

Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2021

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

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

Voting Members Absent: Leslie Dennis, Jack Haskins, Claudia Stanescu

Guests: Christy Ball, Susan Miller-Cochran

Chair Molly Bolger called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. A quorum was established with 7 voting members.

I. General Education Curriculum and Policies Proposal Discussion

Continued discussion of the proposed curriculum and policies surrounding the General Education Refresh.

- Implementation concerns:
 - How many new courses would need to be added each year as we scale up for all students to take the new curriculum? The heaviest lift will be for the Fall 2022, after which it will be a balancing act to ensure there are still enough seats for students in the current program.
 - Would it be possible to do a 2-year hybrid cohort? The Office of the Registrar recommends strongly against running two different programs simultaneously during the same catalog year/semester.
 - Central administration, the Gen Ed Refresh team, and the UWGEC are working on streamlining the course proposal form to make it as easy as possible for faculty to get their courses added to the program.
 - The rubric for course evaluations hasn't been vetted further by UWGEC since initial discussion in January/February. Further discussion with UWGEC will be needed to finalize the rubrics for each course category.
 - There are plans to do an ongoing review process for courses every 5 years to ensure they still fit the area they're designated in.
 - Planning on not tracking the GE Attributes as graduation requirements for the first 2 years. What about a phased approach in which every couple of years additional GE Attribute courses are added as graduation requirements until all 7 are included?
 - Is it expected that the institution will have the same number of GE courses in the new curriculum as the current curriculum? Right now we have far more courses approved in the catalog and seats offered in the schedule of classes than are actually needed. This is tricky because of how budget works based on SCH, but the Gen Ed office is planning on working with colleges to figure out equitable and useful distribution of GE seats each semester. It's anticipated that there will be fewer courses in GE than are currently approved in the GE, but more likely because some outdated courses are not being offered and probably won't want to be transitioned to the new curriculum.
 - Concern that a lot of new courses will need to be created for the BC area- how will we get that many new courses created to meet the needs of the students?

- How many students will not complete their degree in time before the old program dies out after 10 semesters? What is the plan for that? There would need to be a very clear crosswalk or plan for students to follow once the old program is sunsetted. It may be possible to simply leave the T1/T2 attributes on courses indefinitely in the background for students that take more than 10 semesters to complete their programs. UWGEC would need to track the course modifications being made to note if/when the T1/T2 attributes need to be removed from individual course (if they no longer meet those criteria).
- Double dipping policy: students could double count up to 9 units between the major and Gen Ed under the updated policy. According to a recent meeting with the Colleges of Engineering and Architecture this should satisfy their concerns about a net increase in GE units required for their students, if certain introductory level courses are designated as Gen Ed. Will these courses that are being considered as "double dipping" courses meet a distribution of categories? For instance- if they're all approved as Exploring Perspectives Natural Sciences, that will only effectively allow students to double dip 3 units, not 9. The GE team will look into this to determine if these college's concerns will be fully addressed by the double dipping policy updates, or whether an exemption would still be needed for some colleges' majors.
- What will be in place for students to navigate the program? UITS and the Provost's office have committed to build a navigational app, but that tool can't be created until the curriculum has been finalized and approved. A wireframe of the tool has been prepared, and additional work will be done once the curriculum has been finalized.
- Transfer concerns:
 - Transfer Students bringing in a completed IGETC, AGEC, or CSUGE will not be required to complete the Entry/Exit courses. Although the solutions proposed for transfer students are appreciated and will alleviate some concerns, solutions are still needed for the concerns about how transfer credit will be articulated.
 - Transfer credit can be brought in by all students, regardless of whether they are admitted as transfer students or not. The Transfer Credit & Articulation office helps UA students know which courses they can take at other institutions, and also posts credit for coursework that gets brought in by UA students and students transferring from other institutions. It is understandable that the discipline doesn't dictate what requirement the course can meet given the interdisciplinarity of the course categories, but this makes it very difficult to post general rules for students to be able to use and hampers the institution's ability to be transparent. Exploring Perspectives should be easily mapped by discipline, but Building Connections and the Gen Ed Attributes will be challenging to map consistently. The proposed solution of postponing tracking the attributes for a few years simply means that it will still be an issue to be resolved later on, and could create issues for students and for TCA at a future date. Defining some categories as not possible to map means that TCA can't do their job for Gen Ed, and means that advisors will have the burden of making those judgements for students individually. Consistency of transfer articulation regardless of college/major cannot be provided if articulation is pushed onto advisors rather than mapped at an institutional level by TCA for all coursework. Need to be able to create a robust program that can be consistently applied at scale- the complexity currently proposed makes this difficult.
 - GE Attributes are most difficult because they're based on specific things that are being done in the course that can't be known based on the course title and description information that the TCA office receives. This is partially why GE Office is walking back requiring the attributes for graduation for the first 2 years.

- The GE team can't set specific rules about how transfer articulation can work until the areas have been finalized and defined, and the curriculum has been approved. The Gen Ed team acknowledges that a lot of work needs to be done to finalize transfer plans, but also isn't able to do that work until the curriculum has been finalized and additional staffing has been made available.
- Could the Gen Ed team provide a statement of guiding principles on how transfer credit will be approached, to be included in the current approval process so the proposal can move forward?

Molly adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

An e-vote was held on 3/26/2021, following the receipt of additional updates to the policy proposal packet and receipt of the General Education program proposal document. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor and 1 vote against.

The next Subcommittee meeting will be on April 13, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted by Abbie Sorg, 3/26/21