

**Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2023**

Voting Members Present: Karin Nolan, Amber Rice, Ally Roof, Dereka Rushbrook, Christopher Sanderson, Amanda Sokan, Travis Spence, Joost Van Haren, Jeremy Vetter

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

Voting Members Absent: Doan Goolsby, Caleb Simmons

Chair Joost Van Haren called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m. A quorum was established with 7 voting members. Two additional members joined after the meeting was called to order.

I. Approval of Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee meeting minutes, 10/10/2023

Amber Rice motioned to accept the meeting minutes from 10/10/2023. Karin Nolan seconded the motion. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor.

II. Action Items

A. Multiple Use of Courses

Presenters: Abbie Sorg

The committee was informed of changes that the University-Wide General Education Committee (UWGEC) had requested to the policy:

- A reference to pre-majors that had been incorrectly removed was readded.
- One sentence was restructured and shortened for clarity: “Up to 3 courses (for a maximum of 12 total units) may count to fulfill General Education requirements as well as major, pre-major, minor, and/or certificate requirements, provided the units are taken in courses that are approved General Education Exploring Perspectives or Building Connections courses,” was amended to “Up to 3 courses (for a maximum of 12 total units) may count to fulfill General Education Exploring Perspectives or Building Connections requirements as well as major, pre-major, minor, and/or certificate requirements.”

Discussion began:

- A member suggested clarifying within the summary of changes that while the credit limit was being raised to 12, a 3-course maximum was also being proposed.
- The committee was informed that the Registrar has suggested specifying only a course limit, not a credit limit. Including the credit limit is an unnecessary parameter (as most General Education courses are 3 or 4 credits) that would ultimately cause more confusion.
- A member reminded the committee that in October’s meeting, there had been discussion that some transfer students bring in courses with 5-6 units; they

posed the question of whether this is an acceptable amount to fulfill multiple requirements.

- One member asked if transfer students bring in all of their General Education requirements, or if there are some that must be fulfilled at the University of Arizona.
- It was clarified that transfer students bringing in their full Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) won't be affected by a maximum multiple use credit limit. However, students transferring in individual courses that are then applied to fulfill select General Education requirements could potentially bring in a higher number of credits for multiple use.
 - A representative from the advising community added that students bringing in AP credit would also qualify, and that it's complicated to predict all the scenarios that could emerge. They agreed it would be possible for some transfer courses, such as sciences/labs, to be 5 units.
- One member reminded the subcommittee that many advisors wanted the credit cap removed for ease of manual counting.

Amber Rice moved to approve the updated policy, and Ally Roof seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with 9 votes in favor. The UWGEC chair agreed to check for opposition to the amendment in the next UWGEC meeting.

III. Discussion Items

A. Policy Roadmap

Presenter: Joost Van Haren

The committee was given an overview of policies that the Academic Advising Council had requested to see updated. The highest ranked policies included Credits from Community Colleges, Change of Major or College, and Academic Distinction, Dean's List, Honors and Awards. Other, less urgent policies to update are Readmission and Defining Developmental Courses.

Discussion began:

- The advising representative elaborated that the Change of Major policy (incorrectly) indicates that a college dean's signature is required, which is misleading for students.
- Another member gathered feedback from the College of Fine Arts, from which the School of Theatre, Film & Television wanted to see the Course Type and Component Definition updated. The school had concerns about screening time, which currently takes contact hours out of lecture time. It was suggested that other departments could benefit from a Screening categorization for watching movies in class.
- There same member brought up confusion about what contact hours mean in the context of performing arts.

- A representative of the Honors college relayed that their colleagues feel the Academic Distinction policy wording is currently confusing; there is a section titled “University Academic Honors”, which misleads students into thinking they will be part of the Honors Program graduation if they receive the academic achievements described in this policy. The member suggested updating this section to “University-Wide Recognition”.
- The Honors College also hoped to see updates to the House Numbered Courses policy, because advisors for the Honors College advise students from all colleges, and knowing that course numbers have consistent meaning would be helpful. Additionally, the department wanted to clarify exactly how students get the honors notation for a course. Some felt it may be better to have honors sections of courses rather than separate courses designated with an H, as this is not consistently done in all departments.
- One member from Physiology said their department was eager to see the Credits from Community Colleges policy move forward with updates.
 - Another member reminded the subcommittee that no changes could be made to the policy until ABOR made a decision.

The subcommittee suggested beginning review of the Change of Major or College policy in the Spring. The Course Types and Component policy and Academic Distinction policy are already scheduled for discussion later in the current meeting.

B. Course Types and Modality

Presenters: Abbie Sorg

The committee was informed that the current proposal was an early draft meant to serve as a starting place, and that feedback was encouraged. Course Types previously only named on the handout had been added to the policy, as well as a new Clinical type, and discussion could be had about a screening component.

Discussion Began:

- One member asked why the required contact hours for each class type were being removed.
 - Another member clarified that there are currently a few policies containing overlapping related information; the goal of the Course Type and Component policy is to define what kind of learning should occur in each course type, regardless of modality. The House Numbered Courses policy currently specifies the available grading bases for each course type as well as what its catalog number should be. The Credit Definitions policy gives the required contact hours for each course type. The duplicate information can be removed from the Course Type and

Modality policy and instead direct users to the Credit Definitions policy for contact hours.

- Other members agreed that linking to the policy would be helpful for those relying on the information.
- A subcommittee member questioned the difference between the online and Interactive Broadcast modalities.
 - It was explained that Interactive Broadcast was a modality used by CAST before online courses were offered. It is still used infrequently by CAST and other colleges.
 - The Office of the Registrar agreed to look into how the two modalities are different and whether they are both necessary.
 - A former CAST representative suspected that it could likely be removed. When asked by another member, they agreed that interactive broadcast could accurately be categorized within Live Online.
 - Another member pointed out that interactive broadcast's definition refers to occurring with students in multiple classrooms, whereas Live Online lets students participate from anywhere.
 - The former CAST representative agreed that courses under this modality traditionally had a specified location(s) for students to use.
- One member stated that courses with screenings were typically classified as Workshops. They asked whether courses could have multiple different types (components).
 - Another member confirmed this is often the case.
- A member representing the School of Theater, Film & Television relayed that when a class watches a 110 minute screening, this cuts in to lecture time, leaving only 100 minutes remaining for the week. The department would like to classify screenings as a form of homework time done together, rather than taking away from contact hours.
- The same member asked about classifying screenings under Studio, as they pertain to artistic endeavors. This could also apply to music students, who are required in some classes to attend a certain number of performances. Alternatively, a category for Experiential Learning could be created to absorb Studio, Clinical, and Screening course types.
 - A member asked whether screening attendance is required, or if students could watch the films on their own.
- It was suggested that within the current framework, screenings could be classified as field trips, which are counted like a lab and allow increased in-person meetings to take the place of homework time for that number of units that week.
- A member questioned the R notation for Live Online, and whether it could be updated to LO.
 - Another member countered that these notations could be removed entirely, as only department schedulers see them.

- One member pointed out that all course types are also found on the Credit Definitions policy except for field trips, and asked if Field Trips should be added as a course type.
 - Another member suggested “Field Experience” as a title.
 - A couple of members questioned whether field work/experience should be a full component type when it may only represent a small aspect of the course.
 - A different member responded that individual field trips may also be indicated with a note on the schedule of classes, though admittedly this can complicate matters when scheduling.
- It was suggested that if new components were created, instructors would be unlikely to resubmit existing courses to be classified under those new components.
 - One member countered that since a department had expressly asked for a new screening component, this indicated that there was a desire from some faculty to make these changes.
 - A member questioned how to update the component definitions to leave flexibility for existing courses, and whether such infrequent components were really needed.
- If a cultural experiences component was created, a member suggested the following definition: “Course includes required attendance at artistic, cultural, and/or community experiences.”
- The same member requested a discussion on contact hours for the purpose of resolving some issues in the College of Fine Arts’ studios and rehearsals, some of which currently require up to 20 contact hours per week for 1 credit.
 - Members agreed to review both the Course Types & Modality policy and the Credit Definitions policy simultaneously in order to review contact hours.

The subcommittee will continue discussion of the Course Types and Modality policy, as well as begin review of the Credit Definitions policy, at the December subcommittee meeting.

C. Academic Distinction, Dean’s List, Honors and Awards

Presenters: Abbie Sorg

The subcommittee was given an overview of the current perceived issues surrounding this policy, including the required 15 units per term for dean’s list with distinction despite full time status being only 12 units, and the confusing overlap in language for academic awards and the honors program.

Discussion began:

- The representative from the Honors College suggested updating the section title from “University Academic Honors” to “University Academic Recognition,” as it the

current section title could be perceived as addressing the honors program instead of University-wide recognitions.

- When one member questioned the decision to require 15 units for the dean's list with distinction, another responded that 15 units used to be the requirement for full-time status, which was consistent with how many credits a student needed to graduate on time if taking the summers off.
- A member referred to the benchmarking, where only the University of Arizona and one other peer institution required 15 units for a dean's list (all others required 12 units).
- It was questioned what the goal of this policy was; to be exclusive or inclusive. Was this policy a means to engage with part-time students?
- In favor of reducing the requirement to 12 units, a member expressed that they felt the point of distinction was to recognize quality of work, not quantity through overloading students.
- It was questioned whether any demographic information had been gathered on past recipients of the dean's list and/or academic recognition; the Office of the Registrar agreed to look into obtaining this information.
- The same member noted that students utilizing the Disability Resource Center may be encouraged to reduce their course load, which would make them ineligible for the dean's list.
- The subcommittee asked to hear feedback from deans on the intent of this policy, to avoid wasting time formulating suggestions that would contradict the goals of the policy.
- One member relayed the view of an absent member, saying that part-time students are more likely to be first generation students or have significant life responsibilities, such as caregiving, which may make full-time enrollment untenable. This member was interested in reducing the honorable mention threshold to 9 units, which is the average amount of credits online students take per term.
- A couple of members expressed interest in one benchmarked institution's policy of awarding the dean's list each time they accumulate 12 credits after attending for 2+ terms.

The Office of the Registrar was asked to gather feedback from the deans as well as demographic information on recipients of the dean's list. The discussion will resume at the December or January subcommittee meeting.

The meeting was officially adjourned at 4:59 PM. The next subcommittee meeting will be held on December 12, 2023.

Respectfully submitted by Cassidy Bartlett, 11/16/23