

Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
October 10, 2023

Voting Members Present: Caleb Simmons, Karin Nolan, Amber Rice, Ally Roof (Proxy for Claudia Stanescu), Dereka Rushbrook, Christopher Sanderson, Amanda Sokan, Travis Spence, Joost Van Haren, Jeremy Vetter

Non-voting Members Present: Cassidy Bartlett, Carmin Chan, Holly Nelson, Abbie Sorg, Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski

Guests Present: Rebecca Drake

Voting Members Absent: Doan Goolsby

Chair Joost Van Haren called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. A quorum was established with 9 voting members. One additional member joined after the meeting was called to order.

I. Approval of Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee meeting minutes, 9/12/2023

Christopher Sanderson motioned to accept the meeting minutes from 9/12/2023 with suggested updates. Travis Spence seconded the motion. The motion passed with 9 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

II. Discussion Items

A. Double Use of Courses

Presenters: Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski

Members were reminded that when this policy was previously discussed in Spring 2023, the subcommittee had decided to form a small group to continue working on and gathering feedback for the policy proposal over the summer. The group proposed the following recommendations:

- to amend the limit to 3 courses and 10 credits, allowing students to apply a 4-credit Exploring Perspectives/Building Connections course (such as a lab or Psychology 101).
- to allow credits to apply to more than 2 requirement areas, such as general education, a major, minor, and/or certificate. This would be reflected in the title of the policy; "Multiple Use of Courses" instead of Double Use, which currently is a matter of confusion for students and staff.
- to clarify that these updates do not override the current policy on Undergraduate Certificates, which require certificate coursework to be at least 50% exclusive to the certificate.

Discussion began:

- One member asked for confirmation that a student could not apply two 4-unit courses and one 3-unit course, as this totals 11 credits.

- The small group confirmed this would be the case with the proposed limitations, and that staff within the advising community had been interested in wording the stipulation as 3 courses with no credit limit.
- A subcommittee member questioned the classification of second semester courses as General Education courses, as the first semester would satisfy the requirement.
 - Another member pointed out that transfer students or those with AP credit may bring in first-semester credit.
 - A small group member agreed to look into whether these cases would satisfy the General Education requirement, or if the student would need to take the second semester.
- One subcommittee member questioned how General Education credit would transfer in from an institution with a quarter-based system.
 - A small group member explained that advisement reports are built to accept 2.67 credits, so transfer students from quarter-based institutions would still meet requirements.
- The idea of having a course limit and no specified credit limit was again raised. A small group member stated that the concern associated with using only a course limit was that some students might use 1-credit courses, which would be less efficient than applying 3-credit courses, and potentially cause inequity among students.
 - A subcommittee member agreed that maintaining both a course and credit limit would be helpful, pointing out that some students transfer in 5-6 unit courses, and a credit maximum would ensure these students don't double/triple count more credit than others.
- It was questioned how many General Education courses have fewer than 3 credits.
 - One member replied that all Exploring Perspectives/Building Connections courses must be 3+ credits, but transfer student credit could not be accounted for.
- A subcommittee member asked if it has been looked into how transfer credits fulfill the new General Education attributes.
 - The UWGEC chair explained that it is difficult to measure whether other institutions and/or high school AP courses actually meet the attributes, and there is not yet a solution for determining this.
- When asked about the proposed update to multiple use of courses versus double use, a subcommittee member expressed that while there would likely be concern from their department if any courses could be applied to multiple requirements (particularly in cases where there is overlap between majors), they felt that the policy applying expressly to General Education courses would be suitable.
- One small group member was in favor of using only a course limit, but the subcommittee agreed that including a credit limit as well would be wise.
- A subcommittee member suggested 3 courses and 12 units, and others agreed on this amount.

The subcommittee agreed to have the Office of the Registrar prepare a proposal that allows for the multiple use of credits across 2+ requirement areas for up to 3 courses (12 units). This proposal will be routed to UWGEC to begin the approval process.

B. Credits from Community Colleges

Presenter: Abbie Sorg

The subcommittee was informed that although there is no limit to how much transfer credit may be accepted, only 64 units from a community college may be applied towards a bachelor's degree. Additionally, upper-division coursework from community college transfers as lower-division credit. This policy only exists because it is an ABOR policy. However, ABOR is considering the removal of this policy. If ABOR goes through with this, the Office of the Registrar would suggest removing this limit at the institutional level as well.

Discussion began:

- One member noted that ABOR is considering this change due to Arizona community colleges having been recently approved to offer bachelor's degrees.
- Another member supported the dissolution of the policy because it limits equity and access. Lower-socioeconomic status students often begin their education at community colleges. By limiting these students to 64 credits, they are disadvantaged compared to students who transfer from 4-year institutions.
- The same member added that in previous years, many community colleges only offered lower-level courses, but this seems to be increasingly changing. Even if students could apply more credits from their previous institution, they would still need to take 42 upper-division credits (and 30 in-residence credits) to graduate from the University of Arizona. These separate policies could effectively balance how many credits students apply to their degree without the credits from community colleges policy.
 - Another member mentioned that some degrees, such as the Bachelor of General Studies and the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies, have been given approval from ABOR to accept more transfer credit for the above reason.
- It was mentioned that community colleges offering bachelor's degrees would mean more competition for the University, and it would be wise to be more accepting so as to not turn away prospective students.
- One member brought up that Northern Arizona University allows students to transfer in 90 credits from community colleges, leaving only 30 for them to complete in residence.
- The subcommittee expressed interest in removing the policy.
- A member asked if the community colleges offering bachelor's degrees also have limits as to how many credits can be transferred from other community colleges.

The subcommittee agreed to wait for ABOR to act on removing the policy, in which case the inactivation of the institutional policy will be revisited.

C. Course Types and Components

Presenters: Abbie Sorg

It was shared with the subcommittee that the review of this policy is part of a larger goal to amend 3 policies overlapping in content: Course Types and Components, University-Wide House Numbered Courses, and Individual Studies. The Course Types and Components policy gives an overview of standard component types (lecture, lab, discussion and studio) and includes an informative handout, which isn't in the actual policy because it duplicates information from the House-Numbered Courses policy. There is interest in adjusting the handout to address all component types, and using that information for the Course Types and Components policy.

The House-Numbered Courses policy would be updated to remove duplicate information. Additionally, the Honors college would need to be consulted to determine which honors courses require separate categorization.

Discussion Began:

- One member from the Honors college mentioned that because the grading basis is often different for honors courses, it may not be possible to condense the honors courses with regular courses.
- A representative from the College of Fine Arts mentioned that the way their college designates the amount of credits for students (and instructors teaching the courses) often doesn't correlate with the contact hours, rehearsal hours, and practice hours that must be put in. They felt there could be an opportunity to better align the college with standard University practice and more accurately represent the faculty's load and students' work.
 - Another member added that many departments have similar confusion pertaining to practice and independent work that students must put in.
 - A third member speculated this could be the case for Architecture programs.
- A representative of Arizona Online mentioned that the course definitions lean toward in-person learning, despite online students also having options for independent study, research, etc. They requested inclusive language that doesn't describe physical proximity.

Subcommittee members were asked to discuss the policy with their colleges to gather feedback for discussion at the November subcommittee meeting.

D. Policy Roadmap

Presenters: Joost Van Haren, Abbie Sorg

The subcommittee was given an overview of the policies that are up for review this year and which areas will likely be addressed:

- One potential new policy that would define the difference between professional and graduate programs wouldn't go through Undergraduate Council/subcommittee review.
- Another potential new policy would define developmental courses; there are many courses assumed to be developmental that don't count toward GPA like a normal course, but there's no official definition of what is/is not a developmental course.
- An existing policy to amend would be the General Education Foundations Math policy by reducing references to specific courses. The Mathematics department wants to simplify this policy as the current phrasing regarding strands is confusing. The strands were originally created so each major could select the math level they wanted to require for their students. However, many departments have selected a strand and then limited which courses within that strand are acceptable. With so many departments selecting coursework at the granular level, there is some question whether there is a point to having the strands at all.
- Similarly, the General Education Foundations Writing policy is another that the responsible department wants to update. The English department is currently developing more foundations writing courses, but these could not be used to waive the requirement until the policy states that they may do so. This means that the options are to either update the policy each time that new Foundations Writing courses are created, or to remove references to specific courses to keep the policy evergreen.

Discussion began:

- A subcommittee member asked if Accelerated Master's Programs would be a consideration in a policy that defines graduate and professional programs.
 - The subcommittee was informed that if Accelerated Master's Programs are part of the new policy, then some discussion of the policy would occur at the subcommittee due to the overlapping nature of AMPs with undergraduate degrees.
- One member asked for clarification on the difference between developmental courses and success courses.
 - Currently, there is no distinction between the two, giving further motive for creating a policy.
- Another member asked whether success and developmental courses could be defined on the Course Types and Components policy instead of creating a new policy.
 - An Office of the Registrar representative stated that this was an option, though the policy would need to be carefully written to distinguish between component types and course definitions, so it is understood that the two are not mutually exclusive.

The subcommittee was asked to gather feedback from their colleges regarding the discussed policies and any others on the provided roadmap in order to continue the conversation at the November subcommittee meeting.

Due to campus internet connectivity issues, the meeting was not officially adjourned. The next subcommittee meeting will be held on November 14, 2023.

Respectfully submitted by Cassidy Bartlett, 10/19/23