'll start.

CARVALHO: We do have the design principles available to refer back to at any time. Thank you, Kaveh, for the -- the history, and I -- I will try not to repeat anything. You have seen the membership of the Steering Committee. I just put that up here, in part, so that you see the representation and, in part, to acknowledge the many, many, many hours of work on the part of these folks, many of who are here today. We -- part of our charge was to bring a fully vetted proposal to the Senate, and so we have done a total of 31 meetings across 13 colleges, including meetings with student groups, administrative groups and faculty groups. Whole lists, so tiny you can't read it, but that was just to show you that it was exhaustive and exhausting. So -- because I think you all have been exposed to this in the context of your department, or at least if you're in a college with an undergraduate program, you have seen these design proposals, thought about them, heard them discussed. So I'm not going to go through all of them. What I'd like to do is just highlight with each learning outcome the significant changes that were made between the September 8th announcement that these would be available on the Web and today. The outcomes were actually posted in their first version in May. So we tried to vet them over the summer, but

we all know how summer vetting goes. We could have just declared them vetted and moved on, but we really are interested in something that has been fully absorbed and responded to by the broader community. So we declared them unvetted at the end of August and started this more aggressive approach.

Kaveh suggested that I go through each of them and make these few points about the changes that were made, and then ask if there are clarifying questions after each learning outcome, but we save the discussion till I get to the end because I'm only going to make a couple points. You can ask clarifying questions, and then we'll go on to 2, 3, and 4. Is that agreeable? Okay.

The first learning outcome is the one that addresses intellectual inquiry. This is where 12 of the 30 hours are located. And the response that was very meaningful, most significant to us, had to do with the ethical dimension that is a part of everything that has to do with intellectual inquiry. And so that is a phrase that was added in the recent revisions, end of October and the beginning of November. You'll see it, evaluate theses and conclusions in light of credible evidence. But so that evidence doesn't stand outside of judgment, explore the ethical implications of differing approaches, methodologies or conclusions, and then develop.

So we -- we think that was a very significant change. And as you recall from the charge, the next phase will be that curricular teams will be set up to put this into practice and -- and to talk about how a -- what a syllabus has to contain in order to qualify that course for Gen Ed credit. And so this now becomes an integral piece of all of the courses that would satisfy the intellectual inquiry part of Gen Ed. Also, we -- it's a -- there is a real issue about returning to this disciplinary division, arts and creativity, humanity, social and behavioral, natural/physical/mathematical sciences in an era of increasing interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinary. We never meant to exclude that in the minds of the committee. Of course, could be proposed very viably

that would satisfy two of the disciplinary areas. Students would still have to take four. They couldn't do a two-fer, but of course, that would -- that satisfied by social science and humanities would be encouraged, not only allowed but encouraged. So we did say there within an across-the-board broad knowledge areas in order to make explicit room for interdisciplinarity. And also, the science faculty were very good in sketching out a template that might be a model for the curricular teams that was very useful to us in our deliberations. We'll be passing that on to the curricular teams as a model. So those are the three main changes in learning outcome 1. Any clarifying questions about this piece?

Learning outcome 2 is the communications piece. As you -- is my voice at a regular volume? I think I'm sometimes in the microphone and sometimes away. Can you hear me? Okay.

As you know, we currently have the oral communications requirement in suspension. And the design principle specified attention to oral, visual, and written communication. At the same time, the -- our focus of our recent conversations as a result of faculty input has been to ensure that we were not decreasing the rigor of our writing training for students who so desperately need it, and I think that's in evidence across the colleges. So there was some discussion about the graduation writing requirement which is currently under review. This proposal does assume the continuation of the graduation writing requirement as the writing in the disciplines second half to the three-credit writing course. In addition, the second course in this sequence would be an integrated communications course focusing on oral and visual, along with continued development of written communication skills. We've stated that much more clearly here. How exactly that will happen will be the job of the curricular team, but there will be a strong writing component in the second piece. So as we move from the four-credit course to a three-credit writing course, we do anticipate that some of the work of the fourth hour will be

absorbed in the integrated communications course which will be primarily oral, also visual, and strongly writing.

There was a study that just came out today in the Chronicle about the fact that writing is more effectively taught in context, and the oral communications course should give a good context for integrating these skills.

Questions about the learning outcome, in general, or those changes, in particular? Yes.

CHAIR: Clarifying question.

CARVALHO: Clarifying question.

CHAIR: Not discussion yet, just --

CARVALHO: Just clarifying.

CHAIR: If there's anything unclear, you know, you want to know now; otherwise, let's move on.

CARVALHO: The third is the quantitative reasoning outcome. And here we brought in a speaker, Milo Schield, who's one of the leading scholars in statistical literacy to educate us a little bit more about statistical literacy for students in nonquantitative majors. And we also eliminated the word risk because it was a source of so much concern. Risk was used in a statistical sense, but it sounded so risky to everyone else, that we took it out and replaced it with uncertainty, hoping that that's more certain. And we stressed the difference between the two courses. The first course would be methods; the second course would be a conceptual and practical understanding of statistical inferential reasoning, not a methods course, per se. So we wanted to make that distinction clear. Any questions?

And finally, this has been the outcome that generated the most discussion, and it actually has undergone the greatest revision of the four. It's certainly difficult to articulate what it means to be a good citizen, and then how a university can deliver that, and then how it can deliver it in two short courses. So we added a very important footnote which I actually have on the next slide. This proposal recognizes that such issues will be addressed throughout the students' course of study, building upon the foundation of the Gen Ed core curriculum. That's an important piece, to lower our

ambitions before I even start talking about how we're going to make everybody into a good citizen, whatever that means. The design principle contained two paragraphs. One was about understanding difference, and the other was -- I summarized that rather quickly, but that's what it was about, diversity and understanding other perspectives. The second paragraph was about ethical dilemmas in the life of the mind. And we were called on the carpet by several departments for having given short shrift to that paragraph, and when we went back and talked about ethical dilemmas which we had had as one piece of what a course might include but didn't have to include, we started discussing among ourselves what kind of course would not include ethical considerations? We certainly don't want any of those. So in response to very, very appropriate faculty input, we have put that in the category of what all of the courses will do. Students will recognize and evaluate the ethical dilemmas, conflicts, and tradeoffs involved in personal and collective decision making.

We also received input about having put to the -- put to the side issues of institutions and social organizations, and that was not our intention. We talked about how to lay out this outcome so that not just anything counts, but still courses from a broad array of disciplines would be invited and encouraged. And so we do have the institutional issue here.

Each course must address at least two of these four topics, and these are explicitly to make room for particular conceptualizations of citizenship: societal and institutional change over time, civic engagement, cross-national and comparative issues, power and resistance.

Now, the idea of presenting two courses, one as a U.S. focused course, and the other as international is tricky. But when we talked about which one of those a student might be able to do without, we certainly agreed that they're both imperative. And so the students will have to take one of each. However, our initial representation of this had a heavy focus on diversity, and we don't want to lose that. At the same time, we recognize that that limits rather narrowly the array of courses

that might be offered. And so we have changed the wording. It might look small and grammatical, but it's significant. And that is that the first course will include critical analyses of diversity issues, but that does not mean that it has to be a primarily diversity-focused course. It means that within the context of whatever course it is, diversity issues must be considered. And diversity conceived as issues such as, ethnicity, gender, language, race, religion, sexuality, and socioeconomic class; that can be understood as and/or socioeconomic class. But those issues need to come up in some way. I think that opens up this category much more broadly than we had originally conceived it, and we're grateful for the faculty input that helped us do that.

The second course does need to include critical analyses of local-to-global dynamics. And that means that highly abstract courses about nation-states won't qualify unless they also come down to the question of students as engaged citizens, decisions they have to make, and how nation-state concepts affect the people living in those nation-states. So that was the compromise we came to. We're very anxious not to open this up to absolutely any course; at the same time, to allow for the range of expression and scholarship that a university of this type needs to have in its badge in Gen Ed.

So those are the changes in learning outcome 4. Are there any clarifying questions about that -- oh, no, I have to go to the footnote, number 3, which is on your handout about the foreign language piece. Because multilingual was part of the design principles, and we did give it very careful consideration. And what we will be proposing to the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards committee is that the current entrance requirement which is two years of high school foreign language be changed to the competency equivalent of two years of high school foreign language which means that students who are deficient in that area would take a course in foreign language upon arrival -- upon admission to the University. That's a separate consideration, but I want you to know that it's there, and that we're

working with the Department of Education in the state to make sure that our standard for that matches their exit standard for the second year of language study. And so we're talking about how to do that. It's an important footnote.

So this is a summary of what we have, and I can now open the floor for discussion. Is that right?

CHAIR: Just before I do that, just one more time to remind if -- state your name, your affiliation, your college. If you are not a Senator, please mention that you are not a Senator, and ask the privilege of the floor.

There is a Robert's Rule of Order that I -- I hope I don't have to use it, but if -- if need be, I will use it. And that rule is every Senator who wants to talk should at least talk once before a Senator could talk twice. So remember that, please. All right.

And what I'd like to recommend, if it doesn't have any conflicts with -- with your plan is -- just to have some extra order, to have one learning outcome at a time, so if I could go and flash learning outcome 1 and I ask you to, please, only let's discuss learning outcome number 1, and then we move on, and we have about one hour left, so maybe 15 minutes for each one would be fine. So --

CARVALHO: And let me add one thing which is that this footnote got inadvertently deleted from your handout. You'll see a stray number 1 after good question, and we did try to define what we mean by good question, and that's the footnote you see here. It got lost.

CHAIR: I saw a name first over there, but after that, I might kind of sweep from right to left or left to right, front to back, back to front, but why don't you go ahead.

BREAZEALE: I'm Dan Breazeale, Chairman of the Department of Philosophy. I'm asking your permission to speak. I'm not a Senator. I want to -- I want to ask a question about what -- what if our concern is -- is a design principle which we think is not adequately captured by any of the four learning outcomes? How should we -- when shall we speak?

CHAIR: Oh, actually, so you are talking

about a design principle that is not --

BREAZEALE: Yes.

CHAIR: -- in conflict with learning outcomes, but not -- has not been included; is that right?

BREAZEALE: That's right.

CHAIR: Susan, would you like to make a comment about that?

CARVALHO: And you wouldn't see it as associated with any one of the four learning outcomes at all?

BREAZEALE: I see it as associated with all of them, but probably most with 2 and 3, although I'm not sure. What I'm concerned with is learning outcome 1 and the role of critical thinking, the place of critical thinking, in particular, logic in this -- in the learning -- the omission of logic from the learning outcomes. That's what I want to address, but I can't address it under the rubric proposed.

CHAIR: Correct. And after we finish with learning outcome number 4, then I will come to you as a nonSenator and let you --

BREAZEALE: Thank you.

CHAIR: -- bring up a design principle that has not been incorporated in these four. So let me -- maybe I should have said, let me -- I would like to go to Senators first. Yes, back there.

SEGERSTOM: I'm Suzanne Segerstom, Psychology. I have sort of a meta-question about this. I've seen a lot of Gen Ed systems as a student and then a couple here at Kentucky as a faculty member, and one thing that I wonder is how much these reforms to Gen Ed curricula are driven by data? Are the -- do -- do we -- do we think about our aspirations, and then hope that what we do helps us meet them, or has anybody ever -- ever collected any data or looked to see how best to achieve these things, what courses do result in a process of intellectual inquiry among students?

CHAIR: Did you say design principles or learning outcome, based on data?

SEGERSTOM: We have these goals; we have these outcomes that we'd like reach, and I wonder if we have any data about how -- are there courses or techniques or anything sort of more concrete that people have had success with that we can build on, or are we assuming that this -- this is going to result in this outcome?

CHAIR: Susan, please give a brief response, but what I'd like to do is -- if we discuss the overall thing first, we might never, ever get to discuss all the learning outcomes. So after a brief response, I would like to ask you to limit your comments to regarding design principle 1 and then 2, 3, 4, and then we can discuss the entire thing together. A brief -- a brief response.

CARVALHO: If I could just give a two-part response to that question. The first is that the entire framework of this proposal is assessment-oriented. So the verbs have been carefully chosen, and the outcomes carefully written so that they involve measurable outcomes. We do intend to assess this program from here forward, as all universities are now paying greater attention to the tracking of the efficacy of their programs than they have in -- in the past. So that -- that is one piece. Part of this process will include a review of courses every two years and an assessment ongoing at the course level and at the program level to see whether we are accomplishing the goals that we've set out. So that's -- that's one part of the answer. Also, a footnote to say that the current USP in the -- in the state that it has evolved in unassessable, and so this is an improvement over that.

But the second part is that from here, these goals and frameworks would be passed to curricular teams. There would be four curricular teams addressing learning outcome 1, for example. And we envision that those will be heavily staffed by experts in the field, but also containing nonexperts in the field so that it stays true to the purposes of Gen Ed. Those faculty will be bringing the -- the best knowledge of their discipline in terms of effective pedagogy which is an important piece of the new courses, and how to orient them towards inquiry base learning, for example, given the context of the particular discipline. So in the sense that we are reinventing them, with a team of faculty locked in a room and thinking about how to do this, we hope they will be grounded in a great deal of research.

SEGERSTOM: Are we reinventing the wheel, though? Has someone else already done the

assessment and made the changes that -- that we can learn from instead of starting from scratch ourselves, and say, hey, you know --

CARVALHO: We shopped for a ready made Gen Ed, and we couldn't find one that fits the nature of this place, the needs of these students, the culture of our place. But in pieces, yes, and they will be drawing on that, but only in pieces.

CHAIR: I'd like to go to -- maybe you guys don't have any question regarding outcome -- learning outcome number 1, but let's discuss learning outcome number 1 here, and then I'm going to there.

CHAPPELL: Well, I just have more of a clarification question --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

CHAPPELL: -- I think actually.

BROTHERS: Name, please?

CHAPPELL: Oh, Joe Chappell, College of Ag. So the first -- the first line up there, students will be able to identify multiple dimensions of a good question and -- and there's, obviously, some courses identified. Are we think -- is that -- does your committee think about that as being lower division courses, or can these be accomplished by upper division courses as the students proceed through their academic tenure?

CARVALHO: The specific level of courses would be outlined by the curricular teams. So we didn't go to that degree. However, we envisioned these as primarily being foundational. So we envisioned these particular four courses as being lower division, not that they couldn't be upper division, but we can't imagine that students could wait that long for this. Also, this is an area that we hope will explicitly address the transition from high school to college in terms of questioning rather than memorizing, receiving, and -- so we want that to happen early, and we want the courses in the major to benefit from students having had this.

CHAIR: Okay. There was a hand up over there.

SNOW: Do you need to address what you just --

CARVALHO: Yes. At the same time, we envision for all four outcomes that we will be looking at all of the majors in the

University to see which of these they build on, not that every major will build on all of them, but certainly they'll all build on this one. So -- and that's probably what we'll be assessing as well. Yes.

CHAIR: Now, I can go --

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine.

I can make this apply, Kaveh, so you'll be happy, to learning outcome number 1, but it could also be dittoed. I'm only allowed to speak once, so I'll just say it could apply to all four of them. I understood you to say that these -- that the design principles themselves and then the learning outcomes were discussed among a large group of people. But the specific question is, were these specific learning outcomes vetted with students, with a lot of students, and if they were, what was their take on whether this is necessary for them? I'd like to know -- no matter how much we pass down from above, if they don't think these are important for their life, they're not going to be appropriated into their life.

CARVALHO: I'll tell you --

SNOW: What do the students say?

CARVALHO: They were some of the most influential and important conversations we had. We -- we had to tell the second group that they were much better prepared than -- than the other 29 faculty group we had seen. And so that -- that is a testament; the kind of students that turn out for this discussion is really very uplifting. We spoke to the Student Senate first which we consider a representative body; it's about 45 students. And then we held an open forum where the student government was generous enough to raffle off an iTouch, so that drew quite a crowd. What, 50 students there? First of all, they were concerned that something this new would imply that what they were taking was an inferior program, and -- and we had to talk about change over time and, you know, allay those worries. But that is the immediate first response of -- of some students. And so we have to cognizant of that as we talk about the future. Number two, several asked if they could opt into it. Primarily, in part, because it is a 30-hour requirement, and then gives them more freedom to do some exploration guided by their major course of

study, but in courses of their choosing. The third piece is that they asked some hard questions about whether it was the right thing to go down to 30 hours, and what do our benchmarks have for required Gen Ed? It was a question that caught it off guard. We should have expected it from our students. We should expect more of our students. And so we put that in the context of not lowering the number of graduation hours, but lowering the number in this foundational sequence so that we could track outcomes and lay foundations and hold it together, but that they would still take additional courses that would be guided by their major. We also explained that the drop back to 30 was, in part, to allow majors to absorb the changes that might happen if what is currently both premajor and Gen Ed suddenly turns out not to be both premajor and Gen Ed and a new premajor course has to be established, so we really had to drop back to allow for that.

CHAIR: By the way, I teach (unintelligible) and I'm horrified to ask them if this should be taught to them. So just --

SNOW: Those -- those answers apply a little bit more, I think, to the design principles. Can you carry it further and say, when they looked at this list and say, I should be able to ask a good question based on (unintelligible) analytical. When they looked at this in detail, what kinds of things did they say about, yes, or did they care about that detail?

CARVALHO: They're -- they're more focused on what the courses are, which is what a lot of faculty are focused on too. But what some of them did say is we can do those things. And -- and that's, again, a response to be impressed with. We're glad that -- that they are learning to do those things, but not in an assessable, trackable way that -- that we needed. So we -- we meant no slight to USP in presenting this, but that -- that was really the -- and -- and some of them that were more career-oriented did feel that these were the competencies that would make them successful in their future careers. And so we got positive feedback in that sense. I would say that's all.

CHAIR: Okay. Any question regarding learning outcome number 1? Okay.
Then we'll go to number 2. Are there any questions regarding learning outcome number 2 from Senators? All right.
Okay. Learning outcome -- either we are going to be out at 4:10, or I think it's going to be after 5:00.

CARVALHO: Let me just --

CHAIR: I cannot say which way.

CARVALHO: Let me just jump in in case --

CHAIR: Learning outcome number 3.

CARVALHO: -- this one goes on (unintelligible). The Provost just passed me a note to remind me about different assessment measures that we're looking at. This is a new science, assessing a Gen Ed curriculum and how you sort out the value added from the major. But we are looking at different kinds of exams that measure precisely the kinds of outcomes that -- that we're looking at in terms of reasoning and critical thinking as well as written expression. And so we can give more information on that if you're interested in the CLA test or other tests that are being looked at across the country, not just here, but we're -- we are keeping track of the data on that.

CHAIR: Question over here.

STEINER: The comment was a more general question -- comment --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

STEINER: -- so I'll make it more general

--

BROTHERS: Name?

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Arts and Sciences. The assessment you envision being done after the senior year for -- for each course. That's -- I was going to ask a question about assessment, but there was a lock put on general questions.

CHAIR: Sure. But it seems that we're going to get to it momentarily. So if I could -- is that okay to delay your question?

STEINER: Yeah, that's fine.

CHAIR: Any question for learning outcome number 3? Okay.

Outcome number 4? I saw a hand going up over there, and then a couple over through here. Sure.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I want to ask a question about

the requirements for language and that I -- I think this rather weak, and I was wondering what the rationale was for that because I'd really like for us to see students come out of college with a second language. And it looks like to me it's just two years of high school.

CARVALHO: It is weak, from my perspective.

I am in Hispanic Studies as a Spanish professor. Of course, I could advocate for more. We all wanted more than that, but we had to think first about the goal of general education and how much language is required for the goal of effective and engaged citizenship. And what we talked about is what it takes to stand in the footprints of another people and be able to communicate in their language rather than having that experience translated for you. And there is a scale of proficiency that's now nationally used that has novice, intermediate, advanced, and superior levels. And we'd like to see everyone get to intermediate, but that's hard to do even in three college semesters. Two years of high school language is -- is equivalent, more or less, to two semesters of university level instruction. So could they get to that intermediate level with a third semester? Maybe not. That's one piece. The second piece is we talked about adding on a third semester. In other words, the requirement here would be successful completion of the third semester, and if they come in with two under their belt, they ought to be able to do that fairly quickly. But the reality is that a significant percentage would have to take remedial course work before they could take that third semester. In other words, and this was new to me even as a language professor, it takes more to test in than to test out. It shouldn't, I know, I worked with it all summer, but I -- I finally had to buy into it from language experts. And so we if put them in a third semester, they would have to have a higher level of achievement than they -- than they would to demonstrate a two-semester equivalency. And so by the time you add probably two to three courses on a student, we didn't see that as viable. And we thought that since academics changes best in increments, if we could do this, we

would doing -- making a major step, and it may be that once the state level of foreign language instruction gets to where it needs to be, then we could talk about moving it further.

ANDERSON: What were those levels again?

CARVALHO: Novice, intermediate, advanced, superior.

ANDERSON: And high school is novice?

CARVALHO: Yes. And two semesters of college is still novice, novice high, but novice still.

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Arts and Sciences. So I -- I got a comment from a faculty member regarding this fourth objective. And it was agreed upon by other faculty, biology, basically. I'm just going to read you what he sent me in his e-mail. Goal -- goal 4 is -- is a skill set that is limited to a relatively narrow spectrum of activities, suggesting one leg of a curriculum that is somehow being selected in the spirit of the old USP-type thinking; that is, old versus current USP-era. He argues that intellectual grasp of other emerging areas of human endeavor are as vital as citizenship training to the university education of our series -- of our students, such as environmental literacy, evolution of the universe and life. Perhaps we should be considering expanding goal 4 to cover the other literacy -- literacy areas, not along the old academic disciplines represented in USP but rather in more germane areas. And so he -- he sees limiting goals to 1, 2, and 3, or to expand goal 4 to -- to more areas of -- of essential areas than just citizenship. That's -- several -- several members of biology commented.

CHAIR: By the way, I was going to ask how many members of Steering Committee are here? Could you raise your hand so I can see? Please. I should have -- I wanted to come to you first and see if you have any comments to make, but maybe Susan shouldn't do this all by herself. It would be actually more appropriate --

YANARELLA She's doing very well so far.

CARVALHO: And I know you'll jump in here if I don't.

CHAIR: But please, members of the Steering Committee, if you want to respond to questions that are asked, just raise

your hand, and I think I know you because I'm on that committee myself. So I would give you priority to -- to respond. Anybody want to discuss the comment that was made from Steering Committee. Okay, Susan, go ahead.

CARVALHO: I will just point to the design principle on which it was based. And we only gave ourselves so much leeway in terms of trying to think of what -- what the design principles might have left out. It was hard enough to do things with the design principle laid out. But this is the wording of the design principle. And we agree that so much more needs to be done, but the done principle asks that these courses lay the foundation. And when we thought about these two issues, it's not that an environmentally focused course wouldn't count. It would if it does the things that are laid out in the -- in the learning outcome. If a course meets those objectives, it would count, and it could. I could envision the kind of course that would. But not just any course on the environment because of the -- the constraints of the design principle.

CHAIR: Any other question regarding learning outcome 4? Please.

CAMPBELL: Tracy Campbell, Arts and Sciences. In the matter of time, I just wanted to ask about the -- the wording in the curricular framework. A number of my colleagues in history are nervous about the word contemporary. Why does everything have to relate, you know, exclusively to the modern world? And that's my first one and I'll leave it at that.

CHAIR: I would like for an answer to -- I want to go to -- yes, please, Ernie Yanarella.

YANARELLA: We're not ahistorical by any means and the -- the emphasis on contemporary is really a touchstone rather than a thorough going framework for all of these elements. You will note at the bottom the discussion of additional topics, societal and institutional change over time, cross-national and comparative issues. I think both of the -- the last two questions really work off of these elements. And as Susan has indicated, it's not that these are being marginalized or left out. They -- they can be a productive

element of a -- of a course. And so as a result, we can -- we can imagine someone teaching a course on 18 -- 18th- or 19th-century slavery. All that we're asking for is that at some point in the course, that material gesture to and open up out onto the contemporary scene.

CHAIR: Okay. Let me go there and I move that way. Any -- I'm not perfect. I'm not trying to ignore anybody, but go ahead.

JANECEK: Jerry Janecek, Arts and Sciences. In the prose connected with this learning outcome, in the one that you just had out, there was a certain emphasis on cultural things. The current curricular framework that's ascribed sounds very political to me. And that emphasis seems to have gotten lost. I was, you know, I pushed for getting multi-lingual in the -- in the statement, and that worked, but it kind of got weakened, as it were, in terms of other things besides political change and institutions that could be covered under this area.

CARVALHO: We were as hammered for being too cultural as for not being cultural enough. But we certainly meant to create a framework where culturally focused courses would count. We did not maintain a framework where only culturally focused courses would count as the primary emphasis because it did narrow the range of disciplines that think in those terms when they think about effective citizenship, and we wanted to embrace the range of disciplinary approaches to that that the University offers. So the fact that it's not in the curricular framework is by no means excluded from the curricular framework. In fact, perhaps the most important phrase of the curricular framework is each course will have its own topical or regional focus that stems from the research focus of the faculty member and the -- the way of thinking in that discipline. The topical or regional focus will be up to the faculty member submitting the syllabus. What the curricular team will do is simply say, look to see whether that course also does the things listed here alongside all the other things that it does.

CHAIR: Let me go to Diane. That's the second time she's talking but not on this

design principle.

HALLMAN: No, no, this is Diane, a different Diane.

CHAIR: Oh, I'm sorry.

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts. I -- my -- my statement is just an endorsement of the history professor over here, whose name I've forgotten at the moment. I don't -- I don't see why we couldn't add with just a few word changes some sense over -- that -- that links past with present; that -- that emphasizes the connection of history to the present contemporary world because I think all of us would agree that in general the historical knowledge of our students as citizens is very, very poor. And I just -- I think even though you have some sense of historical analysis in the -- the principle, that maybe that -- that could be emphasized even more with just a couple of word -- words in this learning outcome. I think it's really essential.

CARVALHO: I'll take that back to the committee, and we'll -- we will see how we can do that.

CHAIR: I would like to go to this corner.

THELIN: Help is on the way. I know --

CHAIR: John Thelin. Name and college?

THELIN: Oh, John Thelin, Education. I know Professor Campbell just left. I wish he'd stayed because if he's not happy, I'm not happy. At Oxford, modern history means anything after 1400. So is that historical enough? We can say modern.

UNIDENTIFIED: This isn't Oxford.

THELIN: Well, could we emulate?

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

CHAIR: All right. Question, back there.

SUAREZ: Juana Suarez, Hispanic Studies.

I am aware as a future studies specialist that the list regarding ethnicity, gender, language, race, religion, sexuality, socioeconomic class, the lists of those words could be endless. However, ethnicity always counts for otherness, and this is implied both within -- within the U.S. and globally. So I wonder if at any point you consider (unintelligible) ethnicity and nationality, which with my understanding future studies the difference, but for this kind of terminology, I think it's important, and it leads a little bit more reflection on what happens in local

communities.

CHAIR: Anybody from Steering Committee would like to address that? Okay, Susan.

CARVALHO: We will take that back to the Steering Committee. We will be meeting again before we come in -- in December, and we will address that.

CHAIR: Okay. Question, learning outcome number 4. Here.

STARR-LEBEAU: Gretchen Starr-LeBeau, Arts and Sciences. I -- I was just continuing the discussion from earlier. Could we just strike the word contemporary as it relates to the United States as it relates to the world?

CARVALHO: We -- Jeff --

ROGERS: I think that we -- in some of --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name?

CHAIR: Name and college.

ROGERS: Sorry, Jeff Rogers, Steering Committee. One of the issues we talked about is that a course on Ancient Rome could count as one of -- one of the examples that was used. So it's not a matter of historical depth. It's a matter of teaching the course in such a way that you relate the issues that are in the curricular framework to the contemporary world of the students. You can teach an issue on power and resistance in Ancient Rome, if you can relate those issues as they play out in that historical understanding and how that continues on into our contemporary world today for students, then you should have no problem being able to do that. That -- that contemporary is meaning to relate to students' lives so history isn't something that's closed off somewhere else and doesn't relate to them. That's sort of what contemporary -- my understanding, what the Steering Committee meant --

CARVALHO: That's true. The Steering Committee spent a lot of time on that piece, and we think that if a student takes a course on -- on Ancient Rome, you might expect the student to make the connections with how that affects organizations, society today, for example, but Gen Ed is about not taking those connections for granted, helping the students see the connection. We are not witnessing that they can make that connection. Ernie has something to add.

YANARELLA: I would just underline the fact that contem -- the contemporary world is not a code word for presentism. And I think that -- that the concerns that have been expressed by historians or historically minded scholars here would be justified if, indeed, this was the -- the intent of learning outcome 4. Far from it. We'd like to have a kind of depth of historical appreciation in -- in every course that helps to lend insight on issues of the contemporary world. What the balance is, is a matter that would be determined, not by the Steering Committee, but by the curricular committee that will follow us and by any -- any unit or committee that we involve in approving courses.

CHAIR: Question on learning outcome number 4 before we move onto the overall package? Number 4?

DENISON: Yes.

CHAIR: Please.

DENISON: Dwight Denison, Graduate School.

With this particular one, where we're talking about assessment, I'm just curious how you're going to -- has the committee thought about how to assess this? I mean I understand we can identify courses that might fall into these categories, but those courses -- there seems to be a disconnect between what we really would like as an outcome and how we would measure that then, you know, in some of these courses. And I just wondered if you thought about how -- how we're going to know if we're doing a good job on this, this learning outcome?

CARVALHO: Assessment will happen at the course level and the program level. I can speak more easily about the course level. What would be required for all these courses is some kind of product from the student that could be archived and that would demonstrate that the student had the knowledge base and the -- the reasoning ability to grapple with the central issues. So what are the central issues? They're the ones in the outcomes and assessment framework. So the final product for a qualifying course in this category would have to demonstrate that the student could do those things, demonstrate a recognition of difference, demonstrate a basic understanding of the impact of those

differences, and recognize and evaluate ethical dilemmas. So this does constrain in some sense the -- the kind of paper that a -- that a instructor would assign for this course, but that's the nature of assessment. There has to be an assessable product. Program-wide, that's trickier. But we're looking at different assessment measures that lay out a dilemma for students and ask them to address it from -- from as many perspectives as they can come up with. And if they are incredibly naive then these courses are not doing their job, or else the majors are not picking up on these threads in the way that they need to. Because, again, this more than even the others needs to be -- well, this one need to be picked up on explicitly throughout the major, reinforced.

CHAIR: Any question on learning outcome number 4?

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology. I want to go back to the comment I made which is kind of -- so, a lot of very tremendous (unintelligible) science majors for us to reinforce. We're not going to reinforce government. We have -- we have issues that -- we have one of the most illiterate societies in terms of science. If you want to use as a marker change the time, we're next to Turkey. That's it. Those are the two lowest -- lowest countries in -- in the world in terms of accepting change with time or evolution. And we're sending people out that never accepted that challenge. We're sending people out in the world without addressing that. We never -- we never seem to focus on it. And so science majors, chemistry, physics, biology, it's hard for us to reinforce -- we do arguments -- some of the hardest arguments are from scientists. And without -- excluding that in this particular outcome, is going to -- is going to put us at a disadvantage to reinforce this over our curriculum. Now as we -- there are other thing -- other -- other ways to, in fact, other ways for making informed choices. The processes for making informed choices. The complexities of citizenship other than government understandings or understandings of what you have. The thing I read was not for me, but it -- it really reflects my -- my -- my

position. You know, you can say it's because -- you know, I don't -- I don't see any argument that says that a scientist can't -- can't come up with very strong, you know, very strong areas of human endeavor, other kinds of literacy, but the literacy that humanity states is literate. That's really what's here, and I haven't heard a good argument against what -- what was -- what I read from a faculty member. Just don't want to do it. I don't see it.

CHAIR: Anybody from the Steering Committee wants to respond? I just want to remind you, although Susan Carvalho is an Associate Provost, she's part --

CARVALHO: Assistant.

CHAIR: -- Assistant Provost, she's part of the administration. She -- she's a con -- we call this a conveyor or facilitator --

CARVALHO: Convener.

CHAIR: -- convener of the committee which is made of non -- mostly or maybe entirely non-administrative faculty and shouldn't look like this is an administration which is defending or responding to these questions. This is not an administration proposal. This is a faculty proposal. She only conveyor. So I -- I would like to invite the -- the Steering Committee members to respond, please. Yes.

YANARELLA: I don't -- I don't see how the --

CHAIR: Ernie Yanarella.

YANARELLA: Yes, Ernie Yanarella. -- how the articulation of learning outcome 4 has the effect of marginalizing issues of scientific literacy or the role that facts can play in the development of informed choices. I tend to look at all four of these outcomes as part of a -- of a -- of the whole cloth that in some respects interact with one another and can help to mutually enrich one another. We look, for example, at quantitative reasoning and the focus on everyday issues and -- and problems and the way in which statistics are used or misused, I see that as an important contribution to the intent of learning outcome 4. Indeed, the focus in learning outcome 1 on one form of inquiry, scientific inquiry, the role that is played in advancing quantitative reasoning in an everyday and even public context, all, I

think, enhance and underline the fact that the -- the effort to, quote, demonstrate an understanding of the complexities of citizenship and the process of making informed choices, is not a special burden of outcome 4, but in fact, is shared by learning outcomes 1, 2, and, indeed, number 3. We think about the role of oral communications and visual communications. We think about the role of rhetoric in politics. I see this as a very rich framework that far from diminishing the role of science and quantitative reasoning, plays a significant role in enhancing it's -- it's role and impact on the appreciation and the advance of the learning outcomes under number 4.

CHAIR: Okay. Seems like a good time --

CARVALHO: If I could just add one point which is that -- and in specific to the design of learning outcome 1, is that students will gain an understanding of how different disciplines approach problem solving so that they gain an understanding of the fact that -- that few problems can be solved without science and -- and the way that -- that scientific methodologies would approach those questions.

CHAIR: Okay. We used half of our time for the four learning outcomes. Seems a good time to go to discuss the proposal overall, although I'm not going to say, don't ask any questions regarding any specific learning outcome, but let's concentrate on the overall proposal. I will come back to you right after that.

WERMELING: Are we allowed -- Wermeling in Pharmacy. Are we allowed to ask more than one question?

CHAIR: Are you allowed to what?

MICHAEL: That was it.

WERMELING: Are we allowed to --

CHAIR: He's the parliamentarian. No, no, I will -- I will let everybody talk one time on this segment before anybody could talk for a second time. So, no, you are not limited to one, but that's your chance right now, please go.

WERMELING: Has this group considered how these new requirements affect admission into the professional programs because these are now pre-professional requirements, and does it affect in any way the student's ability to transition or

matriculate to the professional schools?

CHAIR: Anybody wants to respond from Steering Committee before I go to Susan? Are you part of the Steering Committee?

CARVALHO: Yes, she is.

CHAIR: Yes, you are, yes.

BEATTIE: Ruth Beattie, Steering Committee. I'm from the --

CHAIR: Name again, we didn't hear you. I know you --

BEATTIE: Beattie, Ruth Beattie.

CHAIR: Ruth Beattie. Please.

BEATTIE: I'm from the Department of Biology, and we obviously have a huge number of students that move on to, in particular, medical based professional colleges, pre-med, pre-dent, pre-pharmacy students. This current model would fit very well into our current biology program and still allow all our students to take the requirements that they need for any of the -- any of the medical based professional schools.

WERMELING: So it doesn't change their time requirements and pre-professional requirements?

BEATTIE: No, it doesn't because this is reduced down to 30 hours, so any course that they cannot -- they could not double dip on, with this model, they have enough time in the freed up hours to be able to do it.

CHAIR: That was technically a follow-up a question, not a second question.

WERMELING: Second question is related to it. We take probably 60 or 70 percent of our class from out of state -- from other universities, so 10 percent come from around the world or from other states; 10 to 20 percent, we're going to increase that to 25 percent probably, how does this then affect our ability to evaluate the equivalency of their educational pre-professional requirements for admission to the college? Does this affect our ability at the College of Pharmacy to evaluate whether they're qualified to enter into our program or to graduate with a pharmacy degree from the University of Kentucky by meeting all the professional degree requirements for an undergraduate to satisfy that for a professional degree? In other words, you have to have that all coming in to get out, right? So does this

flow through still fit?

BLACKWELL: Yes.

WERMELING: Wow, that was really easy. Could you give me a little more thought about the process and how you got there?

CHAIR: Let's ask the Associate Provost for Undergraduate --

BLACKWELL: Education.

CHAIR: -- Education.

BLACKWELL: Yes. I'm Jeannine Blackwell.

The -- the course equivalencies that students transfer in nationally, we have a large inventory of those equivalencies, and that's a separate thing from the Gen Ed requirements. So that we can give the equivalent of incoming course work that would be transferred in or AP credits.

This is not going to affect those equivalencies. This is simply the Gen Ed requirement. And so those decisions about equivalencies will be the same as they are now, basically.

WERMELING: So the bottom line then if I reported to my faculty the results of this discussion is that there's no impact on our professional degree pre-entry requirement; is that a fair statement?

BLACKWELL: Yes, I think.

CARVALHO: Yes.

BLACKWELL: Yes.

CARVALHO: Yes. Except that you'd want to look at them and make sure that you don't need to specify certain courses that used to be included in USP that are no longer included. What we're saying here is that the students will have the time to take them, but you may have to spell them out more clearly because they're no longer here. But there will be time for the students to take them. There won't be more courses, but you should look at what was in USP that's not here that you need to add as an explicit pre-major -- pre-entry requirement.

CHAIR: If I could ask a quick question. You don't offer undergraduate degree; therefore you are not required to require USP or Gen Ed; is that not correct?

WERMELING: No. We have to satisfy general -- general university graduation requirements as a condition of entry into the College of Pharmacy.

CHAIR: Because you decided that. You are not --

WERMELING: I don't know who decided; I just know that's the rule.

CHAIR: Okay.

CHAPPELL: I have a clarification to this. There are other programs --

BROTHERS: Name, please.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, College of Ag.

There are other programs like pre-vet programs that do require very explicit classes that satisfy USP that are likely to be missed. I don't think that was -- was really given full consideration here. So I think Dan's comments are very sincere and important to consider. So there --

CARVALHO: And we -- we would want to hear from those programs. I do think it requires a careful look at what the changes are and how they impact your list, but we'd sure like to know about those well in advance of December 8th.

WERMELING: It's the linkage to requirement to be able to -- to be graduation eligible at entry into the college that makes a risk.

CHAIR: In fairness to others, I'd like to move on, and then we can come back after everybody else has spoken once. We can come back to this side. Any question -- yes. You are a non-Senator, and you asked for permission, so permission granted. Please go.

BREAZEALE: I'm Dan Breazeale from the Philosophy Department College of Arts and Sciences. And I'm concerned with an omission from the -- from the proposed learning outcomes. For those of you who don't have handy a copy of the design principles, let me remind you that the first design principle. Courses in the general education curriculum will incorporate learning experiences that produce understanding of the process of inquiry and help students develop critical thinking skills. In the -- in the -- in the description of what this means, it says knowing how to learn and think is the essential goal of general education. Students should be capable of understanding what critical argument demands. Now, of course, all the courses that we -- I mean, in the best of all possible worlds, all of our courses will teach some of this, but none of the courses that are now -- that now fit under the learning outcomes

actually single out for study what constitutes a sound or valid argument. This has long been recognized for thousands of years as -- as a -- as a foundation stone, a building block of a general education. Now, certainly it's important to have -- to know about rhetorical reasoning which is singled out for special attention in one of these learning outcomes. Physical reasoning is more and more important. It's also singled out for special attention. But so too is old fashioned deductive reasoning. Knowing what constitutes a good argument is critically important for our students. That's not something which is -- which is counted as a general education learning outcome under these four learning outcomes. This -- this has been clarified, but I'd like for a member, in discussing with the members of -- with members of the committee to whom we have spoken, so we think as long as this document does not have a place in it for something like an elementary logic instruction, at least as an option for our students, it is fatally flawed. Now, how we can correct that, I don't know. One option, the easiest option, of course, would be to add an additional option under learning outcome 3, but that would mess up the symmetry of the -- of the -- of the -- as it's currently designed. But as it stands, we think that this is -- should not go forward. Thank you.

CHAIR: Anybody from Steering Committee would like to respond to that, especially from -- was it QR, quantitative reasoning subcommittee? Okay. Susan, do you want -- would you like to -- would you like to respond to that, please?

CARVALHO: I'll try.

CHAIR: Of course, you are speaking for the committee.

CARVALHO: I am.

CHAIR: Not for yourself.

CARVALHO: And I am trying to recall and accurately summarize the discussions of the committee about this very point because we took it extremely seriously, and so I would welcome contributions from the committee members if I misrepresent or leave anything out. We talked about a logic requirement, and we agreed about it's importance. But we couldn't see that that followed the

tenor of the rest of this curriculum which was to offer courses that could be taught from a variety of disciplinary standpoints by a variety of programs. It turned into a logic requirement or a philosophy requirement every time we tried it. And we couldn't see creating a functional portal through which 4,000 freshmen every semester, I mean, every year could pass. Currently, there are a lot sections of logic taught as an alternative route to completing the quantitative requirement USP. And so that's the reason -- that's not the only reason students take logic, by any means, but that is why the number of sections grew in the way that it did. And the current quantitative focus of the design principles excluded that possibility. How to put it back in as a sole requirement, students have to take philosophy or have to take logic, went against everything that -- that we're trying to do here. We did discuss ways in which logic could fit in category 1, as well -- learning outcome 1. Where was I? Learning outcome 1, which has to do with identifying multiple dimensions of a good question and grappling with this difficult situation in the humanities. And -- and there is ample rubric there for incorporating logic courses, but logic, per se, we decided, was not a feasible piece. If we thought we could teach enough of it for 4,000 freshmen, and if we decided to go up to 33 credit hours, and then if all the other disciplines agreed that their -- that they were not as central, then we might have been able to do it because nobody argued the importance of it. Everybody argued about -- and what we considered was how best to incorporate it into a general education core curriculum, sustainable over time for a large number of students and as an option in category 1, we felt that it is certainly included. It's not excluded, but it is not a free-standing requirement either.

CHAIR: Any Senator want to address that particular point before I move onto the next topic? You want to address that?

JANECEK: Yes.

CHAIR: Please go ahead.

JANECEK: Jerry Janecek, Arts and Sciences. I'm in sympathy with my colleagues in

philosophy and realize that in category 3 the emphasis on quantitative reasoning is maybe overdone and limited ultimately to statistics. Where, in fact, something -- maybe it's too late to do that, but in any case, that's probably where it should go like it does now.

CARVALHO: If the design principles had been written that way, that would be an option. The design principles were -- were focused towards numbers added.

CHAIR: Question? New question, yes.

SNOW: Diane Snow, Medicine. A comment -- just a couple comments that have been made here --

CHAIR: Sure.

SNOW: It's -- I think we all know that when you name something, you give it validity and importance. And a couple of the discussions that have been brought on here are about naming specific things that people think are important, study of evolution, incorporating logic, and the ability for logic. Is it possible that the committee can go back to the chalkboard just a little bit, enough to put some of these very critical words in there that will meet these requirements?

CHAIR: Anybody from Steering Committee who would like to talk? Yes.

SWAMY: Can I have permission to speak? I've been very good throughout this whole --

CHAIR: You are a Senator. I cannot not permit it.

SWAMY: I guess, you know, I just want to point out some realities here. I think we're into the fourth year of the process of studying, re-examining, discussing, committee, and so forth. We can -- I mean, I personally think there should be a physics requirement for everyone who graduates from the University of Kentucky, and I think it would do them good, and the country would be better off for doing that. I just think that the best wisdom of this body was expressed in those design principles, considering all the complexities, all the passionately held, parochially held views, and all of those things balance. And to open that up is to go at least a year back, perhaps two years back, that's your privilege, but I just want to point that we're into year 4, and

you still have the task of translating these outcomes through curricular committees into courses and how they map on and how they alter the relationship with the different majors and so forth, and figuring out the financial implications of it, and then implementing. This may be a six-year process, seven-year process. If you want to turn the clock back two more years, that's your prerogative.

CHAIR: I saw your hand go up first.

NADEL: Alan Nadel, A & S. I think these outcomes are fabulous, and I think if we could guarantee that every person graduating from the University of Kentucky met every one of these outcomes, we would be an outstanding school. But I have also noticed a huge disparity between the size of the rhetoric and the amount of the resources. And it's an inverse ratio. And the only thing here to vouch-save these outcomes is the word assessment that keeps getting thrown out without any indication of how this will proceed. Are there going to be control groups? Will we put some people under the old assessment and some under the new? Will we figure out how to isolate our variables? In other words, will we practice the very same things we're trying to teach the people? I see no indication of this. And it seems to me that I agree with Swamy, we should go forward, but that the resources have to come first, and that this body should determine whether the resources are adequate to the task before we simply create a lot of rhetoric which will look good on very -- on an administrator's vitae and do nothing for the educational agenda.

CHAIR: Any other question or comment? Anybody want to respond to that from the Steering Committee or any other Senator? Responding to the comment?

Or a new question? Anybody have a new question? New question? Okay. Responding to comment.

YANARELLA: Mr. Nadel, I -- I really appreciated your first sentence. In some ways, I wish you had stopped there, but actually you're raising -- you're raising a very serious issue. We need -- we need -- we need to be assured at some point down the pike that there will be resources sufficient to implement this program. I

can appreciate the Provost's dilemma here. How does he know what resources until he knows what the -- what the large curricular framework is? I -- I take it from his comment just a few minutes ago that he's not trying to encourage us to backpedal on this. A second point I would make has to do with the issue of assessment. Since the -- the very first year, since the effort on the part of the GERA committee, General Education Reform and Assessment, we have had our eye on two things, General Education Reform and Assessment. And while it is true that in this -- this last iteration, much of our effort has gone to focus on developing this -- this broad curricular framework. I think to a person, ever member of the general Steering Committee is committed to the idea of -- of assessment. This is going to require resources as well. We're going to need both examples and personnel and -- and implementation strategies for assessment to work. I am certainly planning put to -- to put the administration's feet to the fire on this. If we don't have assessment, then we're -- we're -- we're -- we're going to put ourselves in a similar position that we found USP in, it just grew like topsy; there was no consistent assessment to determine the extent to which the explicit or implicit learning outcomes were being met, and we -- we now found, you know, we now find ourselves in a situation where faculty tend to be either cool or, at best, lukewarm towards USP, but it's -- it's an old familiar shoe. I think this is an important step, and I think a qualitative improvement on -- on what we have now. But all of these elements, curricular framework, the resources, and the assessment must be there in the end.

CHAIR: Okay. A brief follow up.

NADEL: Yeah, very brief.

CHAIR: And then we'll move on.

NADEL: It seems to me to say that we have to pass the plan and then have the resources is the same principle that led to all the subprime lending. Let's take out the mortgage, and then see if we can pay it.

CHAIR: Okay. New question over there.

HALLMAN: Actually, it's not new, but I'd like to endorse --

CHAIR: It doesn't have to be new.

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts. I'd like to endorse what Diane Snow said in terms of refinement of the language. I don't think it -- it would necessarily mean going back a year in this, but it seems that there have been so many important inclusions that are promised. Several of the Steering Committee have said, oh, well, that includes logic; that includes the understanding of historical analysis, but I don't see why we can't actually reenforce those things with the additional language. The learning outcome 4, why not under -- out of two out of four topics, just add a topic about science-based environmental literacy or something?

CHAIR: Let me just clarify that. His comment about going back two years ago was regarding changing design principle. Of course, this could -- perhaps should be changed. That's why we are here discussing learning outcomes. Susan or anybody else who wants to speak to that. Or you discuss it, sure.

ROORDA: Randall Roorda, Arts and Sciences. I want to second that and ratify or build on what the biology were saying earlier. And I hadn't really thought about this before, the comments from those quarters there. But as I look at this, and -- and let me say that I support this really strong, and I want to see if go forward very expeditiously. I do think it might be good to tinker with the language of that fourth part, especially, because as I look at it now, I see that three of these four are basically skills or methods-based. Only the fourth has a provision for something like content knowledge and a -- for citizenship. And the content knowledge is phrased basically, exclusively in terms of cultural diversity. I think that it is extremely important at this moment that something like ecological literacy, environmental literacy be included in content knowledge as essential to engage citizenship in this world. So I would like to see something that ratifies that in here.

CHAIR: I saw another hand going up around this area. Non-Senator, please, go ahead.

BREAZEALE: Dan Breazeale, Philosophy. Just

a short follow up to the discussion we've been having and response to Susan's remark that we can't change; we have to follow the design principle. I'm not calling for the design principle to be revoked or be redesigned. There are seven design principles and four learning outcomes. One of the design principles teaching critical thinking, in our estimation, is not sufficiently satisfied by the four learning outcomes. The easy way to do that, to make the fourth or the third learning outcome reasoning, per se, including both quantitative reasoning and critical thinking or deductive reasoning. I mean, it would not require the claim that we are violating the design principles to include logic in there. So I just reject that response.

CARVALHO: Do you mean if we operate as a -- as a potential alternative either/or, either statistics or logic?

BREAZEALE: Well, sure. There are alternatives all throughout this thing.

UNIDENTIFIED: Why not?

BREAZEALE: You've got -- you've got two out of four in the first one --

CARVALHO: Because the design principles do specify the quantitative part, and so by making it an either/or, we're -- we're telling students that --

BREAZEALE: It would still be quantitative. We're not saying you could avoid quantitative. You wouldn't have to have two courses in quantitative.

CARVALHO: There would just be one course in quantitative and one course in philosophy?

BREAZEALE: Or two courses in quantitative.

CARVALHO: Or two courses in quantitative?

BREAZEALE: Yeah. We're asking for options.

We're not saying everybody has to take a logic course, but I don't see why the committee can't consider that alternative, and I don't think saying because the design principles don't allow it is -- is -- is a fair response.

CHAIR: The response was it was not feasible. It was not that it -- there is a -- just for the record, that was one -- not feasible.

CARVALHO: Let me just jump in and say, we considered it for so long, so it's not that we didn't consider it. And -- and we will go back and consider it again.

BREAZEALE: Thank you.

CARVALHO: But we thought that the second paragraph of this cannot be satisfied in just one course for our students in this time. They need -- they need methods, and then they need the reasoning part. And so that --

BREAZEALE: Where's critical thinking? Where -- where -- where are they learning critical thinking?

CHAIR: Okay, friend --

CARVALHO: In the first category and throughout and in the major.

CHAIR: We have seven minutes left, and of course, we can go as long as you guys stay here and nobody says motion for adjournment.

So any new Senator wants to -- to talk about these learning outcomes? Senators first, new ones. People who have not spoken yet.

SAWAYA: If I may have the floor?

CHAIR: You have not spoken, so please, go ahead.

SAWAYA: Peter Sawaya from Medicine. Is this going to be a sudden implementation, or are we going to phase it in and start part of it at a time, like we did with the ACGME and the competency for positions? How they phase them in -- would be working on them -- a lot of -- some of these items really make me -- reminded me of -- of those competencies. But the number one, they didn't put them on us, on our lap to -- to -- to implement them and have the resources to be able to implement them on day one. In fact, they have probably 10 years for us to get into the -- we are learning them as we are going along. And I wonder is this going to be tomorrow, March 1st, all courses, or are these courses being designed and placed?

CHAIR: I hope I'm not mistaken; please correct me if I'm mistaken, I think the phase-in should be at least four years because by University rule, anybody who comes under this program should be able to get out of this program. So -- but anybody have a suggestion?

SAWAYA: But that would allow all these questions to -- to -- to iron out and see what problems, if we have the resources, if -- if -- if it is phased in on the step-wise, or if it affects pharmacy or

medicine.

SWAMY: There's -- there's a practical aspect of that I'd like to address.

CHAIR: Please, go ahead.

SWAMY: Is that, with all due respect to all of those who want to look at my CV, I'll be happy to share my CV and see what I already have claimed credit for, but that's -- be that as it may. I'll let that comment pass.

I honestly don't know how to estimate what's going -- what it's going to cost to implement this new program until it's really given a little better shape to how those 30 credits are going to shape up. There are questions about three credit courses. Will existing courses be -- will fit into this as -- as they give more shape to it? How the new courses have to be developed; how many new courses, what pedagogy will, in fact, be recommended by the -- by the faculty committees, what class sizes will they accept and not accept. With -- with all of that in hand and only then do I know how to estimate the cost of implementing a new program. And then, yes, we'll have to have a conversation about the implementation, the implementation phase, and -- and all that kinds of... Frankly, without going to that next step, I don't know. If you have a better handle on this, please let me know. But I certainly don't have a handle on how we can estimate the cost of offering a new curriculum until we go through that, at least that next step.

CHAIR: I see a new person. Please, here.

WOOD: If I may, Kaveh, Swamy, could I --

BROTHERS: Name, please.

CHAIR: Name?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Statistics, Arts and Sciences.

The current plan or -- or the process is that if, in fact, these learning outcomes are approved in December, that a more substantive curricular package would come forward to the Senate during the springtime. Will a discussion of resources accompany that, or is that -- is that the intent or have you been planning on doing that? I was wondering if that could potentially address the concern that has

been raised.

SWAMY: I -- I, honestly, don't know the time frame, and the following sense is that, yes, we would love to have the next step be concluded in the spring. If the faculty groups come and say, no, this can't be done with integrity, we can't do it until then. We will take our time. But -- but I -- all I am suggestion is that we keep moving forward, and -- and, yes, we can set some timelines, but we have to be flexible on that. And then I think at the right time when -- when there is agreement on what that whole structure would be and what the pedagogy would be, we would be in a position to calculate that. And that then really does become an element of discussion in terms of the implementation which, again, is in your hands. That is, if you're not satisfied that this can be implemented with integrity, you have the wherewithal to say, this won't be effective until whatever time you pick, just as you suspended the oral communication requirement based on logistical reasons. It's a faculty prerogative. I don't make the rules on when the program will be implemented. You approve the program, and you will approve the implementation, solely based on whether it can be done with integrity or not. And so, yes, I mean, I -- I -- I would hope that the curricular committees, the faculty committees can, in fact, come back and give shape to this in time for them to calculate, but if that doesn't get done by the end of the spring semester, then we'll have to go back and stretch it out. But it has to be done with integrity.

CHAIR: Okay. Any -- I'm going to go over -- you have asked several times to speak.

WERMELING: Yes.

CHAIR: Please go.

WERMELING: It's apparent from your work that you've done some benchmarking on looking at how to set this up. And so if you've done it on the administrative side relative to designing this, it's still sort of boggles me a little bit that you don't have any sense of cost. If -- if other universities have already implemented this or some version of this, I'm sure we're not the first, there's no sense on a percentage

basis or some absolute basis of what we are -- that you're looking at. I just can't believe that you would design something without a sense of -- how can you get into a business even of not knowing of what the magnitude of the investment is? I just -- I just can't get there from here.

CHAIR: Anybody wants to respond to this?
Okay.

JOHNSON: I'll respond.

CHAIR: Oh, okay.

JOHNSON: Nancy Johnson, Business College and Steering Committee. I -- I think it's just tough to do. As an Associate Dean who grapples with enrollments and that kind of thing, it's just hard to know what kinds of classes we're going to have, what are the class sizes, what choices the students might make. We, in Business, will still require calculus which now satisfies part of USP, but we'll keep that in addition to this. So I think it's just hard to -- to get the full complement, first, without it being passed, and then second, sort of how it takes shape as the curriculum --

WERMELING: No, but that doesn't answer my question. The question is, historically, if people have already done this, they probably have reported cost implications already. And -- and it probably has a wide range, but at least you would know within an order of magnitude, perhaps, where you are. And I just can't imagine that a large organization could go into that kind of -- making -- making that kind of an investment with the four years of work that you've done without some sense of knowing financially whether you could pull it off.

CHAIR: Okay.

CARVALHO: I -- I would say we're keeping some general sense of feasibility in that we're not proposing the creation of a new college and hiring 100 faculty members, and they're all manage this for us, and we'll pay them to do it. But colleges and universities, they're all starting at a different place. We're looking right now at where we need to be, and we're looking for your endorsement to get us there. And then we'll have to figure out where we are, what the differential is, and what the cost to move us in that direction and get us there. But since universities start at such different places, I don't see how we

could borrow Harvard's data and figure out what it costs them to implement their new Gen Ed.

SWAMY: If I could answer in a slightly different -- because Susan did answer part of the question when she said, for example in answer to Dan Breazeale's comment about logic, that we could not think of how we would get 4,000 students to go through, and every one take a logic requirement, for instance. And that was, in fact, a financial constraint answer. It was -- it was a feasibility answer. What -- what we have also constrained in some larger sense is that the overall way in which general education, USP courses, are currently delivered will remain, more or less, with, you know, changes. And so in that sense the framework is not a -- if I -- if I have to pick a number, a 100-percent increase in cost of delivering USP, but a 10, 20-percent increase. Most probably, we would have to do that anyway in terms of the effectiveness of our program. And so in that sense, yes, it's -- it's in, you know, in the margins at -- at this stage, but I really believe that for the same reasons that people have mentioned here, in order to get a more accurate estimate of what it will take, there's a question of delivering it, will we have -- we have a range of options. The faculty has a range of options that they could agree to that -- arranging from TA taught sections to full-time lecturer taught sections, to only regular faculty taught sections, small classes only, combinations of small and large lectures, large lectures with recitation sections. I mean, there are, you know, ranges of options. And -- and those are something that -- that would have to come out of the faculty discussions. So to simply say, here is this much money and try to come up with a program within that, doesn't make that much sense either. And so it's that give and take.

One -- one comment if I may. Because there's been a lot of talk about assessment. This is, again, not happening in a vacuum. Critical thinking, Dan, is -- has certainly been one of the items that nationally has -- people have been talking about how do we make the program -- program-level assessment, not course-level

assessment on critical thinking. We have subscribed, as have many peer institutions, to something called a collegiate learning assessment, and we are currently doing this. You take a cohort of freshmen and then if you take them four years or three years later, and then you -- you -- you give a set of exercises that are associated with critical thinking skills, and you compare and see if you've made any progress. And -- and there are still nationally people are working this out to see how well they can do this assessment. We're already beginning to take some baseline data. And so, yes, you know, we're not just sitting here cooking up things in a complete vacuum. The faculty -- it's certainly a faculty prerogative and a faculty-driven process. This critical step, next step, I believe, is where we're going to actually begin to get some idea of the types of changes and the -- the costs involved. And then wait -- wait and see this discussion about implementation, time frame, and what kind of a phasing, if phasing in -- phased in approach is a more feasible will have to come up. So I think -- I do believe that -- that this, you know, four-year process, this next step is critical. And the reason we're coming here in bits and pieces is, you know, I think that it's not fair to the groups that are involved to suddenly then bring something, and the whole thing be rejected, and you go back. So this stepwise approach was adopted after, in fact, one group went out and came up with a curriculum and they -- a pedagogy that was soundly and rightly rejected. And that's the reason this is now coming back in -- in pieces to make sure that you're with it; you're going to approve it; you're happy with it; go to the next step. So I believe this is a reasonable approach for that.

CHAIR: Okay. It's 5:05. I know we have to stop somewhat soon, but as long as you guys want to go, let's go. Question?

SNOW: For what it's worth, I feel it necessary to outwardly state how much I, and I'm sure everybody in this room, appreciates that very hard work of our colleagues on this, and that this is a very academic discussion. You've got a roomful of scholars who are absolutely passionate

about education. And it makes good sense to me that people are going to have a lot to say about it, but please don't understand that as us not appreciating the goal and we're behind you all the way on this.

CHAIR: Of course.

CARVALHO: Thank you.

CHAIR: We are losing just too many people. Unless somebody passionately wants to, say -- ask one more question, I will either entertain a motion to adjourn, or I will adjourn it myself.

SNOW: So moved.

WERMELING: So moved.

SWAMY: Could I make one suggestion?

CHAIR: Yes.

SWAMY: That the Chair instruct the Senators to pay more attention to these and in the next few weeks correspond with the committee so that when we come back in December, we're not going to --

CHAIR: Yes.

SWAMY: -- have completely unheard of questions.

CHAIR: Yes. The Chair is instructing the Senators to, please, go talk to your constituents and -- and communicate your concerns with the Steering Committee before the next Senate meeting which we will discuss these learning outcomes. Thank you for a lively discussion.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for November 10, 2008 was adjourned at 5:10 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 4th day of December, 2008.

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE-AT-LARGE
KENTUCKY