

**Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes  
November 24, 2020**

**Voting Members Present:** Chair Molly Bolger, Joan Curry, Leslie Dennis, Moe Momayez, David Ortiz, Amber Rice, Claudia Stanescu, Jennifer Schnellmann, Joost Van Haren

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

**Voting Members Absent:** Jack Haskins

---

Chair Molly Bolger called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. A quorum was established with 8 voting members; an additional member arrived after the approval of the minutes.

**I. Approval of Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee meeting minutes, 10/27/2020**

Claudia Stanescu moved to accept the meeting minutes from 10/27/20 as submitted. Joan Curry seconded the motion. The motion passed with 8 votes in favor.

**II. Policy Proposal**

**A. Substantial Changes to Curricular Requirements Policy Proposal**

**Presenter:** Abbie Sorg, Senior Program Manager, Office of the Registrar

During the discussion of the Undergraduate Certificate Policy amendment at the 10/27/2020 meeting, the subcommittee agreed that a policy should be created to define the threshold for a substantial change to curriculum, as the amendment would require any substantial changes for undergraduate majors, minors, or certificates to undergo review and approval through faculty governance. This proposed policy does not reflect a change to the current procedure, and instead seeks to make the current procedure a matter of policy; it has been the practice for several years to direct academic departments to submit a Substantial Change request any time the updates they would like to make to their major or minor meet or exceed the definition in the proposed policy.

Discussion commenced:

- How will this policy be enforced? Will it be up to the departments to acknowledge when their annual updates meet or exceed the Substantial Change threshold? Annual updates to advisement report logic are not made directly in UAccess by academic department staff, but are submitted as requested changes. These requested changes are individually reviewed each year- in previous years this review was done by Curricular Affairs, and starting with the updates for the Fall 2021 catalog year this review will now be done by the Office of the Registrar. Part of the review process includes ensuring that the updates requested do not meet or exceed the Substantial Change threshold. In cases where they do, the reviewer directs the academic department to the separate Substantial Change request process.
- Should this policy address change to academic programs over time? If a department changed their major by 19% each year, by the 5<sup>th</sup> year of changes the major could be completely different from what was originally approved. While this is mathematically possible, the committee must trust that their colleagues across the institution are acting in good faith and making updates that are appropriate for their field. It should be agreed that any significant deviation from the originally approved curriculum a) would not be desired by the department awarding the degree, and b) would be addressed during the APR.
- Can the title and the text of the policy be updated to specify that this definition is for undergraduate curricular changes only? Yes, this will be updated.

- Can a note be added to make it clear that since the threshold is based on a percentage of the full program, the same number of units' worth of change may be considered substantial for some programs and not substantial for others? For some 12-unit certificates, a change to any 3-unit course requirement would be considered substantial, while for some of the larger majors, a change to 18 units could be considered not substantial. Yes, but this note would need to be worded carefully- the minimum number of units for certificates and minors is a matter of policy, but there is no policy setting a cap on certificates and minors, and no policy on either a minimum or maximum for majors. Listing ranges of units as examples could have unintended consequences.

The subcommittee agreed the proposal title and text will be updated to specify that it applies to undergraduate programs only. The subcommittee also agree that a clarifying note will be added to note that the size of programs vary greatly, and that (for example) a change to two courses may be considered a substantial change for some programs but not for others depending on the overall size of the programs. An updated version of the proposal addressing these two points will be drafted and reviewed by Molly Bolger and Leslie Dennis prior to being discussed at the December UGC meeting.

**Claudia Stanescu moved to approve the proposal pending updates as noted above, and Leslie Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with 9 votes in favor.**

### **III. Discussion on upcoming General Education Policy Updates**

As a result of the General Education Refresh project, a number of updates to policies related to General Education are expected to be on the agenda for the next subcommittee meeting. These policies have been under construction this Fall, and the University-Wide General Education Committee is still finalizing the proposals. The subcommittee agreed that it would be helpful for the proposals to be received as early as possible, to allow sufficient time for members to review the updates being proposed. Chair Molly Bolger recommended that subcommittee members take time prior to the January meeting to review the current General Education policies (a list can be found at <https://catalog.arizona.edu/policy-type/general-education-policies>), along with the information available on the structure of the proposed new curriculum (an overview can be found at <https://provost.arizona.edu/content/general-ed-refresh>) in order to prepare.

Molly adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m. The next Subcommittee meeting will be on January 19, 2021.

*Respectfully Submitted by Abbie Sorg, 11/30/20*