Chair Joan Curry called the meeting to order at 3:18pm with a quorum of 16 voting members.

I. Approval of 17 March 2021 minutes
   a. Larry Busbea moves to accept with the noted changes and comments. Brian Moon seconds. 15 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention.

II. Course Proposals
   a. Course additions:
      1) CHN 448
      2) CHN 449/549

      Rob G: Foundation courses, advanced courses in classical Chinese. Students who complete these courses will have at least the equivalent of a fourth semester of language training. Both involve large amounts of Chinese language, it seems clear that these are well beyond the fourth semester.

   b. Approval of CHN448 & CHN449
      1) Larry Busbea moves to approve. Rob Groves seconds. 16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.
      2) Both courses are approved.

III. Proposition for UNIV 300
   a. Matt O: A proposed structure in the form of a building connections topics course that will allow for some creative and innovative team teaching on campus. Allow instructors to come together to pilot a course without having to go through the formal course approval.
b. Matt O: Course with this course special number would not have to be team taught but impetus for creating it was with that in mind and hoping to really only think about interdisciplinary. Document with resources.

1) Rob G: Founding/workload issue. Guidance attached?

- Susan MC: If good idea to UWGEC then push more with provost office to solve workload problem. Possible possibility: provost office or Gen Ed subsidize but would need to limit number of courses offered. Space for innovation. Funding/workload is at the forefront and would need to be resolved before being able to offer.

- Rob G: Set expiration date so that it doesn’t get approved and then sit there.

- Susan MC: Limited amount of times you can request a special course?

- Abbie S: No policy. Not really a way to tell if a class has been taken too many times.

- Matt O: Advocate for a permanent UNIV number.

- Kim J: Wouldn’t have to be a UNIV number could have a course cross-listed between two prefixes depending on the double counting issue.

- Susan MC: Depends on the individual courses. Case by case basis. If a course is offered and it’s successful and a faculty member wants to pursue putting together the proposal and their unit is supportive then the Gen Ed office staff could help designing, it so it meets Gen Ed requirements. A course offered under something other than UNIV prefix then that’s a conversation that needs to included college, department head and undergrad director.

- Larry B: Thinking through incentives to propose this course. If course is taught for one semester what happens to all the labor? Benefits of all the effort?

- Matt O: If there isn’t a pathway to a permanent offering, it’s too much work.

- Larry B: Grants or some kind of funding?

- Susan MC: A lot of labor on front end to design a new course like that. Possibly funding for those designing the course. Goal
in offering is to encourage innovation and range of courses to meet BC requirement. Incentive and support for faculty, helpful. Open to Ideas.

- Rob G (chat): I think this makes the most sense as part of a team-teaching course development program/fellowship.
  --a "speed dating" event to help folks find collaboration
  --competitive proposals for UNIV 300
  --some guidance in development
  --pilot run
  --conversion to permanent course/Gen Ed status

- Larry B: Funding for grad students for this course. Teaching Assistant.

- John P: Potential research courses to help support faculty do innovative work and building an honors section of a course that could piloted with honor students to build out the pedagogy. Team teaching is complicated. Offer Honors College as incubator for curricular innovation, where courses could be developed on a small scale, and then, when pedagogy is framed it can be scaled for larger for Gen Ed courses. Institutional commitment to these courses, not going to have a lot of them.

- Matt O: Finding right parameters and boundaries around those would be a bit of a challenge. Ideally would make sense to have some categorized as such.

- Kate A (chat): I'm thinking about this line: "UNIV 300 courses allow faculty to be more adaptive and teach around contemporary topics and challenges relevant to students' lives." So, how much longevity is appropriate? This year's new thing may not stay relevant long enough to make it worth getting the course "formalized" for the long term
  - Susan MC (chat): @Kate, that's a good point! I am imagining that many of the courses offered under UNIV 300 would never be intended to be permanent so potential incentives would need to be relevant for timely courses as well
  - Kate A (chat): @Susan, makes sense. reframe for faculty who worry about "wasting work" on a short term or one-off course
Larry B (chat): I wonder if you could have several “categories” of Univ 3xx, such as “arts & culture” “earth sciences” etc. that could change rapidly, but have a semi-permanent berth.

Rob G (chats): Perhaps that's the place to resurrect some of those labels of "grand challenges" along with "responding to contemporary events".

Susan MC (chat): We also could send out calls for courses dealing with specific topics if we wanted, based on areas of focus for the institution.

Bill N (chat): This could provide a connection to the "grand challenges" perspective for GE.

IV. Updates:
  a. UGC update
     1) Joan C: Full committee voted. Most in favor, one against and a couple of abstentions. Still some issues on how to make this work for Engineering relating to numbers of credits.
        • Susan MC (chat): 16-1-2 vote from UGC, I believe (1 no)
     2) Susan MC: Working closely with College of Engineering on issues and best way to resolve them. Two primary issues: number of credit hours and how to incorporate entry and exit courses into the degree without creating hardships to students.
        • Susan MC: Concern from College of Engineering about which courses will be in the new Gen Ed as exploring perspectives natural science classes. Understanding there’s a lot of exceptions made in the past for engineering, trying to figure out how to move forward without creating roadblocks for students in engineering and increasing time to graduation. Requirements and ABOR policy needs to be met by all students.

  b. Timeline
     1) Susan MC: Faculty Senate on Monday, next step to take proposal to ABOR. Timeline would be submitting materials to ABOR so that they can review in June. Get material to them April 30th.

  c. Quick Start Update
     1) Katie S: Asynchronous self-paced course available for all faculty groups and advisors. Self-registration on provost website April 6th. Two cohorts capped at about 30 participants week of April 26th and
May 3rd. Registration prioritized for Group A instructors. All group A proposal forms by May 10th for UWGEC approval.

- Joan C: Ideas of having these courses divvied up, having people go through them as instructors are in the quick start courses so that they don’t get piled up. Having a procedure. Previews etc..

- Katie S: Manually enrolling instructors and can ask for materials before registering. Ask for course that they plan on revising and submitting as well as for original course syllabus. Send everything to UWGEC and anything else that would be helpful.

- Kim J (chat): Do we need to see the original syllabus?
  - Kim J: Not interested in old syllabus, interested in new one.

- Matt O (chat): The Curriculum Coordinators should be helping shepherd proposals to subcommittee members and serving as a liaison between proposers and UWGEC...

- Rob G (chat): I think we'll really have to rely on subcommittees

2) Brian M (chat): Will the associate directors be choosing the people who will participate in the live online cohorts?

- Susan MC: Asked Associate Deans for list of courses that they’re recommending to participate in quick start. Provide support if live online quick start dates don’t work out. Not the only chance to be reviewed or propose a course. Timing is not ideal and may not work for some to do revisions and put through Spring.

- Susan MC: Timeline for Group A submission- feedback by April 9 to have plenty of time to reach out to faculty.

3) Abbie S (chat): Will there be criteria available for each of the course categories for faculty to view prior to participating in quick start? Or is it intentional that the only way they know what is required for inclusion in the program is to go through quick start?

- Jess K (chat): Abbie, I believe anyone can access Quick Start, even just to read about the areas, at anytime, once it is live, without necessarily going through the entire Quick Start “course.” So yes, they can see it anytime.
• Katie S: Live online course will be more like a mini course. Quick start asynchronous more like modules. Information in each module. Designed to be used at your own pace to your own needs.

V. Chair Joan Curry Adjourned the meeting at 4:17PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Itzel Íñiguez 4/1/2021