University-wide General Education Committee (UWGEC)
Meeting Minutes, December 2, 2020

Voting Members Present: Joan Curry, Amy Fountain, Bayo Ijagbemi, Bill Neumann, Brandon Harris, Brennen Feder, Brian Moon, Kate Alexander, Kyle DiRoberto, Maha Nassar, Mark Stegeman, Rob Groves, Steve Kortenkamp, Tanya Quist, Kevin Cassell, Jeremiah Paschke-Wood, Jennifer Ravia, Kim Jones,

Ex-Officio Members Present: Elaine Marchello, Abbie Sorg

Guests: Nolan Cabrera, Ryan Winet, Katie Southard, Jess Kapp, Matt Ostermeyer, Emily Jo Schwaller, Monica De Soto Vega, Aimee Mapes, Susan Miller-Cochran, Michael Beauregard Jr., Julie Christen, Analeigh Horton

Chair Joan Curry called the meeting to order at 3:32 with a quorum of 18 voting members.

I. Approval of 18 November 2020 minutes
   • Brian Moon moves to accept. Bill Neumann seconds. 16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.
     Motion passes.

II. Announcements:
   A. UWGEC meeting recordings (with chat) are all updated in Box
   B. We meet again next week, 12/9, which is the last Fall 2020 meeting
   C. Additionally, Susan Miller-Cochran updated the group on the ABOR Civic requirement.
      ■ ABOR has decided to move forward to take the language for the Civic requirement to the full board in February. For the most part ABOR is not interested in changing the language they have so far.
      ■ They did state that faculty should be the ones who decide how the Civic requirement is met, rather than mandating a course or something similar.
      ■ As we move forward with GE policies, we want to make sure we don't delay policy approvals and also continue participating in shared governance. Would like for us to pass through UGC in a timely way. Full committee for UGC in the beginning of February, CAAC is willing to have GE come the week after UGC, and then Faculty Senate after that. Most of the approval decisions should be considered in late January and February.
a) Q: Will we be discussing the Civics component in this committee at all? Yes. We just don't want to get too far in the weeds until a decision has been made. SMC deferring to Liesl's leadership.

b) Q: When you say "a decision will be made" do you mean for our policies, or ABOR? SMC: We mean what ABOR's decision is with how the Civic requirement will be finalized and potentially met.

D. FYI: Liesl has done some rearranging of administration. We will have a Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, and GE will live under the trajectory. The Vice Provost will report to Gail Burd, the Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs. When SMC gets more detail, she will update the committee. Prior to this, it wasn't very clear where GE lived.

III. GE policies discussion (10)

- Elaine M.: The goal here is whether you agree with the concept of the ten policies, not the verbiage or the exact wording and language.

- SMC: We'll be voting on the group of policies as whole, not individual policies.

- SMC: Would like to thank Kevin Cassell, Kim Jones, Amy Fountain, Elaine Marchello, and Analeigh Horton for going above and beyond on these documents.

B. Curriculum (review)

- Elaine: Basic explanation of the different areas. Did make a few changes on how some elements of the curriculum were characterized.

- SMC: Do we have one course listed there or two for Quantitative Reasoning?
  a) Jess Kapp: Original idea was two, but we did not know who was making that decision.
  b) SMC: Recommend having two if the intention is to scaffold it similarly across the curriculum like we do with writing

- EDIT: 2 Quantitative Reasoning courses, instead of 1.

- SMC: ready to move on to the next one, with a change to two courses instead of one?
  a) Rob Grove: we are pre-approving but not officially voting, right?
  SMC: Yes. A formal vote on the full package will be later.
  b) 17 yeses to move on. 0 No.

C. Foundations (review)
SMC: Only changes to Foundations were to change the wording to Foundations Writing, writing emphasis courses (plural) is clarified, and Tier 1 and Tier 2 are taken off.

Jess Kapp: Should emphasis now say attribute?
   a) Aimee Mapes: There are still writing emphasis courses (as they exist now) which are separate from Writing Attribute courses

Are we ready to move on? 16 yeses, 0 no.

D. Exploring Perspectives and Building Connections (review)

SMC: Brand new policy; replacing the Tier 1 and Tier 2 policies.

Bill: There's no requirement for taking one before the other. It just says it's better to take 200-level before 300-level, is that correct?
   a) Elaine: yes - we were used to students taking Tier 1 before Tier 2, but now we just suggest that students take 200-levels before 400-levels.

SMC: answering Mark's comment in the document - the recommendation is that students take 200- and 300-level courses before 400-level courses, but there's not a difference in course proposal priority. Mark: why would proposers ever propose 300- and 400-level courses if there's no incentive?
   a) SMC: Transfer students are more likely to take 300- and 400-level courses. There's also a requirement about a certain number of upper division courses.
   b) Rob Groves: The question is whether that sentence is complicating rather than clarifying. Generally suggesting taking 100- and 200- before 300- and 400-level, it's possible that sentence is less clarifying.

SMC: Maybe the question then is do we need the part of the sentence: "However" (p. 1) after the semi colon.
   a) How about for the purposes of today, take a note to look at that part.
      (1) Rob Groves: doesn't seem like it's necessary for the GE policy, but just a way to guide students on how to build out their degree program. (More detail in chat)
      (2) Bill Neumann: If you don't qualify the "why", it just leads to other questions. A rationale might be helpful if we keep the advice there. Likes the advice component.

SMC: Ready to move on? 17 y, 1 abstention.

E. Writing Emphasis (review)
■ 60% of the assignments must be writing, aligned with WA courses
■ Slight changes to language:
  a) EDIT: Change “Writing Emphasis” to “Writing Attribute”
  b) Maha: The language about “one regular junior-or senior-level upper-division course in their degree program” is ambiguous.
  c) EDIT: SMC: Let's use bullets to clarify:
    (1) 2 Writing Attribute Courses
    (2) One regular junior-or senior-level upper-division course in their degree program
■ SMC: Ready to move on? 17 yes

F. Approved Substitutions
■ Did not get to this category in meeting; will revisit 12/9/20

G. Attribute
■ SMC: Wrote these policies with the assumption that the undergraduate catalogue doesn’t need to go into specific requirements (those will appear elsewhere for instructors).
■ EDIT: The last sentence of the QR description should indicate that the QR Attribute requirement is 2 courses, not 1 course
■ SMC: The QR Attribute policy follows the same pattern as other policies: First a description of focus, then a description of requirements.
■ Elaine: The QR Attribute is also part of tri-university assessment of QR. You’ll see similar courses at ASU, NAU.
■ EDIT (QR Attribute): Clarify the shift in clauses in the first sentence (parallelism)
■ Who is the “we” in “we as”? Wildcats? Human beings?
  a) Nolan: The “we” came from “Wildcats”
  b) SMC: I like “Wildcats” rather than “graduates” because “Wildcats” includes everybody, including faculty
  c) Steve: Formality concerns (Wildcats too informal?)
    (1) EDIT (Attributes): Clarify "we" or "our" to refer to "Wildcats"
■ World Cultures and Societies section: “our” in the last sentence seems to presume students are from U.S.
  a) EDIT (World Cultures & Societies): Clarify this sentence
■ Discussion: What about immigrant cultures in the U.S.?
■ SMW: Let’s move to the next policies. Vote to revisit at next UWGEC meeting?
  a) 15 yes
H. Entry and Exit Courses
   ■ SMC: New policy encompassing two 1-unit courses at the beginning and end of GE experience.
   ■ SMC: Dropped the language of “first-year” because many students don’t begin GE in their first-year; replaced “first-year” with “freshmen”
      a) But “freshmen” might also cut out many students who enter the UA as sophomores or even juniors (e.g. Honors students)
   ■ SMC: These are great points. If you have additional insights, please include them in chat or send directly to Susan. Vote to table discussion for now and revisit next week?
      a) 15 yes
I. Science Courses
   ■ SMC: This is an existing policy.
      a) We have added language about EP and BC categories because these categories are equivalent to Tier 1 and Tier 2 categories in old Gen Ed (though EP and BC aren’t tiers, technically).
   ■ SMC: We also wanted to ask what the impact of this existing policy on new GE curriculum?
   ■ SMC: This policy ties into Double Dipping policy. Should we move on to Double Dipping policy?
      a) 15 yes
J. Double Dipping
   ■ NOLAN (?): Double-dipping is a great way to expose students to subjects and disciplines they may not even know exist when they come into college and to encourage exploration
   ■ Maha: Agreed.
   ■ Doesn’t double dipping create an incentive for departments to fold GE courses into majors to enhance SCH? (e.g., asking majors to take a particular GE course to increase filled seats)
   ■ Elaine: It can. That’s why it’s a good idea to ask departments to make double-dipped classes electives rather than satisfying major requirements
   ■ SMC: Let’s continue to think through these policies. Let’s revisit for next week.
      a) 15 yes
K. Signature Assignments
   ■ Did not get to this category in meeting; will revisit 12/9/20
IV. Chair Joan Curry adjourned the meeting at 5:03PM

Respectfully Submitted by Julie Christen, 12/4/20