Chair Joan Curry called the meeting to order at 3:21pm with a quorum of 18 voting members.

I. Approval of 9 December 2020 minutes
   a. Bill Neumann moves to accept with Kim Jones’ suggested changes. Larry Busbea seconds. 15 yes, 0 no, 1 abstentions.

II. Recap of policy packet vote and policy packet
   a. SMC UGC Curriculum & Policy Sub-Committee discussed and compiled requests for additional information and clarification.

III. Update Transfer policy discussion
   a. Elaine Marchello met with transfer group on campus and there was some confusion. Simple changes were made based on the new program.
      1) Files were shared this morning with UWGEC and requested reviews and comments.
   b. Kim Jones has a question on how AGEC and second language works.
      1) The AGEC req are agreed upon across tri-univ and CC’s. Students have no AGEC then transfer courses have to be reviewed and transferred per (equivalency guide) to equivalent course.
   c. Joan Curry has questions about “any remaining attributes”
      1) Language from old policy
   d. Joan Curry asks if it’s possible for TR students to have courses completed and still need attributes.
      1) Elaine said it has not been brought up with transfer group.
   e. Steve Kortenkamp points out the AGEC could be used as a “blanket that covers everything” (attributes)
      1) “It’s a situation we have been in and it’s something we agreed upon many many moons ago.” – Elaine
      2) Don’t want to discourage transfer students.
      3) Flexible with transfer policy and can perhaps be changed in the future.
   f. See chat questions and concerns.
   g. Steve Kortenkamp asks about percentage of students that start as first-year students vs transfer students.
1) Kim Jones: It depends on campus

2) Mónica de Soto Vega shares that we will obtain data from enrollment management on number of TR students and those that come in with AGEC and those with DE credit, and those who come in with DE credit, but not all GE completed.

h. Bayo Ijagbemi shares that State Articulation Task Force on transfer students is currently mapping courses in the CC to equivalencies at the three universities. CCs are revising course syllabi so that courses transfer over smoothly. Will the new Gen ed courses be a surprise/issue to CCs?
   1) Amy Fountain: Suggestion to invite Transfer & Articulation Office

d. Joan Curry is asking does GE need vote, draft questions. Elaine clarifies she needs UWGEC to review and comment for input and feedback.

j. Brian Moon: Senior Portfolio concern for transfer students
   1) No extra barriers for transfer students
   2) Devon Thomas: Not for credit option, focus group with transfer students (still working on it)

k. Joan Curry: This conversation will remain open then.

IV. GE Updated timeline
   a. Devon: Aim to solicit feedback and identify gaps in communication
      1) Some progress as you can see in timeline
         1. Reaching out to folks who are interested in joining Refresh effort
         2. Will have some preliminary ideas about submit revised syllabi for review process
   b. Kim Jones: Did the Head’s Up group have a presentation?
      1) Monica: There hasn’t been a formal presentation yet. Susan does want to reach out to Head’s Up and Advising community as well
      2) Joan Curry: Refresh has met with Head’s Up but it was a while ago (responding to chat)

V. Guided Quick Start training:
   a. Katie Southard: Hoping to give an update after we look at the initial courses in the first round of approval. Several avenues to support instructors about new curriculum
      1) Quick Start Mini-Course: Thank you for piloting with us! Currently implementing / incorporating feedback. Hope to have it ready to release as soon as we receive Faculty Senate approval in March.
      2) Deep Dive Sessions: More flexible, specific principles that we would like to incorporate into new GE Refresh curriculum.
         1. First set of Deep Dive Sessions will be about learning ePortofolios, which will be part of the Signature Assignments in the GE Refresh
         2. Next set of Deep Dive Sessions will probably be about Signature Assignments
      3) Office Hours: We welcome additional support for sitting in on some office hours to support instructors later this year
      4) What will the course approval process look like? At this point, we’re hoping to collect thoughts and experiences about what has been helpful and what has not been helpful.
b. Rob Groves: There’s a lot of duplication of information across forms and documents. If we can streamline that (not look at the same thing twice), that would be great. What elements are we really looking for?

c. Amy Fountain: I don’t thing we need to ask for a syllabus at all. I think we should be in the business of approving courses, not the offering of individual classes.

d. Elaine: In current process, an admin has to fill out the form and doesn’t always know the right answers. I think if it’s filled out by the faculty member, we’ll have fewer issues.

e. Steve Kortenkamp: I like the idea of a course document that is different than a syllabus, something that instructors can refer back to. Maybe that document is reviewed every three or five years.

f. Maha Nassar: I like this idea as well. So what elements would go into that document? SLOs as they are tied to BC, EP? As well as to that individual course?

g. Matt Ostermeyer: How are we going to think about some of the pedagogical requirements we’ve tried to prioritized? Wouldn’t be reflected necessarily in a course review.

h. Brian Moon: I’m aware there are classes that have one course number but will be taken in different directions (Artist vs. Humanist). Now that’s two separate courses—or we going to put letters / new numbers to signify difference?

1) Katie Southard: There will be variation even within the same course depending on the instructor. We want to think about the course rather than the instructor “flavor.”

2) Abbie Sorg: If the same course can meet multiple different categories, do we want to distinguish between course and / or section.

3) Kim Jones: If it’s not tied to the course, this sounds like a considerable opportunity for error.

4) Bayo Ijagbemi: When a proposal is going through the approval process, it’s not just coming to committee, it will also go through other stops along the way. We do have a syllabus template which we’re all supposed to use.

5) Katie Southard: Maybe a course abstract (or whatever we call it) might be a way to emphasize the criteria that a syllabus should contain.

6) Kyle DiRoberto: I like Katie’s idea of a general “look” at a syllabus. I’d also like some clarification on how this abstract would be used.

7) Steve Kortenkamp: I wonder if other committees use abstracts. I also wonder about our authority in approving courses in relationship to other committees. This is an opportunity for us to put our stamp on the process.

8) Bill Neumann: We should consider bumping this up to Greg’s level. One approval document with everything in it.

9) Nolan Cabrera: This is a salient issue, as Diversity means almost anything in the old Gen Ed.

i. Joan Curry: Maybe at the next meeting there could be a summary of what you took from this set of comments. That would be helpful.

VI. Announcements:

a. Fall 2020 Policy packets have been consolidated into the folder.

1) Elaine: I can’t comment on UGC Subcommittee. Transfer policies are available. I’ll try to get another draft out. I’ll see if Christy and the Transfer Office can meet with UWGEC.

2) Susan: Updates from UGC.
1. UGC Subcommittee did not yet feel comfortable approving the policy packet that UWGEC approved in December.
2. UGC members wanted to see more materials and examples of how this would work.
3. Policy packet needs to be approved by UGC and CAAC.
4. GE Refresh is collecting syllabi to help provide examples.
5. Hoping to take this to Faculty Senate for their March meeting.

b. Minutes
   1) Itzel began Minutes and Ryan will complete minutes.

VII. Action:
a. How can UWGEC be of assistance?
   1) Katie Southard: Meeting with Matt Ostermeyer to develop course approval documents and a list of suggestions made in the meeting.
   2) Ryan Winet: UGC members wanted to see concrete examples of what different documents / experiences in the new GE would look like.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Itzel Íñiguez and Ryan Winet, 1/27/2021