

Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
April 23, 2024

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

Non-voting Members Present: Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski, Cassidy Bartlett, Abbie Sorg, Alex Underwood

Guests Present: Susan Miller-Cochran, Mark Stegeman

Voting Members Absent: Doan Goolsby, Caleb Simmons, Amber Rice, Amanda Sokan

Chair Joost Van Haren called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. A quorum was established with 7 voting members.

I. Approval of Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee meeting minutes, 3/26/2024

Christopher Sanderson motioned to accept the meeting minutes from 3/26/2024 with the suggested updates. Karin Nolan seconded the motion. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor.

II. Action Items

A. Course Types

Presenter: Joost Van Haren

There had been no additional changes to the proposal following the previous meeting. The proposal was pending feedback from the College of Fine Arts and the University's professional colleges.

Discussion began:

- One member relayed that gathering feedback from the professional colleges would require additional time.
- Another informed that the College of Fine Arts was agreeable to the updates proposed in the previous meeting.
- Multiple members agreed that the proposal should be reviewed by professional colleges prior to its review at the full UGC meeting. The review would take place over the summer, and discussion could begin at UGC in the Fall.
 - Two members expressed that the College of Medicine would likely be glad about the inclusion of Clinical course types, though they may wish to adjust the description.

Ally Roof moved to approve the updated policy, and Travis Spence seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with 7 votes in favor.

III. Discussion Items

B. Bachelor's Degree Requirements, Multiple Majors and Degrees

Presenters: Abbie Sorg

The subcommittee was provided with rationale behind the policy's most recent update in 2014, as well as benchmarking of second bachelor's degrees at ABOR and peer institutions.

Prior to 2014, students were required to take an additional 30 units for a second Bachelor's degree regardless of whether it was concurrent or sequential. This requirement was removed from concurrent degrees because it seemed to be deterring students from earning concurrent degrees, because there was no benefit over earning a sequential degree. Students were earning the 30 additional units through electives rather than major units.

Benchmarking shows that all other institutions with available policy do not distinguish credit-wise between concurrent and sequential.

The Office of the Registrar would need additional time to pull statistics on students who had pursued dual degrees in the past. This information would be available to the subcommittee in the fall.

Discussion began:

- Forthcoming data will likely confirm that students delay graduation for a concurrent degree. One member felt it should be re-evaluated whether the institution is incentivizing the correct thing (a second degree over completion of a first degree).
- One department had expressed concern regarding the excess unit surcharge. If the extra credits required for a second bachelor's degree placed the student near/within that threshold, it would further discourage students from pursuing a second bachelor's degree.
- It was noted that students in departments offering degrees outside of a BA or BS, such as a BSHS, would be disproportionately affected by this policy as they can automatically pursue a second degree from any other program.
- The subcommittee was encouraged to think philosophically about what the goal is when framing requirements for earning two degrees compared with earning multiple majors.
- It was suggested that rather than considering a degree sequential for any amount of time between the conferral dates, there could instead be a time window for sequential degrees; only students who have been away for 3-5+ years would need the additional 30 units.
- One member pointed out that financial aid for some students ends once they complete their bachelor's degree. If it's not financially feasible for them to

return for a sequential degree, they must earn a concurrent degree in order to maintain financial aid.

- Another member confirmed this was similar to their own experience; they had earned two degrees simultaneously to avoid paying out-of-pocket for the second degree. For this reason, they expressed that equity often comes to a matter of financial aid for students; what policy would maximize their financial aid benefits?
- Another responded that the results of the data would indicate how long it had taken for students to graduate.
- With multiple institutions requiring an additional 30 units, one member asked whether there were accreditation implications related to the extra 30 units.
 - It was suggested that the data also include how many surplus credits students had when they graduated, to better gauge how attainable the additional 30 units are.
- It was questioned what the difference was between a second degree or a second major, or whether one was more beneficial than the other.
 - Some members responded that students wouldn't be able to double-major in any two fields because the degree types may be different, which is when a second degree would be applicable. Only a handful of STEM plans have both a Bachelor of Science and a Bachelor of Arts.
- One member expressed that if the goal was to remove barriers, then there shouldn't be a difference between concurrent and sequential degrees aside from the date of degree conferral.
- It was pointed out that students in the College of Education could only take student teaching courses for their final term; any students earning a second degree would have to earn it either prior to or following their student teaching term.
 - This brought up a concern that the policy was written at a time when degree conferral was a more hands-on practice. In many of these cases, the student's advisor and graduation services advisor would know that the student was delaying graduation to receive concurrent degrees. As practices modernize, care needs to be taken so students in unique circumstances don't fall through the cracks.
- A member noted that having no additional requirements for sequential degrees could be problematic depending on how long it had been since the student completed coursework for their first bachelor's degree.
 - One member asked how long a degree was valid.
 - Another noted that continuous enrollment policies would affect return students, and they would fall under a new catalog depending upon the term of (re)enrollment.
- The stipulation that students must complete at least 50% of a sequential degree after conferral of the first degree didn't make sense to one member.
- A representative agreed to reach out to the other state institutions for context and/or procedure not given in their policies.

- One member was curious how often online/nontraditional students pursued a second bachelor's degree.
- It was requested that the policy wording be updated to clarify how many units were needed for two bachelor's degrees, as the current language can be misconstrued to mean that students need 120 units for each degree.

The Office of the Registrar will gather data on students who have earned/attempted sequential and concurrent degrees, obtain further information on policy at other state institutions, and speak with OSFA and an accreditation liaison. Discussion will resume at a subcommittee meeting in fall 2024.

C. Credits from Community Colleges

Presenter: Abbie Sorg

The committee was reminded of its discussion on this policy in the Fall to potentially remove the 64-unit limit of credits that may be transferred from community colleges. Recently, the provost offices reached unanimous agreement to eliminate the policy. This was the only thing preventing ABOR from removing this policy. Even with ABOR removing the policy, the University would also need to remove it at an institutional level to enforce the update.

Discussion began:

- A member noted that a local community college would soon be offering a 4-year degree in Teacher Education, and there would presumably be more programs to follow suit, so there would be a need for allowing more transfer credits.
 - Another member agreed that this was the case for some nursing programs.
- When one member asked if there were separate policies for transferring credits from other institutions, it was confirmed that this was the case, and several policies could be reviewed simultaneously. Related policies include Arizona Community College Transfer Guides, Acceptability of Undergraduate Transfer Credit, Non-Regionally Accredited Coursework, and few types of General Education Transfer Credit.
 - Members agreed that reviewing transfer credit policies in bulk in the fall could allow some of the policies to be combined and/or streamlined.
 - It was conveyed that both Advising and Transfer Credit and Articulation are in favor of such an update. A representative from TCA will be invited to take part in discussions in the fall.
- When a member asked whether the deans would be reviewing this policy update, it was confirmed that U-CAAC (comprised of Associate Deans) was among the review committees. Additionally, there is a Transfer Credit Success subcommittee within U-CAAC that has begun socializing the policy.
 - It was added that this policy update may not be of concern because colleges still have the final say in whether a transfer course is applicable.
 - However, this may be a point of confusion: course acceptability versus transferability.

Discussion on undergraduate transfer credit policies will resume at a subcommittee meeting in fall 2024.

D. American Institutions and Civic Learning

Presenter: Jeremy Vetter

A representative from the General Education committee highlighted four key areas of difficulty surrounding American Institutions and Civic Learning:

1. The new coursework is being grafted onto an existing curriculum rather than built from scratch. With the existing curriculum comes credit limits.
2. The budget model for next year is unknown.
3. Unlike previous general education updates, this one has a political aspect, as the required content is on American Institutions.
4. The University does not currently have a provost, a key figure in moving the process along.

Because it is sometimes the case that members at faculty senate aren't well acquainted with a proposed update, there has been an emphasis on collecting faculty feedback from early in the process. A survey on Civic Learning that was conducted received over 500 responses, and two faculty forums were held (the summaries of which were provided in the subcommittee agenda).

Discussion began:

- The timeline for policy review should allow time for all subsequent committees as well as sufficient time to move classes along through a review process and properly assign attributes.
- The Office of General Education (OGE) would be performing an assessment of civic learning prior to implementing changes to the GE curriculum using existing courses.
 - It was explained that though the University's own rubric may not be complete, courses could be identified using the rubric prepared by the three state institutions.
- One member asked why models aside from attributes were being considered, and if this meant all attributes would be revisited when Civic Learning was added.
 - An OGE representative clarified that knowledge areas as defined by ABOR were different than attributes as defined at the University. ABOR doesn't define how institutions implement the policy, so the OGE is focusing on the best way for students to learn this information, engaging advisors on how to best implement without delaying time to degree, and working with the office of the Registrar to ensure the process works from a systems perspective.
 - Within the attribute models, there is still debate about whether it should be satisfied in one or two courses. Breadth and Depth seems promising, but presents complications for students meeting graduation requirements. Additionally,

requiring two courses for every area except for World Cultures and Societies could send an incorrect message.

- If Civic Learning was implemented as an attribute, it should be attached to Building Connections courses to meet ABOR's definition. If students were trying to meet their Civics requirement, the other courses would have low enrollment, which is important to consider.
- It was added that a benefit of not being the first institution to roll out the new Civic Learning requirement was that the University could learn from how other state schools had worked through complications and how ABOR had responded.
- At the request of one member, OGE will share summaries with the subcommittee of proposals made by the other state institutions.

The discussion ended due to time constraints. Discussion will resume at a subcommittee meeting in fall 2024.

The meeting was officially adjourned at 5:03 PM. The next subcommittee meeting will be held in fall 2024.

Respectfully submitted by Cassidy Bartlett, 05/03/2024