**Undergraduate Council Meeting**

**February 11th, 2025**

**Voting members present:** Christopher Domin, Melissa Goldsmith, John Leafgren, Dana Lema, Michael McKisson, Moe Momayez, Karin Nolan, Lisa Rezende, Allyson Roof, Dereka Rushbrook, Christopher Sanderson, Caleb Simmons, Amanda Sokan, Travis Spence,
Joost Van Haren, Jeremy Vetter, Marie Wallace

**Non-voting members present:** Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski, Greg Heileman, Melanie Madden, Abbie Sorg, Alex Underwood, Kian Alavy, Cassidy Bartlett, Bonnie Taylor, Christine Gronowski.

* **Joost Van Haren called meeting to order at 3:35 pm.**
* **Approval of Minutes from the**[**UGC Meeting January 14, 2025**](https://academicadmin.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2025-02/UGC-January-minutes-2025.docx)**– Lisa Rezende, Acting Co-chair**
	+ Christopher Sanderson motioned approve. John Leafgren seconded. Motion was approved unanimously
* **Reports:**
	+ **Academic Affairs Report – Greg Heileman, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education**
		- At our last meeting, we discussed program approvals. We had five programs moving forward—three undergraduate and two graduate programs. However, one, Integrated Business and Engineering, did not make it through the final approval stage. The main issue was that Regent Finley, who carefully reviews learning outcomes, found the competencies lacking. Instead of clear, structured statements, the proposal only included a comma-separated list of keywords. Regent Finley stated he would vote against any program with that format, so we had to withdraw it.
		- We are now working with UCAT to ensure learning outcomes meet rigorous standards. The key expectation is that competencies should be written as clear sentences describing what students will know and be able to do upon earning their degree. Assessments should also be individualized rather than uniform across all students and should align with realistic applications, such as capstone projects. These assessment plans are crucial, as they are later used for APR evaluations.
		- Moving forward, we should apply more scrutiny at an earlier stage. Previously, we eased up on our reviews once UCAT approved a program, but that has led to last-minute revisions. Strengthening our review process earlier would prevent unnecessary delays.
		- On another topic, we are continuing work on policy updates, particularly regarding foundational programs. Alex and Jeremy will provide further updates in the next meeting.
		- Regarding the graduate project, we are currently classifying "near-completers" and working with colleges to support them. Sharon is leading this effort. Additionally, we recently transitioned from Badger to Credit for tracking, and new micro-credentials have been introduced in undergraduate research.
		- Lastly, I want to address the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE). This program, part of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), allows students from participating states to pay reduced tuition for programs that are not available in their home state. It is designed to prevent unnecessary duplication of specialized programs across states. For example, our mining program is part of WUE because mining programs are rare nationwide. However, we should be cautious about expanding WUE to other programs unless there is a strong justification. Offering WUE tuition widely could result in significant revenue loss. The goal should be to provide access to unique programs rather than using it as a strategy to grow enrollment.
		- For reference, WUE currently covers mining and natural resources at our institution. Other fields, like dentistry and veterinary medicine, have historically participated due to limited availability in the Western U.S. Arizona does not currently have a public dental school, which could make it a potential candidate for WUE in the future.
		- Before we wrap up, I also want to mention that we are compiling a five-year report on program activity. This report will analyze trends in program creation, their impact on enrollment, and whether new programs are expanding total enrollment or simply redistributing students across different majors.
	+ **Arizona Online Report – Caleb Simmons, Executive Director for Online Education**
		- There aren’t many major updates from Arizona Online at the moment. We’re experiencing a slight lag in the development of new programs, but those scheduled to launch in Fall 2025 remain on track, and recruitment efforts for them are underway.
		- The most significant update is our recent pilot campaign targeting corporate students. We used our dialer system, along with our success coaches, to re-engage students who were enrolled in the fall but had not yet re-enrolled for the spring semester. The campaign reached approximately 3,000 students, and about 750 re-enrolled following initial contact.
		- While it's difficult to determine how many of these students would have re-enrolled on their own, the campaign showed promising results in improving retention and persistence. Given its success, we plan to continue implementing this approach moving forward.
	+ **Distance, Continuing Education Report – Bonnie Taylor, Director of Outreach and Business Affairs and Aviva Doery, Assistant Director, Administrative Support and Strategy**
		- No update.
	+ **Registrar’s Report – Alex Underwood, University Registrar**
		- Public institutions in the WICHE region offering DDS/DMD degrees include **University of Utah, University of Colorado, UNLV, University of Washington, University of Oregon, UCLA, and UCSF.** ASU offers a dental hygiene program, but I focused on doctoral programs.
		- Spring enrollment stands at **51,000+ students**, with **40,932 undergraduates**. The **Summer and Fall 2025 schedule** goes live **March 1**, and registration begins **April 7**.
		- The **Bachelor’s Degree Candidacy Policy** has been officially approved by **Provost Marks** and will help some students graduate this semester. Several **General Education policy updates** are in progress for **Fall 2026**.
		- I’ve been working with the **Arizona Credit Mobility Collective** to improve **stackable credentials and transfer pathways**. The goal is to **reduce lost credits for transfer students** through better articulation agreements and advising tools. While still in the planning phase, this effort could enhance **credit mobility and workforce readiness**.
	+ **Advising Resource Center/ Advising Community Report – Sharon Aiken Wisniewski, Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Advising**
		- The **Advising Resource Center (ARC)**is expanding its**Advising Onboarding Program (AOP)** with the launch of **AOP 2** in March 2025. This follow-up training, available to advisors six months into their role, provides deeper insights into policies and campus-wide resources. Delivered via **D2L**, it combines asynchronous learning with live cohort discussions to enhance knowledge and network-building. Additionally, advisors are providing feedback **on proposed changes to the Grade Replacement Opportunity (GRO) and course repeat policies,** increasing awareness and engagement with policy updates.
		- The **Advising Central Dashboard**, launched in **October**, supports advisors by offering **data-driven insights** into student success. Recent workshops have helped familiarize staff with this tool, which plays a critical role in the **Graduation Project**. This initiative shifts focus from student **retention**to**completion**, identifying systemic barriers to graduation. Advisors have already flagged policy inconsistencies, such as second-language grading requirements, which are now under review.
		- As part of**Project Graduation**, the **Impact 2025** initiative is using a **traffic light system**to assess students’ graduation likelihood. Colleges categorize students as **Green (on track), Yellow (potential barriers), or Red (unlikely to graduate)** to identify patterns and develop interventions. This effort aims to **enhance graduation rates** by addressing systemic challenges and empowering advisors with actionable data.
	+ **University-wide General Education Committee Report – Jeremy Vetter, UWGEC Chair**
		- One major discussion revolves around the attributes as graduation requirements, currently set to be enforced in Fall 2026. A proposal is likely forthcoming from the Office of General Education (OGE) to remove these as formal graduation requirements, instead keeping them tied to courses as they are now. This recommendation follows an OGE analysis, which found that most students naturally complete nearly all required attributes while progressing through their coursework. While this proposal has both support and opposition, it will be debated in upcoming meetings, and we welcome input from this group.
		- Another key issue is the civic learning requirement, which has been under discussion for some time. The advisory group for this area, composed mostly of faculty and some advising representatives, will meet on February 24. Initial recommendations may be ready for our late February UWGEC meeting, with a possible vote by late March. We're also considering whether these changes should be presented as a single policy package or as multiple proposals to minimize year-to-year catalog adjustments.
		- In addition to these discussions, other potential changes to General Education Foundations are emerging from various task forces. The Second Language Task Force is actively working on recommendations that could shift this requirement outside of General Education. Meanwhile, Math and Writing Foundations are also under review, and we hope to receive updates soon. Depending on the proposals' development, these changes could be bundled with other General Education revisions.
		- Looking further ahead, we’re beginning discussions on recertification of General Education courses, an issue that will require defining renewal processes and responsibilities. Additional topics on our radar include natural science representation in General Education, revisions to UNIV 101/301 courses, information literacy integration, and transfer/credit-by-exam policies. While we may not tackle all these issues immediately, we aim to streamline necessary changes to avoid continuous annual revisions.
		- We appreciate any early input from this group on these topics before they move further through governance. Let us know if there are specific concerns or priorities, you'd like us to consider as these discussions progress.
	+ **Subcommittees:**
		- **Academic Programs Subcommittee report on January 28, 2025 – Lisa Rezende, Chair**
			* **No meeting.**
		- **Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee report on**[**January 28, 2025**](https://academicadmin.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2025-02/CPS-Minutes-1-28-25.pdf)**– Joost van Haren, Chair**
			* The primary focus right now is the Repeating a Course and Grade Replacement Policy, as there have been some concerns, particularly from advising, about potential changes. Abby, Cassidy, and Alex gathered some data to help inform the discussion, which I want to share with you. The data shows that among students using the Grade Replacement Option (GRO), 63% had an E, 28% had a D, and only 9% had a C. This suggests that the students with the poorest grades are the ones utilizing the GRO policy. Interestingly, 68% of students using GRO improve their grades, while 32% do not. In comparison, only 25% of students retaking a course without GRO improve their grades. This highlights the additional intentionality that comes with choosing the GRO option.
			* Another concern is the three-course GRO limit. According to the data, 1,500 students have reached or are close to this limit, which accounts for 12.5% of GRO users. Among the 23,000 students who have repeated a course, only 9% have used GRO. This indicates that the three-course limit affects a relatively small group of students. Additionally, students withdrawing from courses (W) don’t use the GRO option since a W doesn’t impact their GPA or require replacement. One surprising finding was that Math 112 has the highest number of GRO attempts compared to other courses on campus, suggesting a unique challenge in this subject.
			* The subcommittee discussed the possibility of removing the three-course limit. While there was support for removing this cap, concerns were raised that students might overuse the policy, retaking courses multiple times without making progress. This could benefit some students financially, but it may disadvantage those who lack the financial means to repeatedly take courses. The issue has been referred back to the advisors for further feedback and an iterative review process.
			* Faculty also expressed concerns about students who repeatedly retake courses without improving. The idea of safeguards was introduced, where advisors could monitor students who are not progressing and offer support, potentially through the A Center, to help students who are stuck in a cycle of retaking courses without moving beyond the D or E level. This conversation is crucial to ensure that the policy continues to support students without enabling harmful behaviors.
			* Additionally, the subcommittee explored the idea of flagging students who repeatedly use GRO, potentially creating a color-coded system (e.g., green, yellow, orange) to identify students who may need closer monitoring. If students use GRO three times, an "orange" flag could alert advisors that intervention may be needed. The committee also discussed how to handle repeated course grades if GRO is discontinued, with options like counting the last grade or the highest grade.
			* Overall, there was a shared commitment to supporting students without letting the policy inadvertently harm them. The subcommittee is eager to see feedback from advisors and consider additional safeguards to prevent the overuse of the policy.
	+ **UGC Report – Joost Van Haren – Acting Co-chair**
		- The Faculty Senate has made progress with both course approvals and the final policy, though one of the regions found some issues with one of the learning outcomes. However, everything else seems to be moving through the system. As for the topic Jeremy raised, the number of new programs being created is significantly lower than expected. This appears to be linked to the budget model, where financial constraints limit the ability to start new programs. With the uncertainty around enrollment and funding, it’s clear that without money, creating new programs becomes difficult. The programs being developed now are largely dependent on existing resources, and there is uncertainty about the future of new program development due to financial concerns.
* **Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm**