Voting Members Present: Joan Curry, Kathryn Alexander, Isabel Barton, Kevin Cassell, Adam Daly, Kyle DiRoberto, Brennen Feder, Amy Fountain, Rob Groves, Brandon Harris, Bayo Ijagbemi, Kimberly Jones, Steve Kortenkamp, Brian Moon, Maha Nassar, Bill Neumann, Tanya Quist, Jennifer Ravia, Jeremiah Paschke-Wood

Ex-Officio Members Present: Abbie Sorg

Guests: Mónica de Soto Vega, Tom Murray, Aimee Mapes, Devon Thomas, Emily Jo Schwaller, Jessica Kapp, Katie Southard, Matt Ostermeyer, Nolan Cabrera, Ryan Winet, Itzel Íñiguez, John Pollard, Micheal Damein Beauregard

Chair Joan Curry called the meeting to order at 3:19pm with a quorum of 16 voting members.

I. Approval of 3 February, 2021 minutes
   a. Kim Jones moves to accept with the noted changes and comments. Bill Neumann seconds. 16 yes, 0 no, 1 abstentions.

II. Tom & Devon: entry and exit course overview
   a. Feedback on course syllabi requested from UWGEC
   b. Quick Policy Update & Context:
      1) Working with people across campus with transfer students: Concerns that courses will be barriers to transfer students for graduation.
         • Change language in proposed policy to require the courses for students who are admitted as first year students.
         • Classes available to transfer students for those who may want to take them.
         • Use first couple of years of the new Gen Ed. to dig into the transfer student experience and look at students who opt into these classes and those who don’t to determine if these courses should be added as part of the transfer student degree plan.
         • Transfer students attend campuses (CAST, Arizona Online) that charge per unit and most pay out of pocket so until we know that these courses are going to be value added we don’t want to add time to completion and cost to completion.
      2) Syllabus for entry course:
         • Title for entry course: Introduction to the general education experience
         • Course not a success course
         • Course highly reflective: Course focused around reflection, developing the habit of reflecting on their learning and experiences.
         • Placeholder language for reading. Reaching out to faculty and staff and students from across the university to develop readings for this course that is unique to our students.
            - Not adding cost to this class.
3) General Education Portfolio Course:
- Designed space and milestone on a student’s journey through the Gen Ed curriculum and to compliment entry course.
  - Space for them to reflect and make meaning on what they’ve learned and how that applies to their future professional and academic goals.
- Portfolio, bulk of what they will be curating.
- Designed to be student centered, to provide flexibility for them to curate and reflect on signature assignments as well as additional experiences where they’ve learned and practiced skills, knowledge and experiences they’ve gained through the GE curriculum.
- Students will be tasked with verbalizing and presenting those insights using a mock interview platform that can be used as practice for an interview or graduate program interview.

c. Questions:
1) Joan C: There was talk along the way about having two different levels of the first year course, now there will be one?
   - Tom M: That’s correct. If there is a need to add courses for transfer students then that will be revisited.

2) Amy F (chat): can you say more about the particular tech you're using for ePortfolio?
   - Tom M: Digication, also no cost to the student. Thinking about how to support student’s use of digication not just in these courses but throughout the Gen Ed courses so that it doesn’t become a workload issue for instructors.

3) Jessica K: if a student comes in, as a transfer student and they don't need or opt into the entry course, could they potentially end up one unit short of their Gen Ed required units for Gen Ed?
   - Tom M: Can’t remember explanation but same question was asked a while ago and it was not an issue.
   - Joan C: Minimum is 30 units, with the two bookends it’s 32 units.
   - Bill N (chat): Proposed ABOR policy is "Each university will have a set of general education requirements consisting of a minimum of 32 semester credits of coursework."

4) Rob G (chat): Who will be teaching these courses?
   - Tom M: No exact answer but is a top priority on logistics list. Selecting instructional team for these courses is probably the most important decision.

5) Steve K (chat): Could you tell us more about the discussion regarding waiving the 301 course for transfers? I sort of understand the 101, but not the 301.
• Jessica K (chat): I could see waiving 301 if transfers have not had the benefit of several years of gathering artifacts for the ePortfolios, via courses doing signature assignments, etc.

III. Timeline potentials for course approval

a. Katie S: Time frame: Enough time to be able to put together this packet for submission and enough time for UWGEC to be able to review?

b. Joan C: Deadlines: September 1\textsuperscript{st} for course modifications, things have to be approved for the Spring semester but approval before then due to 10 day period. Fall 2022 makes a lot of sense.

c. Susan MC: Working summer with the assumption you’d be paid. Anyone interested? If so at what point?

d. Joan C: Spring, small number of new freshmen about 200. More transfer students but have the option to go into the tiered system. Fall 2022 makes more sense.

1) Brian M (chat): If you wait till September, you can't get a room for more than 50 or so students in a single class.

2) Kim J (chat): Brian, since these will be existing courses, they can be scheduled before a modification goes through.

3) Katie S (chat): @Kim, yes- to clarify this would only be for "Group A" (minor adjustments to bring things into alignment)

e. Kim J: Modification process won’t slow department down.

f. John Pollard: Willing to work during the summer - 5-6 hands raised

g. Susan MC: Shouldn’t be an obligation for anyone.

h. Brian M: Possibility of others interested to do some of the work and would be a good fit.

1) Rob G (chat): If it's possible to share materials in draft state, I know there are faculty members ready to start working but not able to do so until they have a clearer idea about how to do so.

2) Katie S (chat): @Rob, this is also a tension we are struggling with. There is a very real concern about asking instructors to begin transition courses into a curriculum that has not yet been approved (and on top of that has undergone frequent modifications)

3) Rob G (chat): I totally understand, @Katie! I am sure frequently moving the goal posts won’t earn good will. But I'm a big believer that we'll get better results if we can let things percolate for folks for a long time, even with a GIANT disclaimer that its' just tentative
4) Katie S (chat): @Rob, absolutely. I've been trying to brainstorm some ways around this issue- I'd love to chat more if you would be willing to be a sounding-board!

i. Jessica K: Provide sample materials. Have people sit with them and work through them, talk to others about it and come back with helpful information to shape the final version of course approval form or rubric.

j. Kim J: No need to feel rushed or stressed.

k. Susan MC: Summer might not be a lot of time. Departments know what courses they want to offer. Talks with department heads would continue about what courses they want to prioritize and identify which ones would be easy to expedite.

1) Jennifer R (chat): Another thing to think about, there are other steps in approval that we don't have control over. the curricular affairs preview can take quite a while, then you have to get through the college committee before you get to our committee....so for my college, I'd have to get a course routed ASAP for it to be approved in time, whether we meet over the summer or not....

l. Steve K: Feeling pressure to have existing Gen Ed courses submitted. Might get 200 proposals if others feel the same. Creating language about timing.

1) Brian M (chat): Agree with Steve; I am already getting a lot of questions about how to convert classes to ensure that CFA is well placed for the Refresh; we don't know what SCH will mean, but it will mean something, and there’s systemic pressure to ensure my college "wins" the race . . .

2)  

m. Susan MC: Important to clarify, that any classes being looked at this semester would only be that are already scheduled to be offered in Spring 22.

n. Katie S: Once the curriculum is approved and finalized the quicker there will be support systems for instructors to introduce them to the curriculum, course approval process, evaluation of courses.

o. Bill N: With the courses that have been recast, have one or two people take the proposal, do an evaluation and share feedback.

1) Katie S (chat): @Bill- that would be fantastic! And I'd love to potentially do a small "interview" with folks willing to test this, to make the thought process of transitioning courses visible

2) Katie S (chat): (to post within the Quick Start D2L course or on the GE website?)

p. Matt O: Willing to submit his as a dummy.
q. Katie S: More contextual information will be in Box folder for UWGEC. Would love feedback and comments. Continue theoretical conversations in alignments with solidifying documents.

r. Matt O: Are we at a place where everyone feels like we are ready to go with the documents looked at today?
   1) Kim J: Makes sense
   2) Rob G: yes
   3) Joan C: Not hearing any objections

IV. Moving forward with course proposal rubric & current course proposal form

a. Matt O: Simplified course proposal form and process with the feedback from last meeting.
   1) Simplified it down with items related to course objectives and one rubric item related to signature assignments.
      • Asking course proposers for course objectives, learning outcomes and signature assignments.
   2) Would like feedback on whether objectives and signature assignments is enough to provide a robust review.

b. John P: Important feature of new Gen Ed. curriculum is perspective component. Don’t see it addressed on course approval form. How is this assessed?
   1) Matt O: Defaulting to thinking about the distill down learning outcome for EP and for BC as being the place where we’re requiring that perspective taking.
   2) Jessica K: Form was adjusted to make sure that it’s being expressed to proposers that objectives are means and objectives are written to be focused on the perspective.
      - Move away from a list so that course objectives are written to incorporate perspective.

   • John P: Articulate perspective taking by shifting courses organized by topic to organized by central questions from perspective. Is there a way to push that?
   • Jessica K: Example syllabi that aligns with new core values like perspective taking. Ex) Rather than having a topic that'll be covered in each class it was blocked by weeks and questions that will be discussed.
      - Topical information and knowledge to refer to will not change. Not focusing on the topic but on the questions related to those topics.
      - Framing how the students are perceiving the course. Focused on the student experience and questions.
   • Isabel B (chat): I hear what you’re saying, but there are also some fields where you can’t really have an informed perspective without a firm basis in content, for which topical organization might be the most logical option.
      - John P: Not disagreeing with the comment but slippery slope is that this will slip right into topical organizations and then the perspective taking will be a topical organization as the perspective of the discipline.
Kim J (chat): It does seem too much like micromanaging to mandate a question focused syllabus. Could we accomplish something similar by asking what questions they focus on and how perspective taking is built in?
- Jessica Kapp: Not advocating for mandating question based syllabi. For her, that was the way to work through going from current Gen Ed syllabus to a refreshed syllabus and the best way to highlight difference was to think in terms of questions versus topics.
  - Also highlight what was being done well in class already. Made it front and center.
- Kim J: Worried that it can get to the point where it's being said that kind of syllabus is not acceptable.
- Jessica K: Not ask for syllabus for approval process will help as long as course approval is clear with course objectives that will give a good idea of what students will be engaging in in the course.


  1) Jessica K: Objectives are meant to be a guide for faculty.
  2) Amy F: Instead of thinking about the process as something meets or exceeds thinking about it in terms of alignment or match.

d. Rob G: In addition to the blanks, change bolded areas into blanks/brackets where specific disciplinary perspectives can go. To fill in both the topic piece and specifics of what they mean.

  1) Katie S: Idea of re-labeling student learning outcomes and course objectives. Perhaps changing course objectives to course activities so they look more adaptable than course objective language.
  2) Rob G: Love that idea. Using methodologies, activities or other word would help faculty understand what they're writing and gives a sense of freedom.
  3) Jessica K: Reminder – If objectives is removed, syllabi will still have to include objectives in some way.
  4) Tanya Q (chat): Using the term "objective" is actually referring to "formative and summative assessments" correct?
  5) Jessica K: Traditionally that has meant a list of the topics that'll be covered in your class. that's where there's a disconnect between the goals for the Gen Ed versus what people think are goals for course objectives.
  6) John P: Skillfully use the difference between words objective and outcomes for ABOR policy so that outcomes means you have to measure it and objectives means you don't.

    • Katie S: Would calling it something like activities help communicating that these will not necessarily be components that are assessed but are things that should bring students to that learning outcome?
    • John P: Yes. Difference is objectives are learning environments that are created, what are the activities students will engage in, what questions will
they think about, what knowledge will they acquire and be exposed to. Outcomes are did they do that, what's the measure of them doing all of that.

e. Maha N: If no syllabi is required for course approval then maybe form doesn't need to include objectives. Keep for other purposes but have some language that indicates there's trust.
   1) Jessica K: Worry that if objective gets eliminated then we move towards telling people how they're doing active learning and will rub people the wrong way.

f. Nolan C: Reminder- there needs to be a little top down, and also collegiality to round out that conversation. Trust colleagues but not in the system.
   1) Bill N: Ultimately there is going to be a checklist. Figure out very precise way of defining the standard for course approvals.
   2) Jessica K: Move away from rubric and move towards checklist?

g. John P: Student centric program. Change the culture with collegiality, being formative and working with colleagues but sociologically, top down means, collectively this is where the bar is, this is what is expected.

h. Bayo I: Gen Ed courses will work within a framework of undergraduate course syllabus templates.
   1) Matt O (chat): @John and @Bayo - I definitely think we should do formative assessment on an on-going basis. We have created a separate process that includes collecting information about pedagogy (including a rubric) every semester. An instructor can put all the right things in an approval form (regardless of how detailed it is) and another faculty member can take over the next semester and do things completely differently anyways...

i. Brian M: Systemic issue – courses taught by different professors and don’t have to rethink the process and won’t benefit from that.

j. Amy F: Who is “we” and who isn’t? If a program is good for students, if it's equitable, if it can be successful in meeting the learning objectives, that will be either proven or disproven, based on outcomes. If you can't tell from of course proposal, why try to judge whether or not it forces effective from a course approval process. Asking for better measures at this university for ensuring the outcomes are as they should be. Can't know from a course approval form what's going to happen in each offering, all you can tell is what's planned.
   1) Maha N: Great point. Might help address same concern as Brian’s about courses approved taught by different instructors. Suggestion for a structural quality control component that can be designated to a group or collection of people and figures that out through collection of data.
k. Bill N: Less about yes or no, and more about did somebody put their thumb on the scale. Was it a good proposal and independently reviewed, it's why there's the external reviewers rather than voting and saying okay.

l. Steve K: To help address the issue and have the approval process more streamlined, get feedback on what evidence based practices and provide examples of active learning, student centered etc.. Ask in what way have you thought about implementing this in the class. For classes thought by different instructors, ask them to think about ways the department is prepared to handle the system. Some mechanisms being workshops every semester for new instructors. Assessment after the fact.

1) Brian M (chat): perhaps, building on Steve’s comment, adding something in the Course Activities list which asks for those to display evidence based practices?

m. Joan C: How to proceed in regards to the form?

n. Matt O: Keeping it as objectives but providing additional context and definitions. Down the road, collect syllabi every semester for quality control and looking at specific activities.

1) Amy F (chat): I would move to approve what we have here w/ a few verbiage changes re: 'activities' and 'alignment' rather than 'satisfying expectations' etc...
2) Katie S (chat): Perhaps "student engagement" rather than "activities"?
3) Jessica K (chat): Maybe for now we stick with objectives, being sure to be explicit about objectives being the things students do in class, and change the rubric to alignment vs. expectations?
4) Rob G (chat): I'm not deeply opposed to a clearly articulated definition of "objectives", especially in the light of the requirement that they be there anyway
5) Maha N (chat): I like the idea of “Aligned/Almost Aligned/No Evidence of Alignment”
6) Maha N (chat): Instead of language of “Expectations”

o. Susan MC: What is decided on the form that could be revisited and revised. Make a decision, move on and try it out. Add a bit of context from this meeting for UGC.

p. Katie S: Feel free to make comments on google documents.

V. Chat discussions/Feedback:

1) Tanya Q (chat): I appreciate that a focus on learning activities might encourage improved course quality without explicitly setting a standard for engaged learning or creating the sense among instructors that they're being monitored for quality.
   • Katie S (chat): @Tanya, that was exactly my thought as well. A way to continue pushing active learning as a community without dictating or mandating how faculty teach their courses

2) Amy F (chat): But you can't tell the difference between equitable/effective/students centered courses and those that are not from a *course approval* process
Amy F (chat): You can only tell that difference when you look at outcomes
Jessica K (chat): Amy, I think that is why course objectives as the examples of activities done in your class are the way to express those things.
Amy F (chat): Yes - but those are the things you plan to do, and we know that execution matters and plans might need to change
Tanya Q (chat): I think we could take a very "meta" approach by designing a course proposal process that requires instructors/course proposers to practice quality design (i.e. aligning outcomes with appropriate activities/objectives).
Kyle D (chat): @Jessica I do believe in assessing and quality but I think this can get too reductive and controlled by too few
Kyle D (chat): That is just the danger that might lurk in being too restrictive also understandings change. I guess I am just saying that if we have examples it is better for these reasons
Kate A (chat): So maybe assess a course at the end of the term? a trial/probationary term, and based on how well it matched outcomes then it could be in or out of gen ed?
Jessica K (chat): So Amy, how do we approve or met approve courses for the refresh? Do we not as for anything related to course objectives and outcomes? What do we ask for?
Amy F (chat): Jessica, I think we have to look at developing a smart and effective way of assessing our outcomes.
Jessica K (chat): There is a whole assessment team working on this. And I agree that is important. But how do we approve courses in the meantime?
Amy F (chat): And that's a whole other convo that we should have but it's not easy either.
Amy F (chat): @Jess, I think we don't let concern with assessment drive the approvals process because assessment isn't ready yet
Amy F (chat): I think we do what's reasonable at the proposal stage (which is about what's planned)
Amy F (chat): And at least we know then that what's approved is properly planned
Kyle D (chat): Yes I just think they need to be examples for this reason even on the front end
Amy F (chat): But we shouldn't make a bigger-than-necessary approval process in place of assessment
Jessica K (chat): Also the idea that "we" are a small group, maybe now, yes. But this process has been quite transparent, has invited a LOT of input from across campus, etc. We have had summits and invited anyone to attend and not many people did. It is great to be inclusive, but also at some point there is a smaller group of people who are deeply invested and doing the hard work to create a product that reflects the input of many.
Amy F (chat): @jess it's not just who is deeply invested and doing the hard work - it's also who has had access to share the hard work, and the latitude to leave their other hard work do to this...those who haven't been able to get here, and/or who aren't here yet :
VI. Chair Joan Curry adjourned the meeting at 5:06PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Itzel Íñiguez, 2/18/2021