

Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
October 22, 2024

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

Non-voting Members Present: Cassidy Bartlett, Abbie Sorg, Leticia Soto-Delgadillo (proxy for Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski), Alex Underwood

Guests Present: Ryan Winet

Voting Members Absent: Caleb Simmons

Chair Joost Van Haren called the meeting to order at 3:33 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, 9/24/2024**
Christopher Sanderson motioned to accept the meeting minutes from 9/24/2024. John Leafgren seconded the motion. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor.

- II. **Action Items**

- A. **Transfer Credit Policies**

Presenters: Abbie Sorg

On average, the University matriculates 750-850 students in fall terms with an excess of 64 units from community colleges, and 450 students in spring terms. If the policy proposal were approved, it would likely be effective Fall 2024 (unless approved after fall term, in which case it would likely be effective Spring 2025). All active students in previous catalog years would have the option to update their catalog year and receive the adjusted transfer credit. The cap should not be removed retroactively as the policy was not revoked by ABOR until summer 2024.

Removal of the limit could be accompanied by outreach to advising to review student degree audits from Fall 2024. Targeted outreach could also include students who might benefit from switching to the new catalog year requirements.

Discussion began:

- The provost's office felt strongly that AGEC should include satisfaction the second language requirement, since that is what is being communicated externally by the University.
 - This leaves possible the scenario where a transfer student could declare a BA without taking additional language, while a student who entered the University as a first-year student would still need fourth-semester proficiency to switch to a BA. How can this be safeguarded against?
 - At other benchmarked institutions, second language is not considered a general education requirement; it is enforced as a degree/major

requirement instead. If second language was required by the individual degree, it would ensure all students in those programs obtain the 4th semester proficiency (whether a transfer student or University student).

- It's likely that there will be some recommendations from a working group for the second language requirement in the next year; at that point, the impact of that recommendation might necessitate further updates to this policy.
- It was agreed that removing the references to the attributes as graduation requirements is best for the time being, letting the attributes policy address this (and later amending other policies as a single proposal, if needed).
- However the language requirement is updated (such as if it becomes a degree requirement), there will need to be clear communication to students and advising on why the requirement exists and what value the second language adds to a BA (that does not major in a language).
- The working group will make a recommendation on whether this is a requirement across all BAs, or if it is up to the individual program to decide the language requirement.
- Second language requirements could mirror math strands, where students who switch majors may be required to take a more advanced strand.
 - There is currently discussion around potential updates to the math requirements; foundations math and second language requirements may need parallel structure in policy.
- Are there complications that would arise from leaving the second language requirements purely up to the department, instead of the University setting some standard?
 - Leaving the second language requirement up to the individual department could make it difficult for undeclared majors to select a pathway.
- Because the policy was meant to address transfer credit (not second language and math requirements), those details should be left to each respective policy. Once the language and math requirement policies were updated, adjustments could be made in bulk to all pertinent policies through a single proposal/review.
 - The updated transfer credit policy could start benefitting students with excess transfer credits immediately, compared to waiting for a recommendation on the second language requirement.
- The updated policy would only impact students who have completed their full AGEC/IGETC/CSU GE; students transferring in part of their general education would still have to meet the second language requirement. The policy should be revisited once the second language and mathematics policies are discussed further.

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

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

Presenter: Alex Underwood

As requested during the previous subcommittee meeting, the policy proposal was updated to:

- Remove the required 30 additional units from sequential degrees
- Remove the stipulation that students may not complete more than 50% of the second degree prior to conferral of the first degree
- Add the requirement that second degrees need 18 unique units of University credit
- Add the stipulation that a second degree can waive a minor requirement
- Add language that restricts students from earning a second degree with the same degree title or major

Major Declaration (previously Change of Major) no longer instructs students to see their college dean to change their major, as this is not procedure. The policy was otherwise tidied and organizational changes were made based off of previous subcommittee discussion.

Discussion began:

- The language for sequential degrees waiving minor requirements was updated; because a student must complete the first degree prior to conferral of the second, a first degree could waive the minor requirements of a second degree, but a second degree could not waive the minor requirements of the first degree.

Karin Nolan moved to approve the policy proposal with the suggested update, and John Leafgren seconded the motion. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

III. Discussion Items

C. American Institutions and Civic Learning

Presenter: Jeremy Vetter

The Office of General Education has been working on implementation models for Civic Learning and gathering feedback from campus. There are four overall models (with some variations/additional ways they can be combined) in discussion currently, and feedback is accepted through mid-November. The proposal should be ready for review at the November or December subcommittee meeting.

Documents were shared with the subcommittee on the implementation models, outstanding issues, timeline implications, learning outcomes, and ways to leave feedback.

While UWGEC reviews this proposal with an eye for how it affects the rest of the general education curriculum, it was asked that the subcommittee help anticipate how this would impact programs across the University. What benefits student progress toward degree? Which models are likely to elicit faculty participation?

Discussion began:

- Most models (including Breadth and Depth, the preliminary model presented to ABOR) entail some form of comprehensive (breadth) course that all students take. If an additional (depth) course is required, from what area should it be – General Education, major coursework, Building Connections, or Exploring Perspectives?
- Students in teaching preparation programs leading to certification are required by state to pass a course (POL 210: U.S. and Arizona Constitution) or pass a certification test. It would be beneficial to these students if those credits counted towards general education as well.
 - This could also free up some credit space for Education majors, many of which already opt to take the course at a community college or take the exam instead. Being a general education requirement would motivate students to take the course in residence.
- The ‘breadth and depth’ model would leave it up to the department whether to create a depth course. If they chose not to, their students could take the course through another department.
- One model proposed splitting the 7 learning outcomes of civic learning across two courses. Feedback from faculty has shown that it could be difficult to decide how to split the information. More faculty were interested in covering the broad learning outcomes compared to those with greater specificity.
- Would it be feasible for one of these courses to be a Building Connections course? Or would faculty view that as cramming too much content into one course?
 - It could be advantageous to present the information from a multi-disciplinary perspective, as seen in BC courses. There is some concern among faculty that a civic learning course will be basic factual knowledge; a multidisciplinary approach could help increase applications.
- General Education curriculum has a limited number of units, so anything added has the potential to displace existing course requirements. If Civic learning was embedded into Building Connections (BC), then existing BC courses that don’t meet civic learning requirements could potentially see a drop in enrollment. Which route would have the fewest unexpected consequences?
- The concern for embedding civic learning in Exploring Perspectives is that Social Scientist and Humanist courses on non-US centric topics would see a drop in enrollment as students try to meet requirements with the fewest possible courses.
 - How could decreased enrollment be prevented in existing courses that didn’t cover civic learning?
 - To counterbalance US-centricity, the University could require an additional World Cultures and Societies course.

- Data was forthcoming that would show how students currently navigated attributes. Currently, there is an equal number of required EP/BC courses and attributes (7). While courses can have 2 attributes, seeing the data would help determine how many attributes students could realistically meet.
- If it turns out that students are meeting attributes consistently enough that they do not need to become enforced graduation requirements, it would still need to be determined how to ensure students were satisfying civic learning.
 - It is possible that even if other attributes are not tracked, civic learning would need to be, because ABOR is more specific around testing this component than others and it is not represented elsewhere in the curriculum.
 - What if the few students that evaded the requirement needed the requirement the most? Should it be tracked and required regardless of the overall trend?

Members will speak with their departments about how faculty can envision being involved with the civic learning requirement, what the best potential model would be, and respond with any feedback to the survey linked in Resources & Feedback document in the agenda. Discussion will resume at an upcoming subcommittee meeting.

D. Repeating a Course and Grade Replacement

Presenter: Alex Underwood

Advising has requested the removal of the 3-course limit on GRO (grade replacement opportunity). When this policy was last discussed in Spring 2022, the subcommittee worried that students would halt their progress to degree or get 'stuck' if they were allowed to keep repeating the same course(s). The advising community wants to make sure students don't abuse grade replacement/course repeat; there would still be a limit on how many times a student could repeat the same course.

Several other institutions currently do not restrict the use of grade replacement. Should the University's grade replacement utilize the highest grade, or the most recent grade?

Subcommittee members will share the discussion questions with their departments and notify the Office of the Registrar if additional data or benchmarking is needed. Discussion will resume at the November subcommittee meeting.

The meeting was officially adjourned at 5:01 PM. The next subcommittee meeting will be held on November 19, 2024.

Respectfully submitted by Cassidy Bartlett, 11/04/2024