Voting Members Present: Joan Curry, Kathryn Alexander, Isabel Barton, Larry Busbea, 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, Mark Stegeman,

Ex-Officio Members Present: Elaine Marchello, Abbie Sorg

Guests: Aimee Mapes, Devon Thomas, Emily Jo Schwaller, Jessica Kapp, Katie Southard, Matt Ostermeyer, Nolan Cabrera, Tom Murray, Ryan Winet, Itzel Íñiguez

Chair Joan Curry called the meeting to order at 3:18pm with a quorum of 15 voting members.

I. Approval of 20 January, 2021 minutes
   a. Brian Moon moves to accept with the noted changes and comments. Larry Busbea seconds. 15 yes, 0 no, 2 abstentions.

II. Ideas proposed in previous discussion
   a. Susan MC: Clarification for course proposal process and what the rubric or criteria would look like for determining if a course fits within the new Gen. Ed.

   b. Katie S:
      (https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zpUwEGSwAE0HtIZZoCKbJjS4QxC34/view?usp=sharing) Brief summary with points and ideas discussed in last optional meeting focusing on course proposal process and form.
      1) Moving away from collecting syllabi and instead pull out core components from syllabi into the form.
      2) New form will not require instructors to submit syllabi up front
      3) Will require a more detailed pedagogical explanation as well as an example signature assignment.
      4) Gen. Ed. Office would be collecting syllabi every semester but not part of the proposal and approval process.

   c. Matt O: feedback from everyone – what the role of the initial course approval process is and how much detail we should be looking for, how it fits but also recognizing that we really care about teaching and learning pedagogy.

Chat Discussions:

   1) Pedagogical
      1. Matt (chat) : But we could make the pedagogy "disclaimer" less ominous for sure if it is raising flags :-)
      2. Amy F (chat): so maybe not use these particular labels 'inclusive pedagogy' and 'high impact teaching practices' as these are (I think) associated with particular scholarly traditions, and can be seen as narrow.
2) Chat:
   1. Tanya Q: I think the inclusive practice is an important ideal, but may be better introduced as a separate initiative (OIA)?
   2. Katie S: @Tanya, we definitely have many resources at the OIA (including a series running this past year) to send folks to for professional development on inclusive teaching!
   3. Tanya Q: @Katie, perhaps the course proposal could direct faculty to consider those resources.
   4. Susan: @Tanya, my concern is that it doesn’t become an expectation of GE classes if it’s an initiative from OIA. One of the goals of the team meeting in Spring 2020 was to transform the learning experience for students in GE OIA could help us address a range of ways to engage students in active learning, though?
   5. Katie: @Tanya, I like that idea. I can think of several directly links to resources/mini-courses/series on evidence-based practices, inclusive practices, collaborative learning, etc.

III. New course proposal form draft
   a. Matt O: Asking for feedback:
      1) Page three – stable course materials or activities,
         1. Broader than readings and requiring details about at least one signature assignment.
         2. Asking for context, details, narrative, format.
      2) Page four – Agreement, additional requirements such as course and the instructors offering, completing quick start, submitting syllabi every semester, commitment to inclusive pedagogy and high impact teaching practices etc..

Feedback:
   b. Brian M: Great form, good approach but some classes are taught by multiple professors – possible to have a number and then letters to take a new meaning (Ep 109:A, Ep 109:B)
      1) Susan MC: Challenging trying to determine what requirements a student has met. Something that would need to be brought up with the implementation team – require different iteration of the course?
      2) Kim J: Reiterating what is being said in chat – Her understanding that those are separate courses and no problem tracking it but could be less confusing for students if separate numbers.
      3) Isabel B: Great document, helpful at mapping out a course to fit into a particular area of GE curriculum & clarifying it’s new place in new Gen Ed. Last bit on there at bottom of page four about pedagogical practices could be problematic due to not all professors are good at the same instructional styles. Rather than micromanaging professors, we ought to stop the requirement at the general level of general principles.
         1. Jessica Kapp: Intention not to micromanage, idea is to allow faculty to think about what they do in their class that is beyond the lecture model. Not to tell
others how but this is a commitment to the new GE that is not lecture only. Needs to be reworded.

4) Abbie S: Course catalog having different course numbers – Issues with needing to say whether a student could also take other iterations or would it be similar enough content that it would be inappropriate to get credit both or more versions. Separating them that way would create difficulties for managing student enrollments.

c. Rob G: Big fan of core course materials concept – maintains high degree of flexibility while ensuring that students know what the course is going to do. A worry is that it may lead towards people not rethinking their curriculum but slapping a new label on the old product and may lead people towards the wrong direction.
   1) Susan MC: We’ve been puzzling through how to incorporate the potential review to determine if a course that’s been revised for new Gen Ed should still also meet requirements for old Gen Ed. Leaning towards grandfather approach. Don’t want the way that we gather that information through course proposal process to undercut what we’re trying to do in the revision itself.

d. Bayo I: Not requiring a complete course syllabus with proposal – For approval a need to see the final course syllabus as proposed but will use this proposal form to make sure that the proposal meets the expectations of Gen Ed curriculum. Doesn’t mean that we will be looking at everything. Mindful of the fact that the course approval process goes through different committees. Good idea to have those proposing a Gen Ed course have a complete course syllabus attached and then the complete proposal. Complete product all together. Seeing what matters most to us and it’s reflected in the syllabus.
   1) Susan MC: Others reiterated in the chat but it’s important for us to keep in mind the other groups who review these too. Helpful for us to identify what is needed in first group of courses that we will be looking at that were already approved by Gen Ed.

Description of categories of three group courses

e. Katie S: Courses that will be collected through the new course proposal form for spring 2022 will only be courses that have been previously approved through GE.
   1) First group being courses that are already aligned with the perspective, taking focus and some of the attributes. Transition components would be minor.
      1. Wondering if, for Spring 2022 rollout, folks should submit course proposal form and signature assignment by the end of this semester in order to begin review.
      2. Feedback on whether syllabi should be included at course proposal point.

   2) Matt O: Curricular affairs and Alex from Registrar’s Office open to creating a new rubric for specific pilot transition period to allow for identifying courses that fit into that group A that would require the full syllabus.
3) Susan MC: In response to Jennifer’s chat question about whether there’s a timeline for each of those.
   1. Prioritize those classes and not have colleges or units feel like they have to be running parallel versions of the same course, meeting different requirements.
   2. In March group A would be courses that we would be reviewing. Less revision required for this group therefore less work for faculty and colleges. Ex. Courses that need to incorporate a signature assignment that addresses learning outcomes in the course.
   3. See how many courses are proposed within group B and get a sense how much time it will take to review in UWGEC. Lovely if we could open it up to group B courses at the end of spring semester but not sure, might be until fall depends on what we decide at the end of this semester.
   4. Group B and C courses have them in place and ready to review for Fall but Spring 22 don’t need as many classes on the schedule for incoming group. Not high priority but want to allow people creating BC courses to have enough time.

Feedback:
   f. Brian M: Do you know how many courses you’re going to need in Spring 2022 from each category or overall and how many you’re going to need in the Fall? If so, do you have enough group A courses?
      1) Susan MC: Mónica is focusing on those areas and she would have a definitive answer as she is working with Alex in the Registrar’s Office. One by one we are meeting with each Associate Dean in the colleges to talk about what courses they think might be good candidates to try to move forward at the beginning of the process. One of the highest priorities to make sure we have enough seats available for students. For Spring 22 a lot of students enrolling for these courses will be transfer students. Expectations about what first time full time freshmen might take in the new Gen Ed would not necessarily hold. Working in close coordination with transfer office to make sure we have the right options available for those students.

   g. Susan MC: How comfortable does everyone feel with the idea of courses that are revised for the new Gen Ed that exist in the current Gen Ed, being grandfathered in so that they still meet the requirements that they held before? Or should we review those looking at the current tier system generated requirements?
      1) Isabel B (chat): Could you clarify the question? Are we grandfathering all courses, or a subset of them?
      2) Susan MC: What I was suggesting is that if a course currently carries or fulfills requirements in the current Gen Ed. If it's being revised and approved in the new Gen Ed that it could still meet requirements in the old one now.
         1. Chat: Kim Jones, Larry Busbea, Amy Fountain, Maha Nassar, Kyle DiRoberto, Jessica Kapp, Rob Groves, Isabel Barton all agree with grandfathering in courses.
Susan MC: If a course number doesn’t change, it carries the same number and a student takes it, it would meet the requirements in whichever version of the general curriculum they had matriculated into unless UWGEC revied it and decided to revoke those Gen Ed.

1) Abbie S: That’s how it would work in the system unless UGWEC says no, this no longer applies to X category then it would continue to have category listed.

Maha N: Question about numbering – The 150/160 tier one Gen Ed under, say the EP would no longer have those numberings and what would the implications for ones that count towards the major be?

1) Susan MC: They would still carry the same numbers. If this is a class someone is identifying as one that they could put through in group A not requiring a large scale revision to the content. One of the stipulations for group A would be that it does not need to be re-numbered. Possible to re-number courses but complicated.

Rob G: Presumably, Group C courses (new courses) people could number them however they like.

1) Susan MC: Exactly. That would also be true for group B if there are changes being made and they need to be re-numbered. If there’s no need to re-number let’s not do it.

Steve K: An issue that was also put on the chat. How would grandfathering work with multiple sections taught by multiple instructors? Some who bought into the new system and others who haven’t.

1) Susan MC: One thing we need to figure out for Spring 22 is if faculty member or an instructor is teaching an approved course in the new Gen Ed there are professional development instructional support module they will have been required to participate on. People who are teaching the course understand what the expectations are in the new Gen Ed so that will be a requirement in order to be listed as the instructor.

2) Kim J: Department Heads should sign off and not faculty members proposing a course. Make departments aware that there are certain expectations for participating in new Gen Ed program. Explain support for instructors and courses need to be taught by someone that understands what was approved in the new Gen Ed program and will teach the course in a way that matches that.

3) Susan MC: Meeting with Associate Dean. The process how course proposals come forward from different colleges and units varies. Not every college follows the exact same process. Difficult to dictate what the proposal process should be as it’s for more than just Gen Ed. However, having specific communication with department heads and directors of undergraduate studies since it’s more about putting the schedule together and who’s teaching which course than the proposal itself.

4) Maha N: Amplify Amy’s comment on the chat – Culture change where instructors do not interfere with or advise others on how to teach. Helpful for Gen Ed leadership team to have communication with department head and notifying that it
will require some change in departments. Communicating with department heads and directors of undergraduate studies will help smooth the way and create less awkwardness.

5) Steve K: He understands the need for grandfathering in courses but better with a whole new course number since it’s easy to fall back into old ways of teaching if instructors have taught that course before.

6) Brian M: Informed perspectives really going to hit the arts because some are comfortable teaching from different perspectives the same course.
   Conversations for Spring courses are in April to see who will teach what courses.
   1. Susan MC: Timing is important

7) Jessica K: Difficult culture change – important to the new gen ED to set at least some minimal expectations of change in terms of how courses are taught, in terms of perspective, content etc..
   1. Jennifer Ravia (Chat) : How will this be monitored/enforced?
   2. Matt O (chat): @Jennifer This is a brainstorm for a way we can facilitate some ongoing formative assessment
   3. Susan MC (chat): @Jennifer, one of the ways will be through the recursive review process (long-term). We’ll also have to be checking the schedule and reaching out to departments if faculty are scheduled who haven’t gone through an intro to GE.
   4. Brian M (chat): @ Matt, will the formative assessment be a part of the proposal process, or will that go through the Gen Ed area?
   5. Matt O (chat): @Brian no, it would be after a course is approved. More of an ongoing process that we still need to work out the role of UWGEC, the GE office, OIA, departments, etc.
   6. Brian M (chat): @Matt I think the formative assessment is going to need the department head support. I’m grateful for it, but I don’t feel as if I can pull aside my colleagues that don’t use best practices, and tell them to get out of Gen Ed.

8) Steve K: Often intentions start to drift after a few years. Sunset clause that states some courses can be grandfathered in with old numbers but in three years every Gen Ed course will be new with new description. Not a sudden end.

9) Susan MC: Reminder –
   1. Periodic review, a course is approved for a certain amount of time (5 years) and reviewed after that to see if it still meets goals of Gen Ed.
   2. Implementing an assessment plan based on what ABOR is requiring the team to report data on. Asses elements on campus that are also important within the new Gen Ed program. Any interest, questions or concerns are always welcome.

10) Amy F: Culture change difficult at UofA because there is not one culture. Different cultures in different units. Difficult to implement. Encourage to be cheerleaders in a
way that’s not about changing everything and assuming everyone is doing it wrong. Form is nicely designed but asking for too much that feels like micromanagement. Instructors should demonstrate/qualifying themselves as instructors and then have rules for courses and rules for who can teach the courses in Gen Ed.

1. Kate A (chat): Could there be a Refresh ambassador in each department, who can specify the info in the quick start to the discipline, its goals and methods to a field? someone who has done it and gets it? recognize and work with the decentralization on campus

2. Rob G (chat): Unit-centered Refresh experts was an idea tossed around in the Quality of Teaching and Learning group last spring. I think one of the sticking points is not adding (more) uncompensated labor/service to faculty members' plates.

3. Susan MC: @Kate these are the kinds of ideas we’re exploring. I really like this possibility, and we'd just have to figure out how to support it.

11) Susan MC: Way for us to think about how we’re setting up some of the mini courses that we do and the professional development. Ways for faculty to share some of the strategies that they’ve been using that have been successful. Faculty actively engaged instead of scrolling through a video course.

I. Katie S: Asking for feedback - What parts of this form do we want to keep, modify language, what it might look like for the Spring 22 rollout specifically about syllabi. Including syllabi for Spring 22 and future vs. not, for those two categories.

1) Amy F (chat): Everything you have, just stop at "signature assignment details"

m. Susan MC: Should faculty members only fill out course information and the rest about how many sections and how many students etc. be answered by administrative?

1) Kim J: Forms should come from department so that they are aware what we are trying to accomplish and are committed. Some of the content would come from faculty member. Might get more collaboration and communication between department head and faculty.

IV. (If time) GE course approval work flow

   a. GE Course Proposal Form
   b. GE Course Proposal Rubric
   c. GE Syllabus Collection Form
   d. GE Syllabus Collection Rubric and Checklist

1) Matt O: Thoughts on what others might be looking for. Focus on the narrative provided for meeting, learning, facilitating outcomes for each part of the curriculum and signature assignments. Using the Proposal form, what would the group want to see and evaluate in this process.

2) Susan MC: A review guideline for UWGEC

   1. Yes. Providing context for things that we might look for associated with each course learning outcome.
3) Matt O: Transparent and important document for instructors going through the proposal process so they see what we are looking for. This would be linked in the course proposal.

4) Rob G: Too many words on the page: Creating more categories that are just yes, no, maybe. Having trouble thinking how to use this.

5) Bill N: Very prescriptive. Help folks understand what we’re trying to get to so opposed to just did you meet the checkbox.
   1. Brian M (chat): Bill’s observation about the prescriptiveness of all of the language caught my attention . . . I’m torn. A part of me wants freedom, but I also like the ability to just check the boxes. Bill’s conclusion of finding ways to buy into the spirit . . . to sell the philosophy I think is necessary, and maybe it’s not so much about the language of forms
   2. Amy F (chat): could we look at peer review as a model process?
   3. Amy F (chat): the model is that the course proposal is your paper, the GenEd Office employees are editors-in-chief and faculty are peer reviewers and the options are desk-reject, revise and resubmit (major), revise and resubmit (minor), accept.

6) Isabel B: troubled by the statement that acquisition of a basic knowledge isn't the primary learning goal. I understand the benefit of taking a perspective and being able to argue it, but not always possible for some fields and disciplines.
   1. Language used is confusing for someone without the extensive exposure to educational terms.
   2. Length of text less intimidating.

7) Kim J: Frame things - asking how your course, either as you currently teach it or are planning to redesign it meets these various things that we’re looking for.

8) Bill N: Not everything fits. A course might be wonderful but not fit into the new Gen Ed anymore.

9) Katie S: Feedback on syllabus addition as a required component, appendix or addendum.

10) Jessica K: do we want to leave these things open ended, or do we really want things where when you're reviewing classes can go, yes, this meets or no it doesn't meet?
   1. Isabel B (chat): Perhaps we could have a rubric to ensure consistency and transparency, but leave room for appeals or attachments to allow for additional, freeform explanation?

11) Susan MC: Brian makes a good point in the chat – Some of it depends on how many are being reviewed at a time. Consistency is important. Two things that Gen Ed office can help facilitate is how consistent we are in evaluating courses and providing on the decisions that are made. Immediate and consistent support to faculty.

V. Announcements:
a. Susan MC: Ongoing convo with UGC. As we have new things we’ll make sure you all have access as well.

b. Susan MC: Undergrad UAAC formerly known as CAAC
   1) Asking to review some of the language and definitions for different areas, and specifically things like the language for the different parts of exploring perspectives.
   2) How we phrase building connections and attributes.

c. Susan MC: Presenting the current version and process of Gen Ed to ABOR in February meeting.

VI. Chair Joan Curry adjourned the meeting at 5:01PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Itzel Íñiguez, 2/3/2021