

Report by Chair of the University-Wide General Education Committee (UWGEC)

to University of Arizona Faculty Senate, October 7, 2024

Jeremy Vetter, UWGEC Chair, Associate Professor of History, jvetter@arizona.edu

The University-Wide General Education Committee (UWGEC) is a shared governance body currently with 22 members, most of whom are faculty members representing Colleges that are active in teaching General Education courses, along with two student representatives, three Foundations area representatives, a library representative, and a chair appointed in consultation between the Chair of the Faculty and the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. A list of current UWGEC members can be found here: <https://ge.arizona.edu/gened-committee/uwgec-members>. A recent change to the Faculty Bylaws also provides for two ex-officio voting members from Faculty Senate, to be appointed by the Vice Chair of the Faculty in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty, after nominations have been received from the Senate. If this change is implemented, the membership will increase to 24 members, most of whom are faculty from across the University of Arizona.

“...UWGEC's mission, as authorized by the Faculty Senate, is to review and approve all courses that satisfy General Education Requirements, periodically assess existing courses, make recommendations on policies related to General Education, and disseminate information about General Education to the campus community.”¹

So far during the fall semester 2024, UWGEC has met three times to approve courses for inclusion in the General Education curriculum, hear updates from the Office of General Education and other groups, and consider policy proposals related to General Education.

While we have discussed a variety of important General Education issues and concerns at UWGEC, my top two priorities as chair recently have been: (1) finding ways to streamline the course proposal review process, and (2) facilitating an open, deliberative, and faculty-driven process of incorporating Civic Learning into the General Education curriculum. As faculty chair of UWGEC, I am always happy to hear from anyone across campus with any concerns or ideas about General Education, whether at the level of specific course proposal review or larger policy issues that we are or should be discussing.

Below I am including several appendices to this report, all related to the incorporation of Civic Learning into the General Education curriculum. It is important for us to foster an open, inclusive, and transparent discussion across all shared governance bodies, including

¹ <https://ge.arizona.edu/gened-committee>.

especially the Faculty Senate. I have tried to select from among the available documents, which are the best ones to provide an overview of the current state of discussions on Civic Learning at UWGEC, emphasizing the multiple options that are on the table and the sharing of the widest possible range of views and opinions, to best enable a vigorous and open debate at the Senate. If there are other documents or information related to this (or other issues) that Faculty Senate would like to have from UWGEC, please let me know.

List of Documents:

Appendix A: Important Issues for Discussion of Civic Learning – including Several Proposed Implementation Models for Civic Learning, Version 3, October 7, 2024 (pp. 3-7)

Appendix B: Some Pros and Cons of Different Implementation Models for Civic Learning, Version 2, October 7, 2024 (pp. 8-10)

Appendix C: UWGEC Chair Comments on the General Faculty General Education Committee Statement to Faculty Senate, October 7, 2024 (pp. 11-16)

Appendix A: Important Issues for Discussion of Civic Learning

Compiled by Jeremy Vetter, Associate Professor of History & Chair of University-Wide General Education Committee (UWGEC), 10/7/2024 (version 3)

The information below is meant to supplement the official Policy Revision proposals for General Education Attributes and General Education Curriculum as they move through the shared governance review process, in order to facilitate the most meaningful discussion across campus and on shared governance bodies, including potential alternatives that have been discussed for the name of the attribute and how it will be implemented, along with several other significant issues. The previous versions of this document have been revised to incorporate many valuable additions from the Executive Director of the Office of General Education, as well as members of UWGEC and the General Faculty General Education Committee, who have offered their ideas and concerns, after these issues were presented to them for initial discussion. This document will be updated as deliberations proceed through shared governance bodies, especially following the upcoming meeting of the CLCK (Civic Learning-Civic Knowledge) advisory group, until it is superseded by other documents to accompany the movement of policy revisions through shared governance.

Table of Contents

1. Proposed Student Learning Outcomes for Civic Learning
2. Alternatives for Naming the Attribute
3. Alternative Models for Implementing the Attribute
4. Further Potential Adjustment to World Cultures & Societies Attribute
5. Transfer Credit and Credit-by-Exam
6. Timing of Implementation of Attributes as Graduation Requirements

1. Proposed Student Learning Outcomes for Civic Learning

The General Education student learning outcomes (SLOs) for each attribute are not part of the policy language, but draft versions of these appear below. The outcomes are managed and interpreted by the Office of General Education (OGE) and the University-Wide General Education Committee (UWGEC) as they consider courses for approval or policy changes for the curriculum. The overarching learning outcome is based closely on the ABOR language for American Institutions, while the seven more specific student learning

outcomes below were drafted by a faculty task force on Civic Education that was convened in 2022-23.

Comprehensive course (must be in Building Connections category) learning outcome:

Students will analyze and evaluate multiple perspectives on American institutions, focusing on how U.S. history has shaped the present, principles of constitutional democracy and how they have been applied under a republican form of government, debates over the U.S. Constitution and other founding documents, Supreme Court cases and their effects on law and society, civic participation and civil dialogue, and economic knowledge for public policy and personal or professional decisions.

Depth courses must include one or more of the learning outcomes, as appropriate:

I. Identify key events, processes, and periods in United States history, examine conflicting perspectives on those topics, and analyze how those parts of United States history continue to shape the present.

II. Identify and assess different perspectives on the basic principles of United States constitutional democracy, including its structure, rights, and fundamental protections, and analyze how these principles have been applied under a republican form of government as it evolved over time.

III. Examine the United States Constitution, including one or more amendments, major constitutional debates, and theories of constitutional interpretation, and analyze their impact on subsequent historical developments.

IV. Analyze primary philosophical, historical, and political documents that influenced the founding of the U.S. government and its structure, and evaluate the role these documents played in shaping U.S. institutions.

V. Evaluate landmark Supreme Court cases and assess the court's role in shaping law and society.

VI. Demonstrate and apply the skills necessary for effective citizenship, including civil dialogue and civic participation, shaped by effective problem-solving and information literacy, by employing active learning opportunities, community-engaged learning, service learning, or experiential learning.

VII. Explain and assess how economic data, tools, and theories are applied to compare and evaluate current or historical public policies, as well as professional and personal decisions.

Further issues that could be considered when these learning outcomes are revised include the following, which have been suggested so far by members of UWGEC and the ad hoc General Faculty General Education Committee:

- Including option for courses focused on international comparisons to American institutions, which could be incorporated in one or more of the outcomes
- More emphasis on information literacy, which is already present in learning outcome VI, but could be potentially be made more prominent in Civic Learning
- More inclusion of native/Indigenous governance, which is only present in a few of the interpretive notes on the learning outcomes
- Clearer incorporation of HSI and border issues in Civic Learning
- Including another potential option in learning outcome VI for not only the students' own civic engagement but also study of historical and contemporary examples of civic engagement by others that might be examined in Civic Learning courses

2. Alternatives for Naming the Attribute

The name used for this attribute in the policy, which comes from ABOR policy language, is “**Civic Learning**,” which also aligns with one of the ABOR assessment areas. Other names for this in ABOR policy include “**Civic Knowledge**” and “**American Institutions**.” In the tri-university assessment rubric for this part of the curriculum, the three universities agreed to use the term “U.S. Institutions” or “United States Institutions” instead of “American Institutions.” Which of these names (or something else) is the best choice for UA?

3. Alternative Models for Implementing the Attribute

The Policy Revision documents are based on an implementation model that has been called the “**Breadth + Depth**” model, which includes two courses: a comprehensive course in the Building Connections (BC) category² that addresses all of the seven areas

² The comprehensive course options for Civic Learning would need to be BC courses for at least two reasons: (1) Civic Learning is an inherently multidisciplinary and multi-perspective taking area of learning as defined by ABOR, so it will be important for courses to reflect this; and (2) since students are required to take 3 BC

identified in ABOR policy for American Institutions, and a depth course in any category across the entire GE Curriculum that allows students to exercise student autonomy and develop more intensive civic learning in one (or more) of the seven areas. This model has been presented to ABOR already in a preliminary version, but some other models have also been discussed, which are worthy of discussion and comparison, including:

A/B Model: Would also have two courses required for Civic Learning within General Education, but instead of one course being comprehensive and the other course addressing just 1 area in depth, each course would address 3 or 4 of the areas. One proposed version of this model would have an “A” course on the American System of Government (required to address outcomes 2, 3, 4, and 7 above) and a “B” course on The Evolution of Political and Economic Rights in the United States (required to address outcomes 1, 3, 5, and 6 above). In this model, both would replace BC courses in the General Education curriculum. Other configurations of 3-4 areas and student learning outcomes are also possible.

One-Course Model: Would require only that students take one comprehensive BC course that carries the Civic Learning attribute, with no second Civic Learning course required.

Foundations Model: Instead of implementing Civic Learning within the BC and Exploring Perspectives (EP) curriculum, a fourth Foundations area would be established, in addition to Writing, Math, and Second Language. To create space for 1-2 Civic Learning Foundations courses without expanding the overall number of credits required for General Education as a whole would mean reducing some other requirement, such as the number of BC courses.

***It is important to note that there could be other models that combine different aspects of the above models, or that envision something else entirely. (The CLCK Advisory Group leadership has proposed to call this the “Ruminate Model”!)

courses but only 1 course in each EP area, it is important to avoid dramatically reducing enrollments and student opportunities to take courses on other topics, including non-US or global topics, within the EP-Social Scientist and (to a lesser extent) EP-Humanist categories. Depth courses could be in any category, since they could be offered in a wider variety of subject areas, disciplines, and academic units across the campus.

4. Further Potential Adjustment to World Cultures & Societies Attribute

The current GE curriculum requires a Diversity and Equity course that is US-focused (and one that can be focused on any topic), two Writing attribute courses, two Quantitative Reasoning courses, and one World Cultures & Societies (WCS) course. To avoid inadvertently shifting the General Education curriculum too much in a US-centric direction, one proposal is to increase the number of WCS courses to 2. This would increase the number of attribute requirements from 7 (currently) to 9-10 (depending on the number of Civic Learning courses required). Meeting these attribute requirements with the 7 required BC and EP courses is possible because every course must have at least 1 attribute and can have 2. But it would complicate completion of the attribute requirements.

The Office of General Education has offered to provide data soon on how students have been taking attributes during the first two years of the GE curriculum, which could inform whether this seems like a feasible option to consider. We would also need to consider any limitations that some majors have on how students meet certain General Education requirements through multiple use of courses to meet GE and major requirements.

5. Transfer Credit and Credit by Exam

As with other components of the General Education curriculum, transfer credit and credit by exam would typically be determined by the course equivalencies established for University of Arizona courses, and the category and attribute(s) attached to those courses. While it cannot be guaranteed that similar courses taught at other institutions, or exams such as Advanced Placement (AP), have exactly the same alignment with all the attributes, including Civic Learning, as the equivalent University of Arizona courses, there will often be sufficient alignment, although this will merit further study during the rollout of the attributes as graduation requirements and ongoing consideration by the academic units that establish each of these course equivalencies. In the case of Civic Learning, for example, the guidelines for AP exams in American Government and U.S. History, appear to demonstrate strong alignment with American Institutions areas as defined by ABOR.

6. Timing of Implementation of Attributes as Graduation Requirements

These two Policy Revision proposals do not change the timeline that is in the current policy for the implementation of the attributes as graduation requirements in Fall 2026. One possible further issue for discussion is whether there is sufficient reason to postpone this.

Appendix B: Advantages and Disadvantages of Different Implementation Models for Civic Learning

Compiled by UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter, Version 3, October 7, 2024

The list below makes no attempt to weigh or prioritize the advantages or disadvantages of these models, but merely lists distinct ideas and suggestions that I have heard expressed so far. A previous version of this document has already been shared with multiple shared governance bodies, including UWGEC, the Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council, the General Faculty General Education Committee, and now also the Faculty Senate. I have tried to incorporate any additional advantages or disadvantages suggested by anyone from these shared governance bodies, or others across campus, and will continue to update the file with any distinct new points that are offered, until it is superseded by other documents to accompany the movement of policy revisions through shared governance.

Two-Course (Breadth & Depth) Model

Pros: Students experience a threshold level of broad coverage of all 7 areas through a comprehensive course while being able to exercise student agency and autonomy by choosing one area to study in greater depth, thereby increasing student engagement and motivation; Supports scaffolded learning, especially if students take the comprehensive course first; Allows participation in teaching these courses much more widely across the University by including both faculty who want to teach all 7 areas and those who just want to go in depth in 1 area (many more faculty and academic units for the latter) with a more specific thematic focus for their course related to any area of history, economics, civic engagement, Constitution, founding documents, governance, or courts, which could be related to many disciplines or fields of study

Cons: Students will not gain equally deep exposure to all areas; Comprehensive course would have to cover all 7 areas in one course; Compared to one-course model, students would have to take 2 of their GE courses in this area, which could be seen as disadvantage since this would leave only 5 of 7 courses to be taken in other areas of Gen Ed for BC & EP credit; Compared to Foundations and A/B models, faculty interested in teaching multiple attribute outcomes, but not all of them, would have to offer their courses in the depth category along with many other courses that are just focused in-depth on one outcome; Developing a sufficient number of comprehensive courses may be challenging on a short

timetable after the implementation model is adopted; Would require existing EP courses that could fit the comprehensive description to switch to BC

Two-Course (A&B) Model

Pros: While courses on each A and B list would still cover multiple areas, they would only have to cover some of them (either set A or set B), rather than all 7, so there would be more time available to spend on each area of study, compared to a single course model or a comprehensive course in a breadth and depth model; Students would receive a more consistent level of exposure to each of the 7 areas that could be approximately twice as much time on each outcome as in a single or comprehensive course; Allows participation in teaching these courses by faculty who would like to teach multiple, but not all, of the 7 areas of the attribute

Cons: Compared to one-course model, students would have to take 2 of their GE courses in this area, which some may view as a disadvantage since this would leave only 5 of 7 courses to be taken in other areas of Gen Ed for BC & EP credit, unless additional units are added to the GE curriculum; If both are required to be Building Connections courses, or replace them in the curriculum, this would leave only 1 out of 3 current courses in BC; Students would not have the opportunity to go in depth into one area of their own choosing; Only faculty who are interested in teaching all the outcomes covered on either the A or B list (although this is fewer than all 7 outcomes) would be able to participate; It may prove challenging to designate fixed A and B groupings of the 7 outcomes that align with faculty interests or expertise if the preferred groupings vary too much

One-Course Model

Pros: Students address all 7 areas through a single comprehensive course in Building Connections, thereby leaving 6 out of the 7 EP & BC courses to be taken in other areas so that students are able to choose more widely from across the entire GE curriculum; Could be simpler for advising and student progress perspective, since it only involves a single course, which should make administrative tracking easier; From a department and college perspective, since all students would address the attribute in a single course, there is less effect on enrollments in other GE courses across the University

Cons: Students will not gain in-depth exposure to any of the 7 areas, since the entire attribute is covered in a single course; Not as many faculty across the University are able to participate in the attribute, because only courses that address all 7 outcomes will count for

the attribute; Taking only one course for this requirement means students would have less course work, and less scaffolding, than for other ABOR assessed areas; Developing a sufficient number of courses addressing all 7 areas may be challenging on a short timeline; Would require existing EP courses that could fit this category to switch to BC

Foundations Model

Pros: The Civic Learning requirement would receive greater emphasis in the GE curriculum by elevating it to the same status as other Foundations areas; Courses meeting this requirement would not compete directly with other courses in the EP & BC part of the GE curriculum since they would be in their own category; Designated combinations of 1-3 course groupings that meet the requirement would give students a relatively limited menu of options that might be easier to navigate than another complex attribute layered onto the existing EP & BC array of courses

Cons: Students would have to take 3+ more units total for General Education, unless there are reductions in other parts of the GE curriculum to compensate, such as in Building Connections, which would result in less demand for courses in those categories and students not receiving the learning benefits of taking those courses; Could complicate the first year for some majors that have very tight requirements because of accreditation; Lists of options that are manageable for a relatively small number of courses could become unwieldy if the number of options that meet a Foundations requirement expands greatly, in which case an attribute model could be easier for students and advisors to navigate; Would potentially require the course(s) to be at the 100-level, or at the most, 200-level

Appendix C: UWGEC Chair Comments on the General Faculty General Education Committee Statement to Faculty Senate, October 7, 2024

As a member who joined the General Faculty General Education Committee last spring, in my capacity as UWGEC Chair, I have been part of its recent full committee meetings. It appears that the Committee's bylaws do not allow minority reports from dissenting members of the Committee, so I submit the following comments here, to convey both my agreement and disagreement with various parts of the Committee's majority statement.

The comments below my introductory comments have, in large part, already been shared by email on Saturday morning with the rest of the committee, following the reveal of a draft of the statement at our meeting on Friday afternoon, which I had not seen until then. I will try to adjust these comments below for any final changes made to the Committee's majority statement, but my apologies in advance if there is any confusion because some issues I address below were updated in the document in response to feedback by me and others. The final version was not sent to me until just after 9am today (Monday), so I am adjusting what I can. I appreciate the rephrasing or removal of some statements for clarity or accuracy in response to my feedback, even though I'm not part of the majority. I would also like to offer to include minority or dissenting statements by others on the Committee as part of the UWGEC report to the Senate in the future as well, even if I am in the majority, since I believe that the most open discussion of all perspectives is the lifeblood of a vigorous, thoughtful, and deliberative Faculty Senate.

I sympathize very much with the concerns raised by other committee members who firmly believe in the value of a delay in implementing the Civic Learning requirement, and those who are somewhere in the middle but lean towards slowing things down for more study and consultation. It is a worthwhile approach, especially in faculty shared governance, to want to consider all ramifications of proposed changes, and to ensure the widest possible input across campus. I very much support these things too, which is why I have been pushing for so long to get the discussion of a policy revision for implementing Civic Learning on the agendas for vigorous deliberation as soon as possible at all shared governance bodies, including UWGEC, Undergraduate Council, Faculty Senate, and also UCAAC.

Some context: The faculty task force on Civic Education met in 2022-23 to develop draft learning outcomes and begin discussion of implementation models. Some preliminary discussion has taken place at shared governance bodies since then, especially at UWGEC and the UGC, and on the ad hoc faculty committee on General Education, but it is important now to involve more voices across campus, including Faculty Senate, in open

discussion. The Office of General Education also convened open faculty forums last February, which revealed a variety of important issues and perspectives, for which we have recorded summaries of input, on learning outcomes, implementation/rollout including alternative models, and inclusion. Following this, a CLCK (Civic Learning-Civic Knowledge) advisory group was convened, which is meeting again this Wednesday to offer input and guidance on the multiple proposals for implementing Civic Learning.

What would “delay” even mean at this point? On the current timeline, there should be numerous opportunities for shared governance consultation in the next several months, to consider all these issues and more, and this is exactly the intent of the timeline proposed by the Office of General Education, which I have supported as UWGEC Chair. Any discovered need for extended deliberation at UWGEC, UGC, or UCAAC may extend that timeline, but in no scenario would any policy revision proposal reach Faculty Senate until sometime next spring. This gives us ample time for Faculty Senate to hold open forums and discussions involving a wide range of voices, and also for the ad hoc committee on Gen Ed to continue its important work in analyzing survey data, as well as deliberating and sharing ideas with the official shared governance bodies.

Recognizing that the ad hoc Gen Ed committee is advisory to Senate and is not in the approval chain for policy proposals, I tried to make sure that all proposals and documents were shared with the rest of the committee for early substantive input last month, around the same time as these documents were shared with UWGEC itself to get input from their constituencies around campus. And I have advocated strenuously before both of the Committee’s last two meetings to add this to our agendas, in order to provide this early feedback even before the CLCK advisory group. While I was disappointed that this was not put on either of the Committee's agendas, I have received some thoughtful individual feedback from some of the members, in response to the documents I circulated, and I am looking forward to incorporating more of the Committee’s feedback all along the way for shared governance bodies, in order to be as open and transparent as possible about the range of views and concerns of faculty across campus.

Some of us had hoped to bring formal proposals into the deliberation process for shared governance already last academic year (2023-24), following the work by the faculty task force on Civic Education to draft learning outcomes in 2022-23. It seemed clear to all of us, I think, that the implications for fitting this into the rest of General Education would require a wider range of voices than the more disciplinarily focused group of content area experts who were on the task force. Although the different ways for implementing Civic Learning have not changed all that much since then, we delayed already for about a year so that the ad hoc Gen Ed committee could conduct a survey and refine its own input on various

implementation proposals. This did generate some useful data and responses from faculty, and some of the alternative implementation models have been refined over the past year, including some more details on one of the models from the chair of the ad hoc committee.

But at this point, it seems to me, it is time to move forward with more deliberation and input from other governance bodies across campus, including the Faculty Senate.

While I do not support a delay in moving forward, especially when it is so indefinite, I do see a lot of points of common ground in the document, and things I agree with, including:

- Institution-wide significance of this Civic Learning implementation discussion, and therefore also the importance for Faculty Senate to have open discussion in advance of its coming to the Senate agenda.
- Challenges of proceeding without a university-wide budget/funding model in place, though as others have pointed out, this also offers the opportunity for making a decision in the best interest of student learning without the direct SCH concerns that overshadowed everything in AIB.
- Faculty are exhausted from other on-campus crises unrelated to GE.
- Importance of making sure HSI and border issues are incorporated.
- Importance of considering how we could include native/Indigenous governance, information literacy, and international comparisons as part of the Civic Learning requirement, which could be another way, perhaps even better, for handling the faculty survey concern about US-centricity than the idea I put in the “important issues for discussion file” which was to add a second WCS attribute course, a solution which could complicate student progress toward graduation.
- Challenge of scaling up for staffing, which is actually the main concern that I think could ultimately necessitate a delay, and I would emphasize especially the time that will be needed for faculty and academic units across campus to prepare course proposals in alignment with the implementation model that is adopted and for UWGEC to review the proposals in time. As UWGEC chair this is something that certainly concerns me, although I know OGE has wisely proposed that we prioritize review of courses for Civic Learning, and I think it is just barely possible, but it will be tight! If anything, though, this challenge should prompt us to proceed into in the shared governance process as vigorously and openly as possible this fall, with discussions across UWGEC, Undergraduate Council, UCAAC, Faculty Senate, the General Faculty Committee on General Education and elsewhere on campus.

- I fully concur with the suggestion of a Faculty Senate study session on General Education. Prior to the Committee's meeting to discuss this report, I had already favorably discussed the same idea with the Executive Director of General Education, Susan Miller-Cochran, and I believe this should take place this fall, and again later if necessary, so that Faculty Senate can discuss and deliberate meaningfully about implementing the Civic Learning requirement during this semester, before it comes formally to the Faculty Senate, and can communicate concerns and ideas back to other shared governance bodies that are earlier in the approval pipeline. I am ready to help make this a reality and look forward to engaging with the Senate, along with voices from the Office of General Education, the ad hoc General Faculty Committee on General Education, and others across with perspectives to share.

I respect the majority view of the committee in support of delay, even though I do not agree this is the best way to approach the valid concerns that have been raised. However:

- I find myself in some disagreement with the committee on whether it is desirable for a faculty-driven process to defer to a future Provost's preferences. I am concerned about the assumption that the Senate should defer what ought to be a faculty-driven shared governance decision – our Gen Ed curriculum – to the preferences of a future senior administrator. Obviously, the future Provost will have to be involved once or whenever they arrive, but I for one am uncomfortable with the reasoning that we need to defer taking up deliberation at shared governance bodies while awaiting the approval of a future Provost, especially one who will have newly arrived.
- At one point in the statement, the assertion is made there aren't enough details for the various models for implementing Civic Learning. There are some significant, provisional details available for multiple models, and have been since at least December 2023, if not before. The draft learning outcomes and especially the interpretive notes from the 2022-23 faculty task force, which I would be happy to share whenever the Senate wants to see them, are also fairly detailed, even if these will need some revisions in response to campus wide input. Also, it is important, I would think, to maintain some flexibility and open-endedness in descriptions of all these models, so wouldn't it actually be a bad thing if the details were too highly specified in advance, before deliberation? More details will be ironed out during the lengthy approval process, and through the input of shared governance bodies.
- I fully agree that added complexity for students and advisors has been a key concern all along the way, and this is something that has been included, and should continue to be included, as a key point of discussion on the relative merits of different models. At least one model that was discussed early on -- a sub-attribute

model with distinct tracking of each of the seven parts of the ABOR requirement for American Institutions -- no longer seems to be advocated by anyone, as far as I can tell, and one of the major reasons that has been cited is the excessive complexity in advising and student progress toward degree completion that it would entail. Concern about potential complexity furnishes a reason to proceed with deliberation sooner rather than later, so that this added complexity can be discussed and balanced with other factors and considerations.

- The NAU comparison is helpful, but to me it does not support the idea of a longer timetable. It appears that NAU did the whole faculty deliberation part of the process over just 2 academic years, starting with a task force the first year, and concluding with shared governance the second year. This is an even faster timetable than we are on here, just for the Civic Learning requirement! (Indeed, it appears that their faculty senate final vote was in spring of the second year!) We had a faculty task force in 2022-23, then deliberation in 2023-24, and now 2024-25. So, to me, NAU's was not obviously a "longer but also more intensive process" but is in fact very similar, or even shorter than what we are doing, at least on the faculty deliberation side. The additional years at NAU were, it seems, reserved for implementation, including individual course reviews, which to my mind is the part to be most concerned about for having enough time to complete for Civic Learning. But we are eating into that time if we do not start having vigorous and open debates at all shared governance venues as soon as possible, from the CLCK advisory group convened by the Office of General Education, to UWGEC, to UGC, UCAAC, and Senate. Let's focus on greater open discussion at Faculty Senate, and at all other shared governance bodies in the chain of approvals, the sooner the better!
- I understand the importance of having open discussions about possible needed changes to other parts of the Refresh curriculum. However, I do not believe it is remotely realistic to believe that such consultation can be completed for any more extensive reform proposal (plus the very tight timeline for course proposal approval, as noted above) on a short timetable, if we are going to ensure broad consultation across campus. UA took several years to do this leading up to 2021, and so did NAU as noted in the statement. This would be an ongoing and even a multi-year discussion. How long would it take? One more year? Two more years? 3-4 years? I am very concerned about holding up Civic Learning and preventing this from being implemented for a long time, when it can be implemented within the system we have, both to adhere to ABOR policy and benefit students.

- On a more specific point, I disagree with the statement that the Office of General Education is trying to “accelerate the civics rollout.” This implies that OGE is proposing a plan to accelerate Civic Learning implementation, when in fact they are simply trying to follow the exact Fall 2026 deadline that was approved through shared faculty governance in conjunction with the delay of tracking the attributes as graduation requirements, as the main rationale for setting Fall 2026 as the expected deadline (at the top of the policy document that did this). Thus all shared faculty governance bodies have already agreed to a document that indicates this as the timetable we are aiming for. This does not mean, of course, that it cannot be delayed, but it should not be described as an “acceleration” when this is right on schedule for what was approved by UWGEC, UGC, UCAAC, Senate, and ABOR.

I look forward to continued vigorous and open discussion of the Civic Learning requirement and other General Education issues, with shared governance bodies and across campus.