

University Senate
December 8, 2008

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 8, 2008 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 David Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02. He reminded senators to state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, and also to communicate with their constituencies.

1. Minutes from November 10 and Announcements

The Chair said that some changes for the November 10 minutes had been received. Yanarella **moved** to approve the minutes from November 10 as amended. Hayes **seconded**. There being no objection, the minutes from November 10 were **approved** as distributed.

Turning to waivers, the Chair relayed that there had been a student prepared to graduate with a master's degree in electrical engineering but had not been on the December degree list; after approval by the Graduate School, Chair Randall approved the inclusion of that student on behalf of SC and Senate for UK's December degree list. In addition, the SC waived *Senate Rules (SR) 5.1.8.5.A.2* to allow the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee to hear a request made after the "two-year window."

Moving to announcements, the Chair reported that the SC approved a change to *SR 5.3.1.2* ("Prohibition of Duplicate Credit") but did not bring the revision to Senate; it was an editorial change to clarify the original intent (remove "successfully").

Regarding the election of SC officers, the nomination period ran from December 4 through December 8; the election would be held at the December 15 SC meeting. The election of new SC members, chosen from eligible senators, began at noon and will run until Friday at noon; the Chair urged senators to vote.

The Chair explained that the SC approved a Distance Learning Form, as well as a set of Senate standards for syllabi. He said that the documents will be distributed in draft form to the campus community prior to bringing them to the Senate for review in February. There were no objections.

Exploratory use of Turnitin, plagiarism prevention and detection software, was continuing; the Chair said UK had a license to use it at a reduced cost for a pilot period; he said that questions and comments about the use of such software should be submitted to Ruth Beattie (rebeat1ATuky.edu), chair, Instructional Computing Committee. He asked Beattie to share additional information. Beattie said that the first of three training sessions had been held that morning for faculty who would use the

software in spring 2009. She said that the remaining two training sessions would be held later in the week, last for about an hour, and outline how to use the main program. The Chair thanked Beattie for her information.

2. Academic Calendars

The Chair solicited a motion for approval of the academic calendars ([2009 – 2010 Calendar](#); [2011 – 2012 Tentative Calendar](#); [2009 – 2010 Dentistry Calendar](#); [2011 – 2012 Tentative Dentistry Calendar](#); [2009 – 2010 Law Calendar](#); [2011 – 2012 Tentative Law Calendar](#); [2009 – 2010 Medicine Calendar](#); [2011 – 2012 Tentative Medicine Calendar](#)).

Chappell **moved** to approve the submitted academic calendars: 2009 – 2010 Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Dentistry Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Dentistry Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Law Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Law Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Medicine Calendar; and 2011 – 2012 Tentative Medicine Calendar. Hayes **seconded**.

H. Anderson asked about the February, March and April 2009 dates on the first page of the calendar for the 2009 – 2010 academic year; she wondered if the page was mistakenly labeled as pertaining to fall 2009, when it should really be labeled as spring 2009. Mrs. Brothers explained that those were deadlines that pertained to the fall 2009 semester, even though the deadlines themselves fell in a previous semester.

There being no further comments or discussion, a **vote** was held and the motion to approve the 2009 – 2010 Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Dentistry Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Dentistry Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Law Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Law Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Medicine Calendar; and 2011 – 2012 Tentative Medicine Calendar **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed Name Change: Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology

The Chair introduced the interim dean for the College of Education, Rosetta Sandidge; Guest Tom Prout said he was standing in for the department chair. Prout explained that there were three academic strands in the department – the name change to “Educational, Counseling and School Psychology” would better reflect the department’s activities for a number of years. Each of the three programs was accredited separately, and a number of other universities had similar names to reflect departments with programs such as the one at UK.

The Chair noted that the proposal came from the SC with a positive recommendation. D. Anderson **moved** to approve the name change of the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology to the Department of Educational, School and Counseling Psychology, effective immediately. Jensen **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was held and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Proposed Name Change: Department of Diagnostic Radiology

The Chair said that the proposal came from the SC with a positive recommendation. He asked radiologist Michael Brooks to explain the proposal. Guest Brooks said that this name change was likewise being done to better reflect the activities of the department. He said that the department had incorporated both diagnostic and interventional radiology. Changing the name would also bring them into line with the titles of similar departments around the country.

Wermeling moved to approve the name change of the Department of Diagnostic Radiology to the Department of Radiology, effective immediately. McCormick **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. [New University Scholars Program: BS Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering and MS Biomedical Engineering](#)

The Chair introduced Scott Shearer, from the Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering. Guest Shearer explained that there was an undergraduate prep curriculum for the biomedical engineering program, but no full undergraduate program. He said there was a desire for students in their senior year to be able to double count some credits for the BS in Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering and also for an MS in Biomedical Engineering; it would encourage undergraduates to remain at UK for their master's degree.

D. Williams **moved** to approve the University Scholars Program for a BS in Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering combined with an MS in Biomedical Engineering. Aken **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. [Expand University Scholars Program to Doctoral Students](#)

Dean Blackwell explained that the proposal would apply to doctoral programs that do not require a candidate's earning an intermediate master's degree and would be developed by program choice; an expansion to include doctoral credit for undergraduate students would not be mandatory for any graduate program. A program could apply with a specified curriculum for up to 12 hours of shared coursework, which would count for undergraduate and doctoral credit. Minimum GPA requirements would apply, and it would only be for programs in fields where it is acceptable to have both an undergraduate and graduate degree from the same institution. Dean Blackwell said that it would not apply to all disciplines, but it would be available to those programs that could use it as a tool to recruit and retain the best and brightest students into doctoral programs. She said all requests for University Scholars Programs for doctoral programs would have to come before the Senate.

Snow **moved** to approve the expansion of the University Scholars Program to include doctoral students. Hallman **seconded**. The Chair called for questions.

D. Anderson noted that she was in favor of the proposal, but wondered if a student would have an opportunity to stop off for a master's degree if pursuit of the doctoral degree were ended. Dean Blackwell replied that the student would have the option to stop out with a master's degree if the program offered a master's degree en passant. Otherwise, that would not be an option.

There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the expansion of the University Scholars Program to include doctoral students and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. New Program: BS Equine Science and Management

The Chair invited Mike Mullen, associate dean for academic programs in the College of Agriculture (CoA), to explain the proposal. Guest Mullen said that the CoA began an equine initiative in 2005 because of a perception that CoA had not done its best to serve the equine industry. CoA has a strong research program and an equine nutrition component of the animal science degree, but no undergraduate equine degree. Such degrees did exist, but not in Kentucky. Mullen shared information about the numbers of students who were currently enrolled and/or showing interest in an individualized degree program in equine studies.

Mullen said that CoA had undergone substantial reallocations of its internal budgets for the proposed new program; faculty had been hired, there was a new covered outdoor teaching area at Maine Chance Farm and there was interest within the development office for building a teaching and outreach center, also at Maine Chance Farm.

D. Williams **moved** to approve the request for a new bachelor of science degree in Equine Management and Science. D. Anderson **seconded**. The Chair added that the proposal had been approved by the SC, with a positive recommendation.

The Chair recognized Susan Skees. Guest Skees commented that the name of the program on the PowerPoint slide and in the agenda was incorrect – it should be “Equine Science and Management.” The Chair thanked her for the correction.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve a new BS in Equine Science and Management and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Motion from Senate Council to Suspend the Rules

The Chair prefaced his remarks about the SC's motion by saying that he wanted all concerns pertaining to the Learning Outcomes (LO) to be heard during the meeting. He said that two concerns had been submitted to the Office of the Senate Council – he would go over those in detail shortly.

The Chair explained that the SC preferred the LO not be amended on the fly; the LO were a culmination of four years of effort and a great deal of time and discussion have

been put into the matter. He said it was unlikely that the proposal could be improved by random amendments from the floor. He said that the SC had made a motion to suspend the rules; coming from the SC, it required no second. If the motion to suspend the rules failed, the Chair said that he would solicit a motion to approve the LO and then discuss them, but return the LO to the General Education Reform Steering Committee (GERSC) prior to a vote.

The Chair requested senators approve the motion to suspend the rules; upon approval of that motion, any concerns about the LO would be discussed, as well as a full discussion on the LO themselves. The Chair said that if the LO were fatally flawed, senators should not vote to approve. If the LO were approved, the next step would be to create curriculum committees; the Senate would have the opportunity to vote on the curriculum guidelines in the spring semester. The Chair noted that those would also require serious consideration.

The Chair read the motion from the SC:

Due to extensive prior opportunities for input into a new gen ed program, the Senate Council moves to suspend the right to propose amendments to the Learning Outcomes during the Senate's discussion, with the exception of friendly amendments to correct spelling, grammar or factual inaccuracies in the text.

The Chair stated that any senator with a question about the nature of the motion should ask; there were no raised hands. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to suspend the right to propose amendments to the Learning Outcomes during the Senate's discussion, with the exception of friendly amendments to correct spelling, grammar or factual inaccuracies in the text. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

9. [Gen Ed Curriculum Discussion – Learning Outcomes \(second reading and vote\)](#)

The Chair named all the members of GERSC (Dr. Susan Carvalho, convener (Hispanic Studies); Dr. Ruth Beattie (Biology); Dr. Carl Lee (Math); Dr. Pat Burkhart (Nursing); Mr. Shawn Livingston (Library); Dr. Janet Eldred (English); Dr. Bill Rayens (Statistics); Dr. Sonja Feist-Price (Special Education); Dr. Jeff Rogers (Language); Dr. Larry Grabau (Soil Science); Dr. Deanna Sellnow (Communication); Dr. Jane Jensen (Educational Policy); Dr. Gerry Swan (Curriculum and Instruction); Dr. Nancy Johnson (Gatton College of Business and Economics); Dr. Bruce Walcott (Electrical Engineering); Dr. Ernie Yanarella (Political Science); Dr. Ben Withers (Art); Dr. Kaveh Tagavi (immediate past SC chair); and Dr. David Randall (SC Chair)). The Chair asked those who were present to stand. Senators recognized them with a round of applause.

The Chair said that the recommendation of the SC was to approve the LO. He solicited a motion to put it on the floor. Hayes **moved** to approve the Learning Outcomes as distributed in the agenda. D. Williams **seconded**.

Some [concerns](#) had been submitted to the Senate Council. The Chair said that a summary of each concern was on the PowerPoint slides and read the first received concern, which pertained to LO#3:

We greatly appreciate the willingness of the GenEd Reform Steering Committee to listen to our arguments in favor of explicitly incorporating training in logical reasoning (critical thinking) into the Learning Outcomes, and thus we agree that the new version of LO III is a major improvement on the previous version, since logic is now at least mentioned by name.

Unfortunately, it appears that the revised version of LO III continues to construe instruction in reasoning and inference narrowly as instruction in "Quantitative Reasoning," which remains the general heading of LO III, despite the somewhat incongruous mention of logic in the text of Outcomes and Assessment Framework and Curricular Framework.

More peculiar still ... is the conception of a course (indeed of two courses) that will successfully combine instruction in logic, statistics, and mathematics. No one in the Philosophy Department has any idea what such a course would look like, and we have serious doubts about our abilities to contribute to such a course were it to be instituted.

...Perhaps such a course in mathematics-statistics-logic could in fact be constructed and staffed. If so, we are quite willing to play a major role both in the initial planning and eventual staffing of the same. So if the Learning Outcomes are approved by the Senate in their present form ... we will do our best to find a way to work within these Outcomes, despite our principled and practical reservations concerning the same.

The Chair said that if any senator needed clarification of the concern, the time to ask was then. He suggested that GERSC's convener, Carvalho, respond to the first concern.

Guest Carvalho said that senators should return to GERSC's previous rationale for the same issues that were distributed before the last call for concerns. She said that GERSC's discussions were fully reflected in that rationale. Carvalho invited GERSC member Carl Lee to address what such a course would look like.

Guest Lee explained that GERSC's rationale was in part a reflection of the Design Principle (DP) on quantitative reasoning. He said that 15 to 20 years' worth of literature on quantitative reasoning was reviewed; in addition, a number of institutions have looked at similar issues. Lee said it was reasonable to foresee a course on logic, mathematics and statistics with a real focus on looking at real-world problems, not relying on algebra and geometry, but rather on how students can come to address statements and arguments. Lee showed senators a textbook and explained that the book began with what they termed "critical reasoning and logic." The book was broken into modular sections so a semester-long course could be developed. He added that there were similar courses at UK's benchmarks.

The Chair said that if any senator wanted to address this particular concern, they should do so immediately.

Snow asked for clarification on the actual number of individuals captured in the use of "we" in the first concern. Tagavi said that it referred to the Department of Philosophy. The Chair added that it was a statement made by the chair of that department, after consultation with all of Philosophy's faculty. The Chair said that while he had restricted participation in the discussion to senators, he thought it would be appropriate for the author of the concern, who was present, to comment on the memo he had written. The Chair recognized Dan Breazeale, interim chair of the Department of Philosophy.

Guest Breazeale said that the concern of the department was that the portions of the DP that dealt with logic were not reflected in the LO, which was the argument that he had made in all his communications about the LO. He said that there were seven DP but only four LO, so there was bound to be more than one DP reflected in one or more of the LO. Breazeale opined that GERSC seemed to think that because there was a DP for quantitative reasoning, it was necessary to have one LO for quantitative reasoning. Breazeale spoke in favor of including critical thinking and logic.

Gesund said that he had dealt with a fair amount of math throughout his career; he said that he had always been taught that math was symbolic logic.

The Chair asked for other comments. Yanarella said that within GERSC, the understanding had been that critical thinking was quite a bit broader than the way it had been operationalized in the letters sent from Philosophy. GERSC envisioned a critical thinking perspective in at least three of the LO, and perhaps the fourth. Yanarella noted that he served as chair of the "citizenship" subcommittee for LO#4. In their efforts to elaborate on the specifics of LO#4, they sought to incorporate a strong element of critical thinking and were helped by Breazeale's discussions with GERSC and with the subcommittee. Yanarella said that there was not a fundamentalist orientation to values, nor was GERSC concerned with a kind of civics textbook-type of approach; the subcommittee for LO#4 was concerned with including real-world examples that would

allow students to deal with nuances, dilemmas and the trade-offs that are a part of a maturing mind. Yanarella said that apart from understanding critical thinking in the way described by Breazeale, GERSC understood critical thinking in a more expansive way.

The Chair asked for other comments on the first concern. There being none, the Chair then turned to the second received concern. He directed senators to a summary of the concern on the overhead slide, noting that the complete concern was available in the handout. The Chair said that the concern was from a senator and he read aloud:

Concern with blank check that this proposal seems to contain. Faculty are asked to trust that there will be no increase in number of credit hours required for graduation, but a (future) next group will provide details regarding specific courses.

Requests assurances that the forthcoming Gen Ed reform will not lead to an increase in the credit hours needed for graduation for any and all UK programs that already have more than 120 hours required for graduation.

The Chair stated that any senator needing clarification of the concern should request it. No hands were raised. The Chair asked Carvalho for her comments. Carvalho replied that the entire process relied on the participation of every college and department. She said that faculty should be cognizant of possible issues and let GERSC/Carvalho know of any problems. She said that Bruce Walcott (GERSC member) had also mentioned a similar concern.

Guest Walcott said that in the College of Engineering (CoE), they had done a “worst case scenario” exercise – assuming that none of the hard-core math/science courses would no longer be part of a revised gen ed program; if so, they found that there would be an increase in credit hours for three programs. He said the worst case was for the biopharmaceutical engineering program for which four additional credit hours would be required. Walcott said that CoE was accustomed to having learning outcomes for all its courses; he said that most engineering senators and faculty applauded the process that led GERSC. However, there was some discomfort with that last little leap of faith that a revision to gen ed would not increase a program’s credit hour requirements.

Wermeling said that the College of Pharmacy (CoP) was also reviewing similar concerns; he reminded senators that he had raised such a question during the November Senate meeting. Wermeling said there were about two to three years of pharmacy prerequisites and that a student had to be eligible to graduate in order to move forward through the program; all requirements had to be met at the same time for enrollment. Wermeling explained that the pre-pharmacy curriculum was already at 19 - 20 hours per semester, including chemistry, physics, math, etc. Adding another year to the two-year pre-pharmacy program would be a significant time and financial burden for students. He

noted that an associate dean within CoP also noted that the “devil was in the details” and that faculty would have to trust that CoP students would not be burdened by a revised gen ed.

The Chair solicited additional comments about this concern, but none were forthcoming.

Carvalho said that she had received an email concern late during the previous week that had not been circulated officially through the Senate Council. A member of the Department of History expressed concern about an issue that GERSC had dealt with via a small revision. The request was that “rights and responsibilities” be added to LO#4. Carvalho said that GERSC had added a broader phrase: “ethical dilemmas, conflicts, and trade-offs.” She thought that was sufficient and replied as such to the sender, but had not received a reply.

Starr-LeBeau said that she had written the email that Carvalho referred to. She said that the Department of History remained very concerned, even though they were gratified that the notion of historical context had been added to LO#4; a broader notion of citizenship was still desired. Starr-LeBeau said as written, a course on the Bill of Rights would not qualify under LO#4, even though the DP would seem to allow it. She said that LO#4 really focused on one element of citizenship, that of diversity. While there was no objection to a sensitivity to diversity, there was an objection to labeling everything important about citizenship as pertaining to diversity. It was that concern that caused her to send the email – History really preferred the inclusion of “rights and responsibilities.” She said that there was another possible problem with LO#4 – when individuals from outside UK, including legislators, learned that citizenship courses dealt with diversity but not with traditional citizenship classes, it might generate accusations of left-wing politics. Starr-LeBeau said that it should be called a diversity requirement if that was intended and remove references to citizenship. She said that other humanities areas were also concerned, not just History.

Yanarella replied that in terms of evolution of LO#4 and the Outcomes and Assessment Framework, and the Curricular Framework, he thought it unlikely that GERSC members were concerned with political correctness and also unlikely that legislators would be weighed down by LO#4 as a focus for scrutiny and animus. He said that GERSC had sought to operationalize LO#4 with two courses, one focusing on diversity issues but not just diversity, and another on global dynamics, but not just global dynamics. Other potential foci include applied ethics, change over time, comparative/cross-national issues, and power and resistance. Yanarella said that a wide array of aspects should be incorporated into any course meeting those requirements. He said that such matters should be handed off to curricular teams, who would, hopefully, operate in continuity with past discussions. Yanarella thought it odd that LO#4 should be typified as only focusing on diversity.

Carvalho explained that in the way LO#4 had been fashioned, a course on the Bill of Rights would indeed qualify, but the course would need to include a connection to the present world and how the Bill of Rights relates to a contemporary world.

GERSC member Rogers agreed with Carvalho's description. Guest Rogers said that such courses were specifically discussed as the type that should be included. GERSC did not envision a historical context of the Bill of Rights with no connection to today – Rogers said that what was envisioned was an engaging curriculum in which students have a forum to discuss those types of topics.

Starr-LeBeau read from the first sentence of LO#4: "Students will recognize historical and cultural differences arising from issues such as...." Rogers contended that it meant that a discussion on the Bill of Rights would have to include mentioning that at the time, the rights outlined pertained only to white men. He said a course on the Bill of Rights that would be included in gen ed could not discuss the topic in the abstract, but rather should apply it to today.

Hallman spoke in favor of Starr-LeBeau's comments. She said that as she has previously mentioned, she still did not understand why the language in the LO could not be revised or rewritten.

Yanarella said that if the Senate approved the LO, a set of curricular teams would begin refining the starting points that GERSC had tried to lay down, pertaining to outcomes. He expressed an inability to say something about the concerns of History that had not already been said. Referring to a previous statement from Carvalho, Yanarella said that some language had already been incorporated to accommodate the concerns of the Department of Philosophy. He went on to say that as a political scientist, from his disciplinary perspective he was not terribly fond of the phrase "rights and responsibilities"; he said it focused on ideas he associated with a civics textbook-type of approach. Yanarella added that he was confident that Starr-LeBeau and her colleagues had similar concerns about language from their collective perspective but that he was satisfied that the LO as defined by GERSC did indeed encompass the phrase "rights and responsibilities."

The Chair said that he was not hearing new comments on the matter. GERSC member and Guest Sellnow spoke and said that she was not convinced of the need for concern on the part of CoP and CoE as it related to the number of credit hours; she pointed to the decrease in credits required to complete the new gen ed (30 credit hours) as opposed to the current University Studies Program (45 credit hours).

The Chair solicited other comments. Roorda spoke and introduced himself as director of the writing program. He apologized for not formally submitting his concerns and went on to read aloud a prepared statement outlining his concerns. Simply put, Roorda's concerns were two-fold: 1. Because LO#2 calls for six credit hours (two courses, three

credits each), the first-year writing course would drop from four credit hours to three, which would limit the ability of students to meet learning outcomes; and 2. It would be difficult to create a sequence of courses of instruction in communications across two colleges (Arts and Sciences, and Communications and Information Studies). Roorda was also concerned about remediation for students, and included a comment that an increase in the number of credits for LO#2 by one credit hour would alleviate some of his overall concerns. The Chair asked Roorda to send the statement to the Office of the Senate Council.

Tagavi said that with regards to an increase in credit hours, the DP specifically called for 30 credit hours so any change to the number of credit hours would necessitate a reversion back in the approval process to when the Senate approved the DP.

Carvalho said that GERSC looked at many of UK's benchmarks when discussing LO#2. She said that the proposal assumed the continuation of the Graduation Writing Requirement; therefore, UK had moved from six credit hours of mandated writing to three credit hours plus three credit hours (currently), and would move (with the passage of the LO) to four credit hours plus three credit hours. She said that reinstating ENG 101 might be of benefit to some students requiring remediation. She said another option might be to have a four credit-hour course to get them up to speed. She asked Richard Greissman (assistant provost for program support and Provost's liaison to SC) to speak to the issue of remediation.

Guest Greissman explained that the state legislature has mandated, and the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) has put into effect, a requirement that students, as of fall 2009, will be tested for placement if their ACT scores fall below a certain level. [Part of Roorda's concern was that there was no mechanism in place to identify students in need of remediation.] Therefore, a test will already be in place to identify such students, and testing would begin in spring 2009 and continue during the summer. He said that the testing process might not identify all the students about whom Roorda expressed concern, but said it would capture many of them. Roorda said he did not want to belabor the point, but commented that the ACT did not test writing ability, so his professional opinion was that there was little merit in using ACT scores to anticipate writing ability.

Yanarella commented that it was not within the scope of authority for GERSC to consider issues of implementation and operationalization. Each LO would present formidable challenges to the curricular teams, but it was still worthwhile for the curricular teams to take up the challenge.

The Chair asked if any other senator had comments to make. Jones said that many of the comments from the day's meeting had pertained to budget issues. He asked about when, in the future, there would be an intersection between conversation and budget implications. The Chair replied that when he spoke to the Provost about the

matter, Provost Subbaswamy thought it was preliminary to discuss financial aspects at the current time. The Provost had said that it was the job of the faculty to design the best gen ed program possible. If budgetary issues were encountered, things might be implemented incrementally. At any rate, a discussion of finances at the present time would be premature.

Greissman added that, assuming Senate approval of the LO, the curricular teams would hopefully present their efforts to the Senate in the spring. When the Senate is able to present the Provost with an acceptable “pool” of courses, the Provost will be better able to give a response on finances. Greissman said that he assumed any final vote by the Senate on implementation would come after the Provost responded to a request for resources.

The Chair recognized Scott Yost, from the College of Engineering. Guest Yost said that he had written the email regarding concerns about credit hours. He said that he had received a response from the SC; he also thanked GERSC for its efforts. In CoE, it was customary to look at courses from the perspective of learning outcomes and that in general, the college appreciated the move to such assessment. Yost went on to explain that engineering programs customarily had more than 120 required hours. Currently, accreditation required 130 to 134 credit hours to graduate; a significant amount of double-dipping was currently in place.

When the oral communications requirement was suspended by the Senate, conversely, CoE’s accrediting agency did not allow CoE to suspend the requirements. He acknowledged that some concerns might be exaggerated, but said that with a starting point of 130 credit hours, and then a drop back of 45 credit hours and then adding the 30 gen ed credit hours, there could be significant double-dipping issues. Yost asked for a formal stipulation that approval of a new gen ed would not negatively affect programs over 120 hours. Although CoE advertised a four-year program, in reality it was closer to four and a half years. Yost spoke in favor of the LO, and said that CoE was also favorably inclined to the LO, but that there was still concern about a new gen ed creating a situation in which it would take CoE students even longer to graduate, just to accommodate gen ed courses. He ended his comments by saying that he was asking for an assurance in writing; the issue should not be described as something to solely be addressed by a department or college on its own.

The Chair asked if there were any further comments – no hands were raised. The Chair thanked senators for their participation in the discussion and announced that it would be appropriate to hold a vote.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the Learning Outcomes as distributed in the agenda. The motion **passed** with an overwhelming majority in favor and two opposed.

The Chair thanked GERSC for all its efforts and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Aken,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Arnold; Atwood; Badger*; Bernard; Blades; Bollinger; Brown; Bush; Cantagallo*; Case; Crofford; Desormeaux; Enlow; Etensohn; Ford; Fox; Graham; Griffith; Hardesty; Hardin-Pierce; Hazard; Heller; Hoffman; Hughes; Jackson, V.; Jackson, J.; Jensen; Jung; Leibfreid; Lester; Lorch; Luhan; Marano; Martin; McCorvey; McNeill*; Mehra; Mendiondo*; Miller; Mobley; Moise; Montell; Nardolillo; Neiman*; Parrot; Patwardhan; Pauly; Perman; Rauf; Ray; Richard; Roberts; Rohr; Segerstrom*; Shay; Smith; Speaks; Suarez*; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Swanson; Tagavi; Telling*; Terrell; Thompson; Todd; Tracy; Troske; Turner; Waterman; Webb; Williams; Wiseman; Witt, M.; Witt, D.; Woods; Wyatt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, February 3, 2009.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.