

Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
January 19, 2021

Voting Members Present: Chair Molly Bolger, Joan Curry, Leslie Dennis, Roman Lysecky, Moe Momayez, Amber Rice, Claudia Stanescu, Rich Vaillancourt, Joost Van Haren

Non-voting Members Present: Roxie Catts, Neel Ghosh, Abbie Sorg, Alex Underwood

Voting Members Absent: Jack Haskins

Guest Presenters: Susan Miller-Cochran, Katie Southard, Devon Thomas, Monica de Soto Vega, Ryan Winet

UGC Chair Neel Ghosh called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. A quorum was established with 5 voting members; 4 additional members arrived after the approval of the minutes.

I. Approval of Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee meeting minutes, 11/24/2020

Claudia Stanescu moved to accept the meeting minutes from 11/24/20 as submitted. Joost van Haren seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 votes in favor.

II. Policy Proposals

A. Proposal to Extend Spring 2021 CLEP Exam Deadline

Presenter: Neel Ghosh, UGC Chair

In September 2020, the committee approved via e-vote an emergency extension of the deadline for students to turn in CLEP exam scores for credit for the Fall 2020 semester. The deadline was extended to the last day of classes (12/9/2020) in order to account for pandemic-related limitations in exam availability. The College of Humanities has requested that a similar extension of the Spring 2021 deadline be approved as students continue to see delays and limited availability of exams related to the pandemic this semester. The proposed deadline for acceptance of test scores for course credit is the last day of classes for Spring 2021 (5/5/2021).

Neel Ghosh moved to approve the proposal as requested. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

B. General Education Curriculum and Policies Proposal

Presenter: Susan Miller-Cochran, Director, General Education

Prior to the guests from the General Education Refresh team entering the meeting, subcommittee members gave initial responses to the proposal materials. Subcommittee members appreciated the executive summary and curricular map that were provided, and expressed that the overall plan seemed like positive changes were made to help students. A list of several questions was generated about the curriculum itself, the implementation plan, and how the curriculum would work for transfer students. After introductions of the General Education Refresh team, these questions were posed to the presenters in a question/answer format for the remainder of the meeting.

- Implementation Questions

- Why start the curriculum effective for a Spring semester rather than Fall? The Provost initially requested the curriculum begin in Fall 2021, but this was later changed to Spring 2022 due to lack of time to implement. For Spring 2022 we would need a smaller number of courses initially- relatively few students start in the Spring semester, and this can be an

opportunity to address small issues with the course approval process before a large number of students need to start the curriculum in Fall 2022.

- How will the new curriculum work with the old one? Will departments be able to use the same courses to fulfill requirements in both curricula? Any existing courses should be able to be designated within the new curriculum (departments and instructors will need to determine which course type/attributes would be most appropriate to request for their existing courses). For some courses, this might mean some bigger changes to fit the criteria of their new course type/attribute. Course design might need to be updated to include a signature assignment or meet other criteria (for example: for Quantitative Reasoning courses, the signature assignment should demonstrate competency in Quantitative Reasoning). For Spring 2022 and Fall 2022, priority would be given to courses that fulfill both curricula since most students will have matriculated within the old curriculum. After a few years once most students have matriculated within the new curriculum, it may be useful to put together a plan for how courses taken in the old curriculum could be used to satisfy the new curriculum's requirements. Monica Vega will be working with departments to help manage seat availability; this would also include coordinating availability of both curriculums to meet the needs of both students and departments.
 - What will the criteria/rubric be for new course designations? We don't yet have examples of each type of course, so how will new courses get created? The new curriculum won't dictate the content itself, but the perspectives students will be taught to take. The hope is for instructors to submit a syllabus abstract that shows how students will engage in collaborative learning, evidence-based learning, low-stakes and summative assessments, etc. The GE Refresh team has been waiting to ask instructors to do the work of revising and creating example syllabi until there's more certainty that this curriculum will be approved.
 - What will the course approval process look like for the new curriculum? Current plan is initially only looking at existing courses for the first semester, then once the first group of course designations has been approved, begin accepting proposals for new courses created specifically for the new curriculum. Approval for course designations would still be granted by UWGEC. UWGEC would also have support for each course type/attribute type to help coordinate this, especially as the first waves of course approvals could be a large undertaking.
 - Would like more details on signature assignments. How will signature assignments work for large 700-student classes? Signature assignments will be collected into an ePortfolio.
- Transfer Questions
- How will AGEC/IGETC work? What about the entry/exit requirements that aren't offered at other institutions? What will the ePortfolio look like for those students?). The Gen Ed Refresh team is in ongoing conversation with the Transfer Credit & Articulation office, AZ Online, and AZ Global about transfer articulation concerns. The entry/exit courses are meant to help students, not hinder them. If they've finished the majority of their GE coursework before they get here, it doesn't make sense for them to complete the same entry course that first-year students do; a 200-level course is planned for transfer students to take that meets their needs better. Also looking at a non-credit option for transfer students that they wouldn't need to pay for, that would help them get their ePortfolio assembled (this could still be required for graduation, even if non-credit). Working hard to not remove the transfer population from the assessment plan for the new curriculum, without also burdening these students with additional time to degree or additional coursework to pay for. The Building Connections requirement and the attributes are more difficult for transfer students to

complete than the Exploring Perspectives requirement, mapping-wise. Don't want to get into the practice of reviewing external syllabi for all transfer students in perpetuity. GE Refresh team will get in touch with advising community to put together a focus group to address questions like these in more detail.

- Curriculum Questions

- Are we reducing the science requirement? Would science intensive majors still need to complete the Exploring Perspectives science requirement even though they'll be taking introductory science courses for their major? How will the double-dipping policy affect science majors? The double dipping allowance would only work for majors that would have required courses that also fit one of the GE area requirements. A lot of the intro science courses are content heavy and not perspective heavy- seems like it would be unlikely that these courses could be approved for the Exploring Perspectives category. If this is true, science students (who already have heavy courseloads) would not necessarily benefit from the double-dipping policy.
- How will the double dipping allowance work with the signature assignment requirement? Would students that double-dip have fewer signature assignments in their ePortfolio?
- Will it be true that this will be a universal GE where all majors have identical requirements to complete?
- Recommendation that the Building Connections courses be listed at the upper level rather than lower level- it would be hard for students to build connections between multiple perspectives if they don't yet have a foundation in understanding single perspectives. Transfer students would also likely have already done plenty of perspective taking previously, so having higher level courses in Building Connections would make sense.
- Concern about the complexity of attributes/emphases. 7 attribute requirements over 7 EP/BC courses will mean complexity and likelihood of trouble with students being prevented from graduating because they've missed one or more attribute requirements. Advisors share this concern; it seems like students would need an app to track their GE requirements.

As there wasn't sufficient time to address the questions raised, the committee agreed to forward remaining questions to the Gen Ed Refresh team, continue discussion at a subsequent meeting, and vote once all questions had been addressed.

Molly adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. Additional subcommittee discussion will take place on February 9, 2021 following an abbreviated full council meeting. The next Subcommittee meeting will be on February 23, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted by Abbie Sorg, 1/20/21