**Re-envisioning the Undergraduate Experience**

**March 29, 2018**

* The committee was divided into four groups at the meeting on March 8, 2018.
* The groups were as follows: How (size, ownership, delivery), Process, Stakeholders, and Assessment.
* Each group had 25 minutes to report on and answer questions about what they have developed to this point.
* Materials provided from each group will be posted with the minutes.

**How Group**

* Divided their presentation into four areas: ideas, size, ownership, delivery (see How Group PowerPoint 3 29 18).

**Ideas:**

* Focus on outcomes over content with digital credentialing, alternative transcripts, and badges. Focus is on what students can do. Will be able to demonstrate to employers the skills they have learned.
* Freshman seminar – multiple times and different modalities. Faculty teaching the course at the same time could rotate classrooms and present information on various majors/areas. Other content could include what GE means, critical thinking, being a student at UVU, resources, etc. research shows that students that are more engaged have higher retention rates.

**Size:**

* Based on student feedback and practices at other USHE institutions, reduce GE to 30 hours. Eliminate Fitness for Life/Health and Ethics and Values as required GE (would still be included as breadth options). Eliminate the third science requirement. This allows majors to avoid “double-dipping” (using GE classes as requirements for the major).

**Ownership:**

* Departments would not own courses. Courses would be certified as distribution or other GE classes. Would include pedagogy requirements (HIP or other outcomes). No prerequisites for any GE courses. GE courses cannot be courses required for degree programs.

**Delivery:**

* Focus should be on HIPs rather than course content. Emphasize GE “message” in whatever is developed. Re-envision through pedagogy while still adhering to the R470. Use graduation requirements and digital credentialing to improve, track and assess.

Q&A:

* There was some discussion about how the badges would work. It would be similar to competency based education. A rubric would be used to assess the skill level of the student. They would need to get a minimum score to earn the credential. It would not be associated with the grade in the class.
* Ethics and Values could be taken if there is not a class in the major. There was a comment that Ethics and Values was designed specifically as a GE course – specifically a multi-disciplinary humanities class.
* Every course would have to recertify as a GE course. Courses would be required to show they are achieving the outcomes.
* Concern expressed that we are doubling on humanities and tripling on science.
* The outcomes of the courses eliminated could be incorporated into the freshman seminar.
* Further discussions on these issues should not attribute motives to either side. The focus should be on facts and civil discourse.

**Process Group**

* The group was split into a macro and a micro group.
* The result of the macro group is a draft template outlining a process to move forward. It was designed to keep everything in the proper order.
* Some of the work has already been done in our discussions.
* It was suggested that the large group meet less frequently going forward to give the smaller groups more time to work.
* A handout of the process was provided (see Process Group Handout 3 29 18)
* Tasks are organized into six steps.

1. Understand needs of stakeholders
2. Define objectives for undergraduate education
3. Identify ways of accomplishing objectives
4. Evaluate ideas and select best ones for future development
5. Develop specific undergrad experiences
6. Test experiences and gather data

Q&A

* Some of the work has been done already which can be used along with additional data needed. The size of the committee was discussed as it can be a challenge to accomplish things in such a large group. Faculty Senate designed the committee the way it is so all voices are heard.
* It was suggested that the tasks be distributed to smaller groups to work on and meet less often as a large group. The large group meetings are important to ensure deadlines are being met and groups keep working by requiring reports to the larger group on a regular basis.
* Some of the steps could be fast forwarded allowing for some pilots in the fall based on the work that has been done so far.
* A fully developed framework could be the document that is presented to campus.
* The process can still be fluid. It does not need to be as linear as it looks. Back tracking at times may be necessary.
* Ideas do not have to be perfect before being piloted. They can continue to be refined.

**Stakeholder Group**

* The group looked at all of the assumptions the committee had come up with so far and tried to figure out which ones to test.
* There were four stakeholder groups developed: employers, alumni, students, and faculty.
* The smart lab will be used to do some focus groups/market research with employers.
* The faculty questions were guided by discussions in the committee. A survey will be sent to all faculty members including adjuncts.
* Student senators will survey students from every school/college in the hallways during different times and days to try and get a good representation of students across campus. The survey developed was shown on the projector.
* IR is developing a survey to send out to alumni.

Q&A

* Students may need clarity on what GE is. It might be helpful to give students the definition and ask if GE is accomplishing that.
* It was suggested that some of the questions be open ended.
* Maybe some of the surveys could be taken to a sampling of GE classes and have the students fill it out in class.
* The GE Committee does surveys of courses. That information may be helpful to look at.
* An incentive could be given to students to get them to fill out the survey.
* Shauna will follow up with IR to see if questions were added to the omnibus survey and get results of the focus groups. IR was also going to look at alumni surveys to see if there is any information that may apply to GE.
* IR could also do a phone survey.
* It might be helpful at this point to focus on collecting data. People from other groups may be able to help.
* The committee would like to review the surveys before they go out.

**Assessment Group**

* The assessment group brainstormed to come up with ideas (see Assessment Group Ideas 3 29 18).

Main Ideas:

* They would like to see a separate committee formed to oversee academic assessment.
* Recommend that GE should be tied to PBA processes and RTP processes.
* A self-regulating culture should be developed in departments.
* ELOs should be present in syllabi so students know what they are supposed to be learning. This goes along with credentialing.
* Assessment should be talked about by administration in fall convocation and other faculty forums.
* Academic assessment would be a subgroup of UCC. The current GE committee should be a subgroup of UCC as well.

Q&A

* Need to demonstrate that students are learning what we say they are learning.
* Maps were created but no central repository was created. There was no follow-up.
* Departments need to be held accountable to do the mapping.
* Needs to be systematic.
* There was some question as to how the new committee would interact with the assessment office. The assessment office is tasked with assessing programs not course assessment. The office could be staff to support the new committee. The assessment committee should assess all aspects of the university. The AEC could be converted into the new GE committee.
* It was recommended that the Re-envisioning committee come up with a new assessment model.
* This is something that could be put into place by fall.

**Going forward**

* A formal decision about continuation of the committee needs to be made. A vote will be taken at the next meeting.
* A drafting committee needs to be formed to report on what has been done so far.
* Committee members were asked to encourage as many people to be here next week as possible.