**Faculty Senate Minutes**

Dec. 6, 2022

Via Person/Microsoft Teams, 3:00-5:00 pm

Call to order by President Hilary Hungerford: 3:06 p.m.

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Senate President/Vice President Nominations:
  + Nominations for president & vice president will close within the next 5 minutes. We will send out the election information within the next hour.
  + No new nominations: the nominations stand closed.

**General Education Taskforce Committee:**

* Evelyn Porter: You should all have a paper copy in front of you if you are in person or a digital copy if you are online. R470 Dictates a lot of what we do with GE. To get to a minimum of 30, we really have 3 credits that we need to fulfill. The first two pages of the proposal are the President’s charge reminder. This is a preliminary proposal. The point of this is to gather feedback from faculty. The final proposal will be in March.
* Reduce the GE requirement to 32 credit hours by removing the 3rd science requirement and make some changes to other categories. One of these categories is health and wellness.
* We want to offer options and choices due to the richness and diversity of the students that come to our campus. Currently, it doesn’t meet them where they are at.
* Another proposal is to remove prescriptive GE requirements.
* We have a website with a place for feedback.
* Comment/Kathleen Young: #2 removing prescriptive GE courses: many health programs and also dental hygiene will lose accreditation if that happens. Accreditation requires specific GE requirements.
  + Comment/ Raiden Gaul: The proposal can’t be approved if this isn’t fixed.
* Comment/Maureen Andrade: I was wondering if by not being able to double dip GE and major requirements if this will extend the time to graduation and students will have to take additional credits.
* Comment/Doug Czajka: I just came from teaching GE courses (GEO 1010). I feel like I have to justify keeping my enrollments up to keep teaching important issues. For the learning outcomes, science hits 6 of the 8 of those. There isn’t a whole lot in here to support the justification of removing the 3rd science. It’s not helping to prepare our students to work in the 21st century job market. We feel it’s essential for students to hear these important ideas and critical issues that are very related to science. If science did have to go, maybe we could add a lab requirement and cut 2 hours instead of 3 hours. We could combine ethics and science together into a science and society class. Removing the 3rd science is not in the best interests of our students.
* Comment/Kathleen Young: This is about creating a balance. It evens it out even more to have 3 of the total credits be science. Within our dental hygiene we have an ethics course. Would it be possible to have this count as GE?
  + Evelyn: Because these are mostly 3000 and 4000 levels, most of these ethics classes won’t fit into the GE requirement right now. The issue will be even if it happens, part of the expansion will be you won’t be dictating all students majoring in nursing are required to take a certain GE course.
  + Kathleen: If it was re-numbered the courses to a 1000 or 2000, would it open it up as a possibility? It would make it so they have one less course to take.
  + Evelyn: It’s not impossible but I can’t really answer that right now because we haven’t settled on exactly what that would look like. A department would need to apply and it would have to go for some sort of process.
* Question/John Hunt: My question concerns the vote. Was there a broad consensus for these changes and if not, what where the major concerns?
  + Evelyn: Initially, there was a broad consensus to go with the 32 proposal I presented today. But based on feedback that members of the committee received, we had a second discussion on 35 for broadening the 3rd science and had another vote. We decided to go with the first one and take that forward and adjust it based on the feedback we get. We are hoping our feedback will help us break the tie. 30 is off the table, but 35 and broadening the 3rd science is not off the table.
  + Hilary: By the 35 proposal the 3rd science would become a STEM requirement. It could be remedial math or applied technology.
* Question/Natalie Monson: Was accreditation discussed during the taskforce meetings? If this is done, we wouldn’t be able to be a program. Was this not know previously?
* Comment/Raiden Gaul: There is no way this can move forward if the health science programs can’t be accredited.
  + Hilary: Accredited programs have special permissions that other programs don’t.
* Comment/Natalie Monson: I do appreciate that we are giving students choices, but I think it’s nice when a student knows what he or she wants to do, they know what they need to take and can move forward.
* Comment/Jim Price: It scares the heck out of me to reduce the science requirement at all. This semester I’m teaching non-majors and they are so ignorant and unengaged about science and there are too many problems in this world that are subject to science denial.
* Evelyn: We have exit surveys but the issue is there is no way to show what boost UVU gave the student.
* Question/Skyler Simmons: It seems like part of this to remove so-called hidden prerequisites. Did you look at USHE and other institutions?
  + Evelyn: We did. Snow is the lowest and the U is the highest at 45. We didn’t dig into it program-by- program at other institutions. We don’t allow hidden prerequisites in our programs. There may be some we missed, but that was a big effort to go through and find those.
* Comment/Nancy Allred: Years ago in music, we found PHYS 1700 and we decided all music majors should be aware of it, so we put it as a recommendation. We didn’t feel like we wanted it to be prescriptive.
* Comment/Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer: General education isn’t something that is just geared towards specific skills, but also something where they first decide what they actually want to be and what they want to become. We need to keep in mind that GE is laying down different classes and laying a broad foundation. The whole idea of reducing the amount of credits is a bad idea and isn’t serving the students. I do think 35 credits and not losing the science would be a much better idea. We need to look at backwards engineering design.
* Comment/Sandie Waters: I do think most departments can make a case for how important their content ideas are. I wonder if we are so tied into our courses that we maybe we need to take a step back and look at our objectives and what we need to do to cover our objectives. This doesn’t cover the nursing and dental hygiene, but that’s another issue. We need to come from a place of creativity.
* Comment/Raiden Gaul: Nursing is in a hard position. We need to meet both the needs of intensive programs and general education.
* Comment/John Hunt: We are a university, so we adopt the value of most universities that are a providing a general education. I support the general science courses and those that help create an informed voting population. We need to watch out because the President wanted to reduce this to 30 credits. Is this going to be an ongoing thing each year? I believe in compromise but sometimes we need to stand our ground.
  + Evelyn: I never felt that the President wanted to go down to 30.
  + John Hunt: I’m just concerned because there are many cases where we establish something and then change it 3 years later.
  + Hilary: It was at the encouragement of the President that we look at our GEs but there wasn’t anything to trick the committee.
* Comment/David Frame: From the technology perspective, our advisors are asking us for more and more skills. We need to graduate people who are capable in the field. If you give us those three credit hours, they will be used well in our program and our students will benefit from it.
  + Evelyn: Things to consider as we talk about giving back 3 credits, you still have to consider stack- ability. You hope to get students an associate degree and then add it on to a bachelor’s degree. There will be some limitations.
* Question/Dustin Shipp: Of all the different questions where they rated how UVU students were doing, the lowest one was the awareness of the natural world and so now we are proposing removing the requirement so students will be even less educated? We talk about the quantity, but what about the quality?
  + Evelyn: We have talked about this. What we would like to see is GE developed with HIPS. We want to help our faculty teach this more broadly. We also talked about an informational campaign. If you ask people what GE is, you get 10 different answers from 10 different people. This is something we fall short on as a campus.
* Evelyn: There are a lot of comments in the chat about smaller enrollments in GE classes. That’s outside of the Taskforce but something we can definitely look at.
* Question: Who is creating the PLOs for the wellness?
  + Evelyn: We would create a separate taskforce with broad guidance from the GE Taskforce. We would find subject matter experts in this category.
* Question: First year seminar courses: is it a seminar class or a first-year seminar housed within a class?
  + Evelyn: that would have to be a separate thing that we would look at under new guidelines.
* Comment: Public Health is worried about losing their first class. We are the first and only health class they get after high school. It’s the only adult health-based education that any of our students get.
* Question/Ming Yu: UVU is special and diversified with lots of students with different needs. There will never be one solution to fit all. Based on these discussions, we have different concerns. One GE requirement will not satisfy all departments or all students. Is there a record from another institution where they have different GE requirements?
  + Evelyn: What we are starting to see evolve is diversity, equity, and inclusion requirements. Nobody is saying what we are doing is wrong, but can we do it differently? Can we adapt to the world around us and meet the needs of our students in a different way from what we are currently doing?
* Ming Yu: Based on research, we want to introduce students to their majors earlier. The assumption is the students know what to do, so we shorten the GE. This assumption is the students don’t know what they want to do, so we introduce more classes. It seems like these statements contradict each other.
* Evelyn: We are trying for flexibility.
* Question/Jennifer Shubert: Would departments need to modify their programs and when would these go into effect?
* Evelyn: It would be Fall 2024. Anything that we can do to facilitate, we will work with the Curriculum Office to make it happen. The best advice I can give, look at your program and those 3 credits can go back into your open electives.
* Natalie Monson: I’m nervous about talking about possible dates when there are major problems with this.
* Hilary: We are definitely going to look at the accreditation issues 100%.
* Question/Raiden Gaul: To meet everyone’s needs can we take out the statement that programs cannot prescribe certain requirements. Would that be a good compromise?
  + Hilary: We can revisit this for sure.
* Comment/Natalie Monson: There was discussion about students who transfer into our college and have to re-take classes. When I was in college and I knew if I chose to transfer, somethings would transfer and some wouldn’t. It’s about changing your journey. That’s not a bad thing to learn.
* Question/Eric Russell: What is the downside of just adhering to USHE? There is so much bias in our own fields and we have these guidelines from USHE, so why go above it?
  + Evelyn: Reducing hours caused more problems than it solved.
* Comment: We should hear from Jaden and what the students think of it.
* Jaden Muir: Students don’t understand the nature of general education. As a student, I still don’t know everything and it’s worthwhile to hear faculty perspective. With that, looking at the third science, there were so many uncertainties. Advising is trying to direct students who aren’t interested in science to another class. You already have departments on campus that are teaching students that there are other options out there if you aren’t passionate about science. There is still the option for major science departments to change those to course requirements for students that aren’t as science privy that are still trying to figure out their way. For students who are trying their best, we can give them more opportunities. The few students I’ve had these conversations with are very excited about going down to 32 credits and broadening some categories.
  + Raiden Gaul: How do you feel about filling GE requirements that are geared for a specific major?
* Jaden: I see a lot of pros and cons to it. I think having a general ethics course is great for paving the way for future courses. I also think there are so many other prerequisites and things that don’t serve the student body well. I support 32 credits and the College of Science rep sees the value of it too.
* Hilary: As we are doing this, there is no right answer. We are all working towards the same goal, we just have different ways on how to get there.
* Comment/Jim Price: We know that people tend to gravitate to forums that tend to reinforce their own ideas. Giving the students more choice is giving them more choice to avoid being exposed to ideas that don’t attract them. The purpose of a university is to expand their minds.
* Comment/Doug Czajka: The survey results from the Taskforce were that a majority of students meets their educational needs. A majority did not agree that it provided leadership, but 60-70% of students agree with current GE requirements.
* Question/Dustin Shipp: Can we have the 3 credits be something to broaden your perspective?
  + Hilary: The spirit of it is right, but how do you track it?
* Comment/Jim Price: The employers’ survey rates the knowledge and skills and the lowest one is a broad understanding of human cultures and the natural world. The second lowest is math.
* Question/Natalie Monson: Is this what we need to take back to our faculty now and take back to the Taskforce?
  + Hilary: This is the next step. That is why we aren’t voting on it today. This was really helpful today for the GE Taskforce. We will meet on Friday and go over this feedback. Make sure people know they can send feedback back to me, Evelyn, Wioleta or anybody really.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:57 pm