

University Senate
April 13, 2009

The University Senate met in regular session on Monday, April 13, 2009 at 3 pm in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. As the first item of business, the Chair asked senators to stand in a remembrance of Russ Williams, a longtime employee and UK's staff representative to the Board of Trustees, who passed away the previous week. Senators stood and remembered Mr. Williams during a moment of silence.

1. Minutes from March 9, 2009 and Announcements

The Chair solicited a motion for approval of the minutes. Anderson **moved** to approve the minutes from the March 9, 2009 Senate meeting and **Bollinger** seconded. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the Senate minutes from March 9, 2009 were **approved** as distributed.

Turning to announcements, the Chair reported that he approved new course GS 680 (a placeholder, zero-credit course) on behalf of the Senate Council (SC) and Senate. The Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 has been distributed widely across campus. The Chair asked senators to look it over and send in comments no later than Friday, April 17. Editorial changes were made to *Governing Regulations VII (GR VII)*, pertaining to a change in title of an ex officio position (from “associate provost for academic affairs” to the current title of “associate provost for faculty affairs”) and grammatical changes. The nature of the changes, however, did not warrant approval of the revisions by the Senate.

The Chair reminded senators that proposed revisions to *Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1 (AR II-1.0-1)* had been emailed to them in March. He noted that the SC was reviewing the changes, and the Senate would vote to endorse or not during the May Senate meeting. He added that there was not sufficient time to go over the proposed changes during the day's meeting, but urged senators to read the document carefully, and contact Assistant Provost for Program Support Richard Greissman with any comments or concerns.

There were also proposed revisions to *AR 3:14 (II-7.01, “Faculty Practice Plans”)*, which had been vetted for over three years, involving complicated and legal issues. The Chair suggested that senators, particularly those who would be affected, should review the proposed changes. He noted that the changes were complex enough that it was very possible the Senate might not hold a vote for endorsement.

2. KCTCS December 1008 Candidates for Credentials

Jones **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve the KCTCS December 2009 list of BTC candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Zentall **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

3. UK May 2009 Degree List

The Chair commented that it was critically important for senators to offer input into the degree list process – he thanked the senators who submitted suggestions.

Jones **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2009 list of candidates for degrees, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Reed **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. [UK August 2009 Degree List](#)

Jones **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's August 2009 list of candidates for degrees, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Cantagallo **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

5. [Proposed New Department of Gender and Women's Studies](#)

The Chair invited Professors Deborah Crooks and Patricia Cooper to explain the proposed new Department of Gender and Women's Studies. He added that all curricular proposals were coming to the Senate with a positive recommendation from the SC.

Guest Crooks explained that she was the former, interim director of the Gender and Women's Studies (GWS) program. She then described various materials available to senators in the handout: response to questions from Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, letters indicating support by various entities, the proposal itself, a five-year plan, the proposal for the BA in Gender and Women's Studies previously approved by the Senate, and policies and procedures for the proposed new Department of GWS.

Bollinger asked about the logic behind creating a new department during the current fiscal situation. Crooks explained that the letter from College of Arts and Sciences Dean Phil Harling addressed those concerns. There was an interdisciplinary program in Gender and Women's Studies already functioning, and no new resources were being requested. There was a desire to offer a graduate degree in the future, which would require additional resources, but that would occur sometime in the future. There were currently some faculty with one hundred per cent of their assignment in GWS, but located in another discipline's home. Crooks added that there was already a budget and budget officer in place.

Dean Harling reiterated Crooks' comments and said that GWS already functioned much like a department. Upon approval of the new department, faculty members were ready to move to GWS. A doctoral program will be discussed over the next several years, although there were currently sufficient personnel to handle the recently-approved baccalaureate program. In addition, there was a robust graduate certificate available in GWS, with 40 – 50 affiliated faculty who were involved. Dean Harling ended by saying that the college had already devoted the necessary resources to keep the new department in good standing to fulfill its mission.

In response to a question from Rohr about the numbers of faculty involved, Cooper explained that there were currently five faculty, with one additional coming in. There were two joint appointments, in addition to an agreement with the College of Education to teach two courses per year. There were already affiliated faculty regularly teaching in the program.

The Chair noted that the major program in GWS was approved by the Senate during the previous meeting – one aspect which was given close consideration at that time was assuring that there were a sufficient number of faculty to underwrite the program.

Sellnow **moved** that the Senate endorse the creation of a new Department of Gender and Women's Studies. D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor and one opposed.

6. [Proposed Change to Graduation Standards: BS Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles](#)

The Chair invited Professor Vanessa Jackson to explain the proposed change to graduation requirements in the BS in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles. Guest Jackson said that, as stated in the proposal, Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles (MAT) was attempting to increase the quality of students within the department by incorporating a standard of a C grade or better in all pre-major, professional support and MAT major courses. No grade of D would be accepted in pre-major, professional support, and MAT major courses.

Jones **moved** that the Senate approve the change in graduation standards for BS in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles. Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor and one opposed.

7. [Proposed Suspension of Minor in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles](#)

Jackson explained that there was no chair person in position to handle advising for minor students in MAT, which averaged about 25 – 30 students. There were presently two untenured faculty, three tenured faculty and an enrollment of 280 non-minor students, making advising difficult. Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell asked about the duration of the suspension. Jackson replied that there was no timeline for the suspension, although the department was examining and revising its curriculum and after a look at benchmark universities, MAT would decide on what to ultimately do with the minor. The Chair asked if a timeline for the suspension should be included in the motion, but Dean Blackwell thought it was unnecessary.

Jones asked about students currently enrolled in the minor and Jackson replied that current students would be able to complete their program, but new students would not be accepted.

Jones **moved** that the Senate approve the suspension of the minor in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles and D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. [New University Scholars Program: BS Mining Engineering and MS Mining Engineering](#)

Associate Dean for Administration and Academic Affairs Richard Sweigard (College of Engineering, or CoE) explained the proposal for a new University Scholars Program of a BS Mining Engineering and MS Mining Engineering. It mimicked other University Scholars Programs (USPgms) in CoE, such as those in Electrical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, etc. When other programs established their USPgms, there was not sufficient demand for a USPgm in Mining Engineering. Now enrollment has increased and the demand is present.

Viele **moved** that the Senate approve the new University Scholars Program of a BS in Mining Engineering and an MS in Mining Engineering. Yost **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

9. [New Graduate Certificate: Clinical and Translational Science](#)

The Chair suggested Kelly explain the proposal. Kelly said that when the Center for Clinical and Translational Science was established, a cross-college group was created to evaluate what the core competencies would be required for an individual in clinical and translational science (CTS) research. The output was a description of the courses outlined in the proposal, which amounts to entry-level training for a student interested in pursuing a career in CTS research.

Thelin commented that the associated NIH proposal emphasized and required the participation of every educational unit on campus and Kelly agreed that the NIH encouraged a broad approach. Thelin opined that broad representation would greatly strengthen the proposal. Provost Subbaswamy explained that Professor William Balke holds a dual title as director of the Center for CTS, as well as associate provost for clinical and translational science, and that the mentioned center was campuswide. Thelin disagreed, saying that with the exception of the Department of Statistics, it was primarily for the medical center, which seemed to him to be counter to a university-wide, multiple-academic-unit character.

Provost Subbaswamy stated that there was a desire to broaden the purview of those faculty members conducting CTS, and there were many degree types in which students trained, both in the medical and non-medical profession. The proposed certificate would be just one aspect of a broader thrust on CTS.

Gesund asked about any interpretation. The Provost replied that in the case of CTS, “translation” meant taking clinical research and translating it into practice.

Gesund **moved** that the Senate approve the new Graduate Certificate in Clinical and Translational Science and Effgen **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

10. [Proposed change to Senate Rules 5.2.4.6 \(“Dead Week”\) from Student Government Association](#)

Student Government President Montell said that the proposal to modify *Senate Rules 5.2.4.6* (“Dead Week”) was shepherded and championed by Joe Quinn (sophomore, Economics and Finance major) and Kara Sutton (junior, Economics and Political Science major).

Guest Quinn gave a brief presentation on the proposed changes. He commented that a large assortment of projects and assignments during Dead Week (DW) made it difficult to study. Even as a good student, he said that DW had put a strain on him. Quinn opined that students could be better prepared and could perform better with extra study time. Although some individuals had argued that students desiring more study time should simply begin studying earlier, Quinn explained that students often work to support themselves and pay tuition. Quinn said that the issue was not that of time management by students; many students succeed and do well, but a change to DW policies would offer additional help for students. The Student Government Association (SGA) worked hard with students and faculty to create a good proposal and Quinn said there was no desire to intrude on a faculty member’s ability to teach; everyone wants students to succeed.

Guest Sutton stated that she was a junior with a 4.0 with a double degree and a minor. She said she held a variety of positions across campus, which did intrude into study time. Sutton said that during the current semester, she had one in-class assignment, two papers and an empirical assignment in addition to finals. Over 50% of her grades would be determined by the last two weeks of the semester. Sutton said she had no intention of asking faculty to rid classes of assignments, but rather wanted faculty to spread the assignments out over the semester. Sutton stated that she was organized and hard working, so if things were tough for her, she thought other students would have the same trouble. If the proposed changes were approved, she said it would allow better preparation for Finals Week, and if more time is available, students will not just cram for finals, which would enhance performance and improve learning and retention.

Montell commented that many students faced economic challenges, including increased difficulties in getting financial aid and working 20 hours or more at a job. Montell reiterated that the SGA did not want the academic schedule to be decreased, but rather to become more predictable. Students have to work and be involved in organizations, things that are important in future considerations. Although there was a problem with DW as currently described, a change could really make UK better.

Sottile commented that he has always been sympathetic to students' needs, since he had been a student for nine years to earn three degrees. Invariably, students of his have a final scheduled for Friday and the student asks for the final to be given during DW so the student does not have any finals on the Friday of Finals Week. He said he had never done that, thinking that often students are their own worse enemy. Sottile opined that a better change would be to have classes begin on Monday to allow two days of reading. In the fall there is orientation, etc., but such a change could be accomplished for the spring – a Monday start with two reading days prior to Finals Week.

Janacek stated that he often required a substantial paper to be due – under the revised language, when would that have to be due? Montell replied that it would be due the week prior to DW. In response to Viele, Quinn stated that the language pertaining to DW also applied to graduate students, as well as undergraduates. Viele asked if regularly scheduled assignments could continue during DW and Quinn replied that they could. Viele said that when he teaches during DW and puts the material on the final, the main complaint is that there was not any review or feedback on that material. Viele was concerned that the proposed changes to DW would result in a week or two less of actual instruction time.

Sutton responded by saying that there was no desire to eliminate instruction during DW, which is why section G was added; learning during DW is important. She said faculty could tell students via the syllabus how material during DW would be covered, which would also help students prepare for finals outside of class.

Jones asked a follow-up question pertaining to reports being due on the Friday of the week prior to DW – a literal reading would be that professors would give students less time in which to complete the assignment. He wanted to confirm that if students know on the first day of class that lecture material will continue to be delivered during DW, and that an outside project would be due sooner, it would help students by forcing them to have one less week for the outside project. Montell responded by saying that the idea was to allow reserve time for studying. Jones

stated that students could just turn in a report at any time, but that the change would mean projects were due sooner. Montell said that students would turn in reports when they were due, not usually early. The purpose of the revision was to reserve DW for studying.

Starr-LeBeau said that she also thought it was odd that there were no reading days at UK. She said she was all for academic instruction, but all that was required was 15 weeks, not the current 17 weeks. Since the spring semester had 16 weeks, it seemed that it would be fairly easy to squeeze in one reading day. Starr-LeBeau added that she supported the proposal at hand.

Gorringe asked whether pop quizzes and concept quizzes would be allowed during DW. Quinn replied that it depended on how it was structured – if it was a quiz, it would not be allowed, but if it was class participation, that was fine.

Gesund said that as he read the proposal, he would be forced to tell students that they had to turn in their final project on the Friday before DW, and have the exam at the regularly scheduled time, when up until now he has given students until the final exam to hand in the project. He did not think students would like the change. Sutton clarified that if the final project and exam made up one grade, the final project could be due during finals week.

Yost posed a question – if given the opportunity to choose one option or another, which would the students prefer: the revised DW policy, or reading days, and why? Montell replied that reading days could interfere with K Week, an event which is beneficial to students because it allows students to become acclimated to the University community. He said that in an ideal world, he would prefer reading days, but since that might interfere with instructional time, the proposed DW policy would be sufficient. The Chair commented that the Senate had rather rigorously explored changes to the calendar to include reading days, but it was an extremely complicated issue.

Sellnow **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.2.4.6*. Steiner **seconded**.

Yanarella stated that he respected the students proposing the change, and said they had done a good job of interacting with the SC during discussions about the proposed change. He said the SC was more or less split on the issue, and that he thought the proposed change would impinge on the rights of faculty to make reasoned decisions regarding when requirements would be due. He opined that the issue was truly one of time management by students; over the years, he had increasingly seen a need to put in interim deadlines for activities so that students did not wait until the last minute to proceed. Yanarella spoke of his intent to vote against the proposal. Steiner objected to Yanarella's characterization of SC opinions, saying that after some suggested revisions were incorporated, the SC was not split on whether or not to approve the proposed changes. Steiner said that students were taking responsibility for themselves and that taking this proposal through the approval process, up through the Senate, was a very good lesson and if it turns out a mistake was made, then students will learn from it and seek to modify the language. Saying he supported the initiative of the students and would vote in favor of the proposal, Steiner added that he appreciated the reasonable attitude of the students when presented with suggestions from the SC, and that he strongly supported the proposal.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.2.4.6*. The results of a voice vote were ambiguous, so a **vote** via a show of hands was conducted. The motion **passed** with 31 votes in favor, 17 opposed and five abstaining.

11. [Proposal to Change Foreign Language Requirement \(first reading\)](#)

Susan Carvalho, Gen Ed Reform Steering Committee convener, presented information on the proposed change to the foreign language requirement. Guest Carvalho explained that the KY Department of Education was moving towards statewide use of a test from Oregon, to assess foreign language competency among KY high school students. In a class of about 4,000 incoming freshmen, all but about 26 came in having met UK's foreign language requirement of the University Studies Program (current general education program, or USP). However, there was a feeling across campus and the state that the requirement of two years of high school foreign language training (or two semesters on campus) does not get to the level of competency required for global citizens. She said that requiring a third semester of study at the 201 level was discussed, but that would likely require incoming students to take 101- and 102-level classes at UK to succeed in a 201 class. Another reasonable option was to institute a competency, outcome-based test, and if a student is unable to pass that test, the student can have an intensive one-semester or a two-semester series of classes.

Carvalho explained that a test from Oregon was going to be used across the Commonwealth within the next two years, in the hopes that foreign language competency will be increased. The proposal in front of senators is that as part of the advising process, students would take a proficiency test in high school and be placed in foreign language classes at UK if necessary. If the student presents a passing score upon arrival at UK, the student will be exempted from further foreign language classes at the university level. When this requirement is rolled out across the state, all UK-bound Kentucky students will eventually come to UK with the results but until that time, the test will be available at UK. Carvalho noted that many people were concerned with a presumed "dropping" of the foreign language requirement from a new gen ed program, but said that the requirement would remain in place, but as an entrance requirement and not a graduation requirement. In essence, the process was changing from a seat-based requirement to a test to ensure competency.

Bollinger, referring to the Oregon STAMP test mentioned by Carvalho, asked if students receiving passing scores on the STAMP test will have the expected knowledge and proficiency. Carvalho replied in the affirmative, adding that testing will be instituted in fall 2010, but that remediation will not be instituted until there is sufficient data to review. Results will be immediately reported back to school districts. In response to a question from Rohr, Carvalho explained that there were some cultural measures in the STAMP test, but that it was primarily a language competency exam.

Zentall asked about future remediation needs. Carvalho explained that remediation data was hard to come by, and that the standing assumption is that at the present time at least half of students would not pass the test. Data has shown that districts that institute the STAMP test and take action on the results deliver better scoring students as time passes. Carvalho noted that there were a large number of students in majors that required additional layers of foreign language study, which would not be affected – only students in majors without foreign language requirements would be affected.

Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell reiterated that the proposed foreign language testing somewhat parallels the testing done for math placement – when students come to UK, their ACT math scores or placement scores determine the math course.

Steiner asked why foreign language would have a competency-based exam, as opposed to English, biology, etc. Carvalho replied that foreign language was the only admission requirement with no associated competency requirement. In response to a question from Humphrey, Carvalho said that the STAMP test was available for any language in which the students presents learning, and that native speakers have a different exam.

Peterson asked for information about the cost of the test. Carvalho replied that the test cost \$15 per student, and Dean Blackwell added that when a statewide license has been purchased, the test will be even cheaper. Carvalho added that she hoped students would push for testing to be conducted immediately after language instruction, rather than waiting to be tested later after being admitted to UK.

The Chair thanked everyone for a fruitful discussion.

12. Curricular Teams (first reading)

- Co-curricular Team Update

The Chair invited the chair of the Co-curricular Team, Erica Caton (director of advising in the College of Arts and Sciences) to offer some comments. Guest Caton reported that the 11th, or Co-curricular Team, had been reviewing the Learning Outcomes, as well as reports from hundreds of people developing new programs, ideas, initiatives, etc. to enhance student life. As a result of studying the Learning Outcomes and reports, and observing other curricular team meetings, the Co-curricular Team identified some programs to help students move toward the Learning Outcomes. Caton expressed appreciation for being part of the gen ed process. She also expressed her hope that senators would join her team in co-curricular discussions and submit suggestions for other ways that her group could further support the faculty. In response to a comment from the Chair, Caton confirmed that the Co-curricular Team's materials were on the gen ed web site.

- Overview

Carvalho began by stating that her current role pertained to guarding the process. Commenting upon her assumption that senators were already very familiar with the documents at hand ([Curricular Templates](#) and [Appendices](#)), she offered a presentation that went over key points. At the end of her presentation, she asked members of the curricular teams to stand, and they were then given a round of applause by senators.

- State of Academic Resources – Provost Subbaswamy

Provost Subbaswamy gave a presentation on the state of academic resources, specifically pertaining to the ongoing revisions to gen ed on campus. He solicited questions upon finishing his presentation.

Zook asked about a perceived movement to lecturers, instead of tenure-track faculty. Provost Subbaswamy said that in lower-level classes it is customary for many of the instructors to be teaching assistants (TAs) and lecturers. He explained that the size of graduate programs is

largely determined by lower division classes but over the past years there has been an attempt to get the right combination of faculty in the right mixture of courses.

Nadel stated an assumption that the financial modeling done by the Provost was based on current TA salaries and workloads, which are below UK's benchmarks. He wondered why, if it was so easy to carve out the Provost's forecasted \$4.4 million differential cost of gen ed (as compared to USP), could that not be done for raises, and how can the Provost say that the new gen ed would not be paid for out of raises? Provost Subbaswamy replied by saying that he did not state that the new gen ed would not be paid for out of raises, and that is why he put all the various numbers in front of senators for comparison purposes. He said that a TA could expect six credit hours of teaching, with a stipend of \$15,000 plus tuition scholarship of about \$10,000, which is roughly average. Nadel said that the TA workload in English was drastically higher than in any schools UK competes with. He said that the number of hours taught and the salary was much lower and that if the situation in English was at all similar to that of other departments, it would be difficult to compete for students. The Provost replied that UK would have to use both TAs and lecturers in a new gen ed, which will allow UK to rebalance the teaching load for TAs.

Eldred expressed concern that UK was creating a group of faculty (lecturers) who were not involved in governance and said that there needed to be an effort to revisit the inclusion of lecturers. Provost Subbaswamy said that he did not want to put the cart before the horse – there was much debate among benchmarks and that UK would not reinvent the wheel, but rather join a national conversation. The Chair suggested Eldred express her concerns to him after the meeting.

Wood asked a question pertaining to the timeline in the Provost's presentation. She said that one very creative solution was to have a line item increase in tuition to support gen ed for the fiscal year/budget year 2011 – 2012 and 2012 – 2013. She asked if it was correct to assume that students will be admitted into a new gen ed only if an implementation is approved for fall 2011, which would allow the Provost time to fund the proposal. The Provost replied affirmatively, saying that he would explicitly return to the Senate before implementation would begin. Until senators are satisfied that a budget is in place and the University can move ahead, nothing would go forward. What the Senate would review (and perhaps approve) in May will be the course templates, which would give the green light to begin discussions on vetting courses. Any suspension of USP and a subsequent introduction of a new gen ed is a Senate prerogative. In response to Wood, the Provost affirmed that introduction of a new gen ed will be a separate action taken by the Senate in the future.

There being no further questions for the Provost, the Chair thought it was appropriate to move on to discussions of each course template.

- Presentation on Individual Curricular Teams (1 – 10)

The Chair explained his intent to allow senators the opportunity to discuss each curricular template individually, and asked that senators confine their comments to substantive issues, not fixing grammar, etc.

Intellectual Inquiry (Humanities, Natural/Physical/Mathematical Sciences, Social Sciences, Creativity and the Arts)

There were no comments or questions about any of the four courses in this area.

Composition and Communication (Composition and Communication I, Composition and Communication II)

Carvalho said that the Composition and Communications (C&C) teams would henceforth meet as one group, with joint conveners Roxanne Mountford and Deanna Sellnow. Carvalho noted that the information in the handout was new.

Arnold asked for confirmation that the projects involved would be written and oral, which was affirmed by Guest Deanna Sellnow. In response to Arnold, Guest Roxanne Mountford said that in addition to written and oral delivery and small group interactions, it was possible that faculty could incorporate additional, digital technologies into the course as faculty so desire.

R. Jensen noted that he was part of the C&C team, but was unsure as to where the program would be housed. Sellnow explained that one thing that was discussed was that to successfully take advantage of the integrated nature, the instruction training and assessment for the two courses should be centralized with a group having representatives of oral, written and visual communications. She offered an example: someone in art history could teach a course for C&C with the right training to teach in a skill-based way. Sellnow added that it could even allow the Department of Art to fund TAs that they normally would not be able to.

In response to a question from Dean Blackwell, Sellnow explained that the new C&C courses would be sequential; the new draft includes writing and an introduction to other concepts of communication, while the second course would be much broader. R. Jensen asked about the offering of courses – Carvalho replied that students would end up in a fall-spring or spring-fall pairing of courses.

Sellnow and Mountford urged senators to submit questions and concerns to them via the Comments link on the web site, or via email, prior to the May Senate meeting.

Quantitative Reasoning (Quantitative Foundations, Statistical Inferential Reasoning)

There were no comments or questions about either of the courses in this area.

Citizenship (Community, Culture and Citizenship in the U.S.; Global Dynamics)

Guest Sue Roberts (College of Arts and Sciences) said that she opposed the sixth student learning outcome under “Global Dynamics.” Carvalho read the item aloud and noted that Ernie Yanarella was convener of that curricular team. Carvalho added that that a course would have to address just two of the four themes. Roberts stated that she was not opposed to any of the four themes and said they were good to teach. They were, however, redundant, having already been covered in the areas of diversity and equality. She thought of it as a trend, over-specifying aspects of a course, which could lead to an over-policing of course content, percentages, etc.

Yanarella said he felt that there were real conversations about gen ed going on, and referred to two recent forums in which curricular team members listened to get an idea of what was bothering faculty about some aspects. He said that he had heard from language faculty that putting percentages into course templates was going too far, and that it was far better to utilize the Learning Outcomes. Yanarella opined that the shift to course learning outcomes was a big move. Regarding number six, he said that the curricular team was bound by the statement in

Learning Outcome four, which was passed by the Senate, and used essentially the same language.

Arnold asked if the curricular team considered using parts of number six in other Learning Outcomes, rather than have number six stand alone. Yanarella replied that due to the language in Learning Outcome number four, it was not possible to do so without changing the intent of the language. Thus, such a structure was not discussed.

R. Jensen wondered when in the implementation timeline the Senate would address the issue of transfer students. Guest Greissman began by saying that general education was something that was required for students who start and finish at UK, part of the parcel including gen ed, college requirements and major requirements. Transfer students are protected from any university imposing an additional general education requirements if they were imposed at another institution, so students from other Kentucky institutions who finished those institutions' gen ed requirements cannot be required to complete UK's gen ed program. Greissman noted that a student could be required to complete a graduation writing requirement; he stated that a spreadsheet with transfer guidelines was available on the gen ed website.

Yost asked why UK students were being held to a higher standard than the looser requirement for transfer students. He suggested that students were given a message to go elsewhere first so they do not fall under more stringent requirements. Carvalho said that whether students matched up course for course was not necessarily an indication of a less rigorous program. Other universities statewide are watching closely, and she hoped that UK could serve as a model, especially since the evolving gen ed followed national research and trends; she thought cohesion of gen ed programs could occur over time. UK did not want to turn away students who spend a year or two at another institution. Carvalho added that individual programs would have to decide if a student was lacking an essential course, since it would be very difficult to create a campuswide safety net for students.

Saying that if UK is Kentucky's flagship university and should set an example, Yost wondered why UK did not say specifically that students must satisfy UK's gen ed requirements. The Chair explained that that particular loophole was enshrined in state law. Provost Subbaswamy said that UK had continuously been discouraged from doing anything radical, perhaps a case of the tail wagging the dog. He said the choice had been made to comply with the law and have a liberal interpretation, but that for the bulk of the students who start and end at UK, they will benefit from a robust gen ed and will still choose to attend UK. Carvalho added that the SC and Senate would necessarily make a transfer decision separate from the scheduled May Senate vote on the curricular teams.

Yost asked a question about whether or not there would be an internal conflict between what the curricular teams described for course sizes, if funding was only available for larger class sizes. Carvalho said that the Provost's calculations concluded that the new costs were manageable, and that the projected class sizes could be attained.

The Chair asked that senators send in comments, etc. as soon as possible. Provost Subbaswamy reminded senators that UK was accredited by SACS. The oral communications requirement of USP has been suspended for the past three years. In addition, UK must track outcomes and report on how UK is doing and how UK will improve based upon assessments. The accreditation

visit will be in December 2012, and by that time two cycles of assessment results must be in hand. Provost Subbaswamy ended by saying that senators were in a position to make UK compliant with accreditation at the next visit.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Aken,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Aken*; Arrington; Atwood; Barnes*; Bernard; Bishop; Blades; Brown, J.; Brown, S.; Campbell; Chappell*; Crofford; Desormeaux; English*; Enlow; Etensohn*; Fox; Graham; Hallman*; Hardin-Pierce; Harling; Hayes*; Hazard*; Heller; Hoffman; Hopenhayn; Houtz*; Huberfeld*; Hughes; Jackson; Jung; Kalika*; Kidwell*; Kirschling*; Leibfreid; Lester; Lorch; Luhan*; Marano; Martin; McCormick*; McCorvey; McNeill*; Mehra*; Miller*; Mobley; Moise; Moliterno*; Montell; Nardolillo; Neiman; Nokes; Parrot; Patwardhan; Pauly; Perman; Perry; Richard; Roberts; Sandidge*; Santhanam*; Sawaya*; Seales*; Segerstrom; Shay; Smith; Snow*; Speaks*; Stenhoff; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Swanson; Telling*; Terrell; Thompson; Todd; Tracy; Troske; Turner; Waterman; Watt; Webb; Whiteheart*; Williams; Wiseman; Witt, M.; Witt, D.; Woods; Wyatt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, May 15, 2009.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.