Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes  
April 13, 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: Neel Ghosh, Abbie Sorg, Alex Underwood

Voting Members Absent: Jack Haskins

Chair Molly Bolger called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. A quorum was established with 7 voting members.

I. Approval of Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee meeting minutes, 1/19/2021, 2/16/2021, and 3/16/2021

Claudia Stanescu moved to accept the meeting minutes from the meetings held on 1/19/2021, 2/16/2021, and 3/16/2021 as submitted. Moe Momayez seconded the motion. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor.

II. Review Cycle for Academic Policies Discussion

Presenters: Alex Underwood, Abbie Sorg

Continuation of discussion topic from August 2020 CPS meeting. Currently academic policies are reviewed by the subcommittee when they are initially proposed and approved, and only come back for review when a modification to the policy is being requested. It would be beneficial to the institution to have a regular review cycle for academic policies, to ensure that all policies are maintained and adjusted appropriately in a timely manner. What would an ideal review cycle look like, and what players would be involved? Discussion commenced:

- How many academic policies do we have that need to be included in this review cycle? Are there any standing subcategories of policies? At this time there are a little over 100 distinct academic policy pages listed at catalog.arizona.edu. Policies are tagged as applying to Graduate or Undergraduate careers (or both). Policies are also currently sorted into the following subcategories: Academic Program Policies, Academic Standing and Progress Policies, Admissions Policies, Course Policies, Credit Options and Policies, General Education Policies, Grade Policies, Registration Policies and Procedures, Student Conduct and Rights, Transfer Credit Policies, and Tuition and Fee Policies.

- While faculty approval is needed for any academic policies, the reality is that faculty’s institutional memory is weak- faculty members of governance committees have relatively short terms of service, so the makeup of any governance committee is almost completely different every three years. Faculty members aren’t experts on the institution’s policies or the context of how they are implemented.

- It would be preferable for the administrative offices that are primarily responsible for enforcing and working with the policies to be the ones that review and propose updates to the policies. These units have a longer institutional memory than individual faculty members, and are in a better position to know the details and logistical effects of the policies. Rather than this subcommittee doing a full review of all policies on a regular cycle, administrative policy facilitators should do that review directly, and in cases where a policy needs to be updated, the facilitators could submit a policy modification proposal as usual for the subcommittee to review.
• Policy language should be reviewed regularly to ensure it reflects institutional values of inclusivity, nondiscrimination, etc. It would be helpful to include representatives from Title IX and/or other compliance offices when policy language is being discussed.

• The General Petitions committee could be a helpful resource for identifying policies that may need to be updated if a particular policy is petitioned often, it may be a sign that either the policy needs to be updated (if the petitions are always approved) or that the institution needs to do a better job of communicating the policy to students (if the petitions are never approved).
  o Academic advisors need to be included as partners when policies are created or updated without advisors being in the loop on changes to policy, student experience with that policy cannot be expected to be consistent across campus.
  o The GRO policy and the “18 of final 30” University Credit Requirement are two policies that the General Petitions committee sees often. Since the University Credit Requirement was updated last Spring, it is not yet clear if the changes will result in fewer petitions.

• How often should units review the policies they facilitate? One possibility would be to have policy updates submitted each year over the summer, then over the next year the subcommittee could work in conjunction with the advising community and key administrative units to review that year’s proposals in a holistic way. This would help to prevent situations where a policy is updated multiple times in succession due to lack of communication between proposing units.

• Accepting proposals once per year could needlessly delay the implementation of policy updates. While it might improve communication across units, it might also hamper the institution’s flexibility.

• Some updates to how policies are listed in the catalog could improve campus-wide understanding:
  o List one or more units/offices for each policy that students and faculty can reach out to for additional information on navigating the policy. Listing offices rather than individuals will ensure continuity of assistance as individuals change positions or retire.
  o Include timestamps on each policy page. With the current search functionality, it is possible for students, faculty, and staff to find an outdated version of a policy as a search result. More clearly labeling archived policies with effective dates could reduce these misunderstandings.

The Office of the Registrar agreed to reach out to administrative units over the Summer to begin considering policies they interact with, and whether those policies currently need any updates. Those discussions should result in some policy proposals that can be brought to the subcommittee in the Fall.

Molly adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. The Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee will be adjourned until the Fall 2021 semester.

Respectfully Submitted by Abbie Sorg, 4/20/21

The above minutes were approved via e-vote on 4/30 with 8 votes in favor.