

**Interim General Education Oversight Committee  
Tentative Agenda for October 8, 2010**

**Information Items**

1. Update on vetting process (and problems, fine tuning?)
2. Facilitator form was developed
3. Problems with forms?
4. Notification for faculty after proposal passes GEOC

**Items on Consent Agenda – Voted on as a block**

1. GWS 200: Recommendation from Dr. Jane Jensen that this submission should move forward (2-0 vote by referees).
2. ENT 110: Recommendation from Dr. Ruth Beattie that this submission should move forward (2-0 vote by referees).
3. PHY 120: Recommendation from Dr. Ruth Beattie that this submission should move forward (2-0 vote by referees).

**Items to discuss**

1. Suggested policy language to be sent to Mike Mullen
2. Development of FAQ list – seeking additions
3. How to proceed with naming of the curriculum
4. What role you see GEOC playing in Gen Ed assessment

## Details on Discussion Items

### 1. Policy Language

- a. K-course sequence – When more than one course is submitted with the intention that a certain General Education area be satisfied by the group, the Interim General Education Oversight Committee recommended:
  - i. That departments be required, when submitting such a request, to construct a complete and concise curricular map detailing how the outcomes of those k courses map to the Area Outcomes
  - ii. To recommend acceptance of k-course sequences provided the sequence met the appropriate Area template requirements as a group.
- b. Topics courses and courses requiring subtitles – The Interim General Education Oversight Committee recommended:
  - i. Departments should submit a *single* syllabus for each topics course, or course requiring a subtitle. This syllabus should make the case for how subtitled courses that are offered consistent with the overall organizing principle for that course category address the same set of learning outcomes, which can in turn be mapped to the Area outcomes.
  - ii. Once the overarching generic syllabus has been approved for Gen Ed, courses with different subtitles can be offered as Gen Ed within that category for a period of four years without separate syllabi having to be submitted.
  - iii. That it become the responsibility of the submitting department's Director of Undergraduate Studies to monitor the learning outcomes for courses with varying subtitles, as they arise, to make sure those courses can be mapped to the outcomes on the approved syllabus which was, in turn, mapped to the Area outcomes.
  - iv. Every four years such departments submit to the Office of Undergraduate Education an accounting of actual courses offered as subtitles or topical courses under the approved, generic syllabus, with a summary of the justifications for how each mapped to the approved syllabus outcomes. Upon successful review in UE the approved syllabus would become Gen Ed approved for another four years. An unsuccessful review would lead to temporary suspension of the approval of the course (and all subtitles and topics) for General Education credit.
- c. Enrollment restrictions – The Interim General Education Oversight Committee recommended:
  - i. That courses could be restricted as Department's saw fit (say to majors)
  - ii. That no additional resources be made available to deliver such courses if they were part of the major

## 2. Suggestions for FAQ list

- A. Can I propose a one-time-only Gen Ed course? (no, too much like work; but you can propose a pilot A&S 100 or 300 with the expectation that you will turn it into a permanent course with its own name and # soon thereafter).
- B. Our department has a 'special topics in X' course number: can we propose one section as Gen Ed, but not other sections? (no, every section of a given course must be Gen Ed; the Gen Ed proposal can be written in such a way as to require ALL 'special topics' of this course to satisfy the Gen Ed learning outcomes for the specific area)
- C. (Variation of 2): Course ABC 123 has been approved as a Gen Ed course. Can we teach section 001 as Gen Ed, but 002 as non-Gen Ed? (no, all sections of a single course must be Gen Ed; a Gen Ed designation is permanent).
- D. Can I teach course X as a Gen Ed course this year, and my colleague teach it next year as non-Gen Ed? (no, see 3 above)
- E. I am submitting a course for Gen Ed approval: does my course have to satisfy ALL the learning outcomes listed on the form? \_\_\_\_\_?
- F. I proposed a Gen Ed course in the original pilot phase (2009). My pilot course was approved. Do I have to resubmit Gen Ed paperwork for the REAL (not pilot) course? (NO, spare us more paperwork. Pilot approval = REAL approval.)
- G. I proposed a Gen Ed course in the original pilot phase (2009). My pilot course was approved. Does my course now automatically exist as a real course? And, Will the GEOC fill out my paperwork for me? (No, unfortunately, YOU must now prepare the documentation required by the Senate to give your course its own name and number; all paperwork must be submitted to your college undergraduate committee.)
- H. Is it a requirement that all Gen Ed courses must be taught by a full faculty member? No.
- I. Are some Gen Ed courses offered online during the summer session? Yes.
- J. What do programs use as place holders for Gen Ed Courses that have not yet been developed? (e.g., Stats XXX; requirement for nursing students)
- K. To whom do I talk about available course numbers for this 100-level course?
- L. Where do I find the list of documents that need to be sent when one sends a course to the UGC for approval?
- M. Who needs to be sent these documents?

### 3. Naming the Curriculum (Our Discussion to This Point)

Started: 7/27/2010 10:15 AM

[View Properties](#)  [Reply](#)



Rayens, William S

#### **Naming the Program**

Let's start some discussion about naming the new Gen Ed program. Several options have been suggested over the last couple of years:

1. Coming up with a name we can all agree on and asking the Senate to accept that name
2. Creating a short list of names and asking for faculty and/or student feedback on which name is preferred (could created a Zoomerang survey to collect the opinions)
3. Conduct student focus groups with the goal of converging toward a particular type of name, if not a particular name (e.g. does it reflect something unique about U.K. or is it less parochial than that?).
4. Have an open ended competition asking students to name the program. Give an iPad or something to the winner, and some smaller prizes to the second and third place winners.

I am not offering my opinion on any of these options at the moment and they are not ordered in any particular way. What do you all think?

Posted: 8/2/2010 12:05 PM

[View Properties](#)  [Reply](#)



Yanarella, Ernest J

I have been open and persistent in touting "Twenty-first Century Studies" (TCS) as my preferred name for the new General Education program. While I am a democrat in most things, I have real hesitations turning the selection of the name into a popularity contest. (Remember "Unbridled Spirit"?) No name will achieve unanimity; all names will mobilize some complaints. In the end, somebody, group, or representative body will need to come up with or ratify a name or label or brand that gives the new General Education program some measure of coherence.

My rationale for "Twenty-first Century Studies" is two-fold. First, following (and indeed participating in) the discussions in AAC&U forums, where Carol Geary Schneider and others came to argue for a general education thrust in college from the 20th Century University to the Twenty-first Century Academy. As the outline of the latter was described by Schneider and others, this emerging model of general education emphasized learning outcomes, urged critical thinking over memorization of content, etc. (Some of you may still have that two-page handout I distribute some years back in the process. That model has remained in the back of my mind over these past five or six years of reform effort at the University of Kentucky.

Second, if we consider what inroads in reform we have tried to make in this General Education reform initiative, it generally maps onto the change-over AAC&U has both perceived and sought to foster--i.e., a shift from a program of general study popularized in the sixties to a course of general study that seeks to be in tune with emerging twenty-first century realities about work and life, society and environment, place and globe. Certainly, this shift has not always been well- or self-consciously articulated in the many team and committee discussions. But I believe the spirit (though never entirely "unbridled"! ) was a continual impetus.

For these two reasons, I urge us to give careful consideration to this name. Needless to say, I know there will be push-back for a variety of good intellectual and entrenched disciplinary reasons. Some historians will argue that it is too presentist in its connotations. But we have already fought that battle on other fronts. If need be, we can fight it again.

Finally, a word on process. It is my feeling that any name that the oversight committee might embrace with a strong enough rationale would pass the University Senate, if carefully presented. If, in addition, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Provost, and President endorsed it, that much more gravitas would be mobilized in its favor. Turning the name into a plebescitarian vote strikes me as the least sensible way to settle on a name. If say three names were chosen for voting, it seems likely to me that that lowest common denominator and the symbolically most vacuous label would win.

If however this process is chosen by the committee and other powers-that-be, I urge the inclusion of the best rationale for each in any balloting so that there be some continuity between those of us who have participated in this reform effort off-and-on and the sense or meaning of any of the candidates for naming the program. Implicit in what I have argued is that there should be some link between symbolic meaning and coherence in the name of the program and the driving goals of the program itself.

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 8/2/2010 2:04 PM

[View Properties](#)  [Reply](#)



Lane, Derek R

I'm not opposed the the "Twenty-first Century Studies" label proposed by Ernie. Though it does sound a bit like the "global studies" label that was used to describe a specific program--as opposed to a general education curriculum. I also like "UK Signature Curriculum." I am against labels like "USP." I would like to distance this new curriculum from the older label. Ultimately, who is charged with NAMING this curriculum? Is that the charge of our committee? -Derek

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 8/2/2010 3:06 PM

[View Properties](#)  [Reply](#)



Rayens, William S

It isn't clear (surprised :- ) ?) who is in charge of naming the curriculum. Best bet is for GEOC to agree on something and if we have Mike's support, approach the Senate Council for approval.

This is not my vote, but it is sure to come up. Have you all considered something with a more common feel like "Wildcat Studies" or "The Wildcat Curriculum". Course then when someone says they've finished with their WC we may get the wrong idea about what they've just completed. In any case, let's also think about what is going to catch the attention of kids and parents who are interested in UK. Any of your suggestions so far may be just fine for that.

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 8/2/2010 3:47 PM

[View Properties](#)  [Reply](#)



Yanarella, Ernest J

All--

The committee will go where a sense of the committee takes it on this issue. The issue of naming is important, and I think this committee should initiate the process and report to Mike and then on the basis of his advice go from there.

Personally, I recognize Derek's point about the possibility of "Twenty-first Century Studies" being associated with the old "Global Studies" program. But I think that linkage is extremely weak and should not deter us from embracing my suggestion if there is enough support. I grant that Miami University of Ohio has do right well with a label as general and unclarifying as the "Miami Plan." So I could live with some variation on Bill's suggestion of the "Wildcat Curriculum," though I again would like the label to carry with it some semblance of what is distinctive and meaningful in the new program.

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 8/3/2010 9:26 AM

[View Properties](#) [Reply](#)



Petrone, Karen

Hi all! Ernie points out that: "Needless to say, I know there will be push-back for a variety of good intellectual and entrenched disciplinary reasons. Some historians will argue that it is too presentist in its connotations. But we have already fought that battle on other fronts. If need be, we can fight it again." And, I can attest as an historian that 21st century studies is not attractive to me due to the implied presentism in it. I like two ideas that have been raised: 1) that we connect the name with the school's identity writ large. 2) that we offer the community input on the name 3) And it might be good for us to think of acronyms with a positive connotation. (The new gym at my daughter's middle school -Bryan Station- has a huge "BS" painted on the floor. this is the kind of thing we want to avoid...)

Posted: 8/3/2010 9:31 AM

[View Properties](#) [Reply](#)



Petrone, Karen

What about using the word Inquiry somewhere in the title? Kentucky Inquiry Curriculum or KIC? Wildcat Inquiry Curriculum or WIC? UK Inquiry Curriculum or UKIC?

Edited: 8/4/2010 3:17 PM

[View Properties](#) [Reply](#)



Grabau, Larry

I like Karen's idea of inquiry appearing in the title. And I would also submit that "blue" might be a good choice to consider. While we may not wish to get involved in a naming contest, it would be fabulous if we could actually create some enthusiasm among students for the new core curriculum.

Posted: 8/6/2010 12:11 PM

[View Properties](#) [Reply](#)



Hi all, Although I like the 21st Century Studies in general, I also get the sense that it sounds like a special program rather than the core curriculum. We also have to sell the idea that this curriculum is not intended to be "General" in the sense of including everything, but "Purposeful" in the sense of getting to the

Jensen, Jane M

heart of what we want students to think about (as opposed to "know") and "Foundational" in the sense of being a starting point for all students to engage their UK studies regardless of major or precollege characteristics. So I like tying it to a campus wide idea (Kentucky) and to thinking (Inquiry) rather than theme. And it's going to be called by its acronym if we don't give it a really short name (eg Miami Plan). Kentucky Core? Jane