CLAS Faculty Council Meeting
Zoom
Thursday, November 13, 2025
9:00AM -10:30 AM

MINUTES

Attending: Michael Abeyta, Masoud Asadi-Zeydabadi, Ryan Brown, Emma Bunkley, Mia Fischer, Jeffrey Golub, Rodney Herring, Lorna Hutchison, Betcy Jose, Laurel Hyslop, Katharine Kelsey, Julien Langou, Michael Moore, Scott Reed, Chad Shomura, Dale Stahl, Anna Warrener, Masoud Asadi-Zeydabadi

Ex-Officio Attendees: Michelle Comstock, Pamela Jansma, Lisa Keränen

Guests: Faye Caronan, Alex Freedman, Keith Guzik (sitting in for Jennifer Reich), David Hildebrand, Alyssa Martoccio, Bodhi Rogers, Lindsey Tollefson, Victor I-Hao Woo,

Recording: Jill Hutchison

Welcome and Introductions: Kathy Kelsey, Interim Chair, CLAS Faculty Council

- Kathy welcomed everyone to the meeting and suggested participants introduce themselves.

Approval of Minutes for October 9, 2025 meeting

- Motion to approve the Minutes, seconded.
- Minutes approved by majority vote with no changes.

IRC promotional criteria document: Kathy Kelsey

- This document was first brought to Faculty Council in September 2024, when the teaching professor track (TPT) was added by the college. Principal Instructor rank was added at the same time, leading to the creation of this document to define the teaching professor track.
- It is meant to be a set of college-wide criteria that departments could either adopt or adapt for their own department or choose to use the college-wide criteria for the ranks of this new track.
- A subcommittee of Faculty Council in 2024 revised the document and presented it to the Council. The newest version is posted in Teams and includes a draft set of criteria for the Senior and Principal Instructor ranks. This enables everyone to review the document to take up the discussion in our December meeting as we've been charged to create the college-wide criteria for the Principal Instructor rank.
- There was concern that there be a mechanism for exceptional candidates to go up for promotion earlier than the 5-year probationary period. That was introduced in the document and the subcommittee agreed with it.
- When the document came to a vote in November, one of the concerns Council members expressed was the presence of IRC votes at the table. Three IRC members were at the meeting, but one was new to the Council and wanted more time to review the document, so he abstained from voting.

- The document will be discussed further at the next Council meeting.
- There was a question about why the document does not address CTT faculty since there are still CTT faculty in the college. Perhaps the Council can draft a statement advising departments who still have CTT to consult departmental bylaws for guidance.
- Regarding TPT, there is concern that rules we're putting into primary units are in addition to what is in place at the campus or system level. It's important to know when we are going beyond what has been asked. For example, we're requiring 10% research for TPT, which isn't required at the campus level, only teaching and service. This is an important consideration since some chairs value good teaching and some service, but have no interest in having TPTs do research. Could there be a way to distinguish TPT rank from instructor?
- Currently, we don't have a good set of criteria for TPT, but the criteria for Instructor is very detailed. Some departments may choose to use the TPT rank (with the 10% research added) over Instructor because they have more leeway to set their own criteria.
- Would it be advisable to require reappointments for TPT when we don't reappoint Instructors? Instructors keep their title forever. If we require reappointments for TPT, we would be the only CU Denver school or college to do so. It is like a PTR review for TPT, but with a review every five years because they would be doing research.
- In addition to the workload required for this review, it complicates the 3-year contract for TPT by adding the 5-year clock for the reappointment review. With the 5-year reappointment clock for TPT, but no required clock for TTT, it does not feel equitable.
- There was a comment that changing the title of Clinical faculty to Teaching faculty was inaccurate, because "clinical" has a lot of different meanings, not just related to medicine. They are doing a lot in terms of research, which we need to acknowledge and give them opportunities to do the research.
- A question was raised about whether we would entertain the idea of having TPT faculty with 0% research? There are many TPT faculty who do outstanding research, but some don't want to do research. There should be some flexibility built into the description that leaves the door open for a variety of TPT faculty.
- There was a suggestion that the Council not revisit the research component, because it's a protection for those IRC faculty who do the work of tenured and tenure-track professors. It's an important area of their jobs since the research component helps keep them marketable and competitive. Don't take away the authority of IRC faculty to be able to have at least 10% research.
- IRC faculty do not have the option of going on sabbatical, which figures into the research done by TT faculty. It should be included in the language regarding TPT that those faculty do not get a sabbatical, which should be a consideration in the evaluation of their research.
- There was a question about how much of a voice the IRC faculty had in drafting this TPT document. As a small portion of CLAS Faculty Council, it's important for them to be included in talking about what a potential subcommittee will look like.

- The question was raised if the change from the 3-year to a 5-year period for Instructor promotion will affect the criteria already established by each of the individual departments for TPT?
- It was suggested to table this discussion for now to allow the Council to gather more feedback from IRC faculty for more review in December. Discussion of criteria for Senior and Principal Instructor will be added to the agenda in December. In the interim, there was a request for an *ad hoc* committee from the Council to work on this document before the next meeting.
- Pam Jansma said there seems to be a lot of confusion right now because there is discussion about moving to 5-year contracts. When we were doing this initially as a system, we were only allowed to offer 3-year contracts. That has changed and 5-year contracts are now allowed. There has been some movement in the criteria to align with the 5-year option. The question now is, do we want to have 3-year evaluations or appointments if it is a 5-year contract? This is the challenge we need to figure out.

Regarding the process of presenting and reviewing this document, Faye Caronen brought it to us, so it was drafted, perhaps in consultation with the IRCF DAC. It was presented to Faculty Council, and the subcommittee consisted of Jeff Golub, Vivian Shyu, Margaret Woodhull and Rodney Herring so there were two IRC voices as part of the 5-person group. The Council has been discussing this document for about a year and we can bring it back for further review in December.

Dean's Updates: Pam Jansma

Merit Pay:

The campus announced a 2.5% merit pool, but .25% will be held centrally for adjusting for compression, equity, and other issues for faculty and staff.

In CLAS, we are operating like we always do, where we now have the remaining 2.25%. We hold 10% of that back so that we can make our own adjustments for equity, compression, or other adjustments we need to do in the college.

The average raise in CLAS will be 2.025%, and Central Administration has not been clear about what's going to happen with the.25% they held back.

Questions:

It was asked whether that campus merit pool includes our emergency instructor hires, and if they are included in that additional pool of .25% that's being withheld for faculty and staff campus wide.

Pam answered that she didn't think so. We include them in the CLAS pool. Instructors are appointed each year, so the emergency instructors get their raise in the fall. Whereas the people who are on a multi-year roster get their pay raise in January. We're not sure if other schools and colleges do this, but we do include them in CLAS. And if instructors are rehired in future semesters, they get a raise in the fall. In the past, that's not what occurred, because emergency instructors were never on our rostered list.

CLAS Graduation Requirements Proposal: Keith Guzik

Background and History:

In 2023, Faculty Council asked Senior Associate Dean Rich Allen to assemble a faculty committee, the CLAS Academic Planning and Working Group (APWG), to develop a proposed revision to the CLAS graduation requirements. Members of that group are here today to present their proposal and discuss the context of their decisions. We'll discuss the proposal in this meeting in preparation for voting to adopt it in the December meeting, in time to make the deadline for it to be included in the next year's catalog.

Keith explained that the group had planned to have the proposal ready for a vote earlier in the year, but there were so many questions and concerns from their conversations with other groups, they recognized the need to explain and back up their conclusions.

The decision to evaluate CLAS efforts to recruit and retain students was precipitated by a decline in student enrollments since 2018. While this is a national trend, it was evident that CLAS was experiencing a sharper decline than the rest of the University.

The group recognized that there was a crucial need for our college to get more help in publicizing our programs to increase enrollments, so Dean Jansma approved the hiring of full-time positions in CLAS MARCOM to bring us more in line with the marketing activities of other schools and colleges. In conjunction with this growth, the college website has also been redesigned by Tim Stalker and his team, Rebecca Ward and Elly Lewis, over the past several years, resulting in a more attractive and effective presentation of our programs.

Rich also initiated an increased management of online core course sections, which has worked nicely. Accompanying that is all the work going on within the college to improve program development.

Looking for other factors that may be influencing the enrollment declines, Faculty Council had already investigated CLAS graduation requirements. A proposal to revise them was unsuccessful in Council, so Rich was asked to have the APWG explore what effect our graduation requirements may be having on enrollments. Their work was halted while another committee worked on the University Core and has resumed this year under the leadership of Lisa Keränen after Rich was named to the ACE Fellows leadership program.

Statement of the Problem:

CLAS undergraduates are required to take all University Core requirements (34-40 credits) in addition to a set of College graduation requirements (15-26 credits), for a total of 49-66 credits in addition to their major curriculum to total 120 credits to graduate. When compared to the minimum core requirements at other Colorado schools, CLAS students take 15-26 more because of our extra grad requirements. That alone would be enough to convince a prospective student to go elsewhere. If we were able to reduce the number of credits CLAS students need to take in the core or grad requirements, we would be more competitive among the state schools.

To reduce these credits, we can look to the CLAS grad requirements for duplicative course credits in English and our content areas in math, sciences, and social sciences. Then there is the second language requirement, which most schools/colleges at CU Denver state schools in Colorado don't require. That constitutes 6 credits (down from 10 when the language courses have been reduced from 5 to 3 credits each, which is currently proposed.) We also require 45 upper division credit hours to graduate, which is more than the 30 upper division residency requirements.

These additional credit hours make it a challenge for our transfer and non-traditional students to enroll with us and to finish.

We've talked to students who might want to join us from another college on campus, because they like our programs, but then they see the graduation requirements and realize that they'll have over 120 total credits. What we know is that, on average, students at CU Denver graduate with 134 credits, 14 more than the 120 required, which works out to be about $7,000 per student. That's if they're in-state with our most affordable tuition rate.

APWG Draft Proposal:

There are five points to this proposal:

- First is to align the overall credit requirements with our state peers; we want to bring our total credits down. Referring back to the bar chart shown earlier, how do we get closer to where other Colorado schools are?

- The second step is to remove the duplicative requirements. This would mean that, rather than requiring a second social sciences course, we will live with students meeting the social science requirement through the university core.

- The third component is to match the residency and upper-division credits. This entails lowering the 45-credit-hour upper-division CLAS requirement to equal our 30-hour residency requirement. This would give students greater flexibility to be able to count their lower-division courses toward graduation.

- Our fourth recommendation is to sunset the CLAS second language requirement, but not do away with language, because we're planning to move language courses to the university core. [It should be noted here that Modern Languages has recently made the change from 5 to 3 credit hours for each of the first two semesters of language study. It just passed EPCC and won't be implemented until 2026.]

- The fifth component is to add a 3-credit CLAS capstone course, in which students can analyze and demonstrate their liberal arts experience as it applies to their major and future careers. This could also be met with the existing capstone courses several majors have already developed and added to their major requirements.

Kari Campeau, in APWG, researched capstone requirements in colleges across the country and convinced us to add that into the graduation requirements. Keith Guzik will try to answer your questions about this part of the proposal since she cannot be here today.

You've had a chance to review the proposal to eliminate the existing CLAS requirements and replace them with the 3 credit hours for the capstone, which can be met by taking a capstone course developed by departments. CLAS students would need only take 37 credits from the University Core, out of the 120 total credits to graduate.

We believe this change would give greater flexibility to students, allowing them to explore their interests using credits saved from the CLAS core, and will increase our competitiveness with other

colleges across the state. The emergent best practice of a capstone would enrich students' experiences as liberal arts and sciences graduates.

As for disadvantages of this proposal, we don't know how SCH production will be affected by this. For this reason, we're requesting that the college hold units harmless for 3 years, as they adjust programs as needed to meet the new requirements.

There's no guarantee that this will boost enrollment, graduation and retention rates. But we feel strongly that something needs to be done for us to meet the challenge by upper administration and the campus in general for innovation from colleges to better serve our students.

Questions and Discussion:

Q: There was a question about how departments will experience the change in CLAS requirements credits, how many credits will be available to their students to apply toward their interests. Will that be 37 credits free for all students, or does it vary?

A: It really depends on what the student is bringing in. Currently, the bulk of our students satisfy the second language requirement through high school coursework, so that is taking 10 credits out of core requirements. If a student needs to satisfy second language with us, that's a 10-credit sequence they have to take. This aligns with that discrepancy. Additionally, some of our lab sciences are 4 credits versus 5 credits, another difference depending on what's needed.

All CU Denver students must satisfy the Core. What we're talking about is the current additional CLAS requirements and pulling those back. So, we're never going to get rid of those 37 to 41 credits of liberal arts and sciences classes that the campus requires, plus the 3-credit CLAS capstone course. Each student ends up taking a different number of core and CLAS credits, because it all depends on what they had in high school, and what they're transferring in. That's why these numbers are so variable for different students.

Q: It was pointed out that Boulder and Colorado Springs still require foreign languages. Is there a sense of how Boulder and Colorado Springs have experienced enrollment issues, and whether keeping the foreign language requirement has not been too arduous for student retention and graduation rates?

We don't have those statistics at the moment, but UNC Greeley, CSU and MSU have all dropped their language requirements. UNC published the following in answer to the equity arguments: "For a number of reasons we do not have a foreign language requirement. We know students may have unique circumstances that warrant an exception, such as already being bilingual/multilingual or students with learning disabilities or processing disorders. In addition, we recognize school environment circumstances are beyond students' control, such as schools not offering foreign language courses due to nationwide teacher shortages or other reasons."

There was a comment that having other schools drop their language requirements sounds like a great opportunity for CU to distinguish itself. If these other higher institutions in the state are not prepping their students for being educated citizens of the world, then that's something that CU and our institution can uphold.

Q: What are the repercussions of eliminating foreign language requirements for AP language studies students in Colorado high schools? There are also equity issues that come up for students who haven't

had the opportunity to learn foreign languages because the resources that they had at their high schools didn't provide language instruction.

Several people asked about what is happening in Colorado high schools, such as students working toward a biliteracy diploma in DPS. These immersion schools teach courses bilingually to give students a better understanding of the world through their studies in all areas. Is there a way for CU Denver to provide upper-level language instruction as immersion students move into high school?

A: The proposal doesn't say that students should not do foreign language or that it shouldn't count as credit. We can assume they would still be able to transfer language courses and AP credits as electives. Perhaps major programs that agree foreign languages are important to their pedagogy could adopt that as part of their major requirements. Also, students who are interested in it could have that opportunity by moving it to the University Core.

It's difficult to find a one-to-one correlation between a requirement and what your student credit hours are going to be. We're not saying that graduation requirements are the main cause of this. What we're thinking about is the environment in which students find themselves.

Listening to the experiences that students have had trying to fit in the extra 6 or 10 hours to the overall 120 credit hours, we realize that this is a real obstacle in terms of time and money. We've also found that a lot of students are unable to fulfill the requirement because they have a learning disability related to language.

Q: If the language requirement shifts to the University Core, why would we need to retain it in CLAS?

A: Second Language has not yet been proposed as a Core requirement, but rather as an option to satisfy Humanities requirements.

Q: Has Modern Languages ever tried to get a foreign language requirement into the University Core?

There was discussion about how these changes are important for particular areas in CLAS, especially Modern Languages.
We have made adjustments with the requirements in our first-year classes, so now it's 0 to 6 hours. We are reducing them to 3 credits each, and that is consistent with a lot of other programs across the nation.

Beginning level classes, the 1010s and 1020s, would be added to the core, but those still must go through the regular processes of approval.
The document says UCCS does not require second language proficiency. However, the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences at UCCS, as well as Boulder's College of Arts and Sciences, both require a second language.

What are the repercussions for high school students taking AP language classes who are preparing to come to CU Denver and utilizing the credit hours they will receive for that work?

We should encourage rural schools to include more language teaching to offer more opportunities for high school students.

There was concern about the precedent it would set to reduce these language requirements and if we were to be one of the few colleges who don't teach foreign languages. Language teaching and study abroad are valuable experiences.

There was a lot of dialogue including a comment that students taking Foreign Language AP credits would still be able to count the classes as electives, so no credit hours would be wasted.

Another concern is that future students would be less willing to take those courses if we proceed with this proposal. One asked why is satisfying a secondary language requirement at high school level a reason to get rid of the requirement at the college level?

There was a suggestion we leave the decision about the second language to the individual units and departments, which can make it more relevant to their needs.

Keith Guzik said he agrees with a lot of what was said in terms of the importance of language study, and others on the APWG do as well. However, students are so different now than when we were university students. They're just CLEP-ing out of the requirement, so we're not able to get them in our classes. But there's nothing in the proposal that means we're eliminating language instruction when it's seen as mission critical to students in history, philosophy and other departments. So, it's very much within their purview to adopt foreign language as a program requirement.

Keith also emphasized every one of the courses that have been part of the CLAS graduation requirements have been either minimized or removed. Yet everyone here would say, for example, that communicative skills are essential to any university student. But in our proposal, we reduced those courses to give students more flexibility, in the belief that they can learn communicative skills as they go through the university, in the same way that they could do it with second language. So, you can't say we're eliminating language instruction in this proposal, any more than we're eliminating communicative skills instruction.

It was noted the bulk of our students are satisfying the second language requirement through their high school coursework right now. If you take two years of a single language in high school, you have the second language requirement satisfied. That is the same as Boulder and UCCS. Additionally, if you take AP Spanish, for example, and pass the test, you are going to get credit for Spanish 2110 and 2120, potentially. To satisfy second language by taking CU Denver coursework, you'll need to take the 1010-1020 sequence.

Students who are bringing in AP coursework are more likely to pursue our Spanish majors, minors and certificates, because they have that starting place for their language studies. It could be considered unfairly disadvantageous to heritage speakers and speakers or languages that are "uncommon" as these often do not have CLEP or FLATs proficiency exams. So, overwhelmingly, our students are not taking CU Denver courses to satisfy second language requirement.

Bodhi Rogers was a member of the Academic Planning Working Group and is the advisor to all Physics majors. Along with being a PhD physicist, he's also a professional archaeologist, and does a lot of work internationally. Like other members of the APWG, he understands and supports the value of languages. One of the challenges facing students who are going into STEM professional degrees or jobs is the initial packages companies are now offering. For example, if you wanted to work only at Lockheed Martin's Denver office, they'll offer you an initial salary of ~$70,000, but if you're willing to be relocated twice in the first 5 years, they'll offer you $130,000. So, I'm seeing our graduates moving

globally. One of the things that I want to talk about with my colleagues in Modern Languages is what this means for our students and what do they need? I would love to see a course for physics majors that helps students know how to navigate using technology, to communicate in a culturally appropriate and sensitive way. There's are opportunities to change what we mean by language and language needs.

There were questions about how faculty or departments would be affected by the possible disadvantages of discontinuing the foreign language CLAS graduation requirement and a request for clarity on what it means to sunset a requirement.

The proposal states that the foreign/second language requirement would no longer be within CLAS. Those courses would move to the core so that students could fulfill the humanities (if that's where it were to move) requirement by taking a second language. Sunsetting would involve eliminating foreign language and communicative skills from CLAS graduate requirements, and the other duplicative requirements that we currently have. So those would sunset and we would just have the 3-credit capstone.

If this is approved in time for the Fall 2027 catalog, students would start under the new requirements that catalog year. So, there's a transition period from students who are in the old catalog to the new catalog.

Lisa Keränen clarified that not all Modern Language courses are 5 credits. There are only two 5-credit classes in any language that we offer, which students can take to demonstrate proficiency. After talking to Alyssa Martoccio and Modern Languages, we decided one of the solutions to encourage students to take the beginning language classes was to bring down the credit hours from 5 to 3. Students have suggested that they don't like high-credit classes, that they're drawn to courses that are fewer credits.

The CLAS EPPC approved the reduction of the 5 credits to 3 credits for those classes. In Fall 2026, the beginning 2-course sequence in foreign languages will be 0 to 6, unless the proposal to eliminate this requirement is approved. This changes a long-standing requirement for 0 to 10 credits in foreign languages since 2002. This change has just happened and that's one of a package of things that we've been working on with Alyssa to ensure that there are pipelines for students to take Modern Languages.

To speak to some of the concerns about this proposal, there were also a few small items missed in the proofreading:

- One was the typo on the three programs that don't require modern languages (UNC Greeley., Metro and CSU);
- Two, it says UCC would be approving things for the University Core, but it should have said CCOC;
- CLAS will be allowed to put our courses up for consideration as requirements in the humanities core, which would open up more of our courses to the potential pool of students on campus in engineering, public affairs, business, etc., not just CLAS.

This is a new development in terms of possibilities for language instruction at CU Denver.

> What kind of process we will have for transferring courses that are currently in CLAS graduation requirements to the CU Denver core? Because right now, in terms of scheduling classes, those which are part of our grad requirements are highlighted due to that status. If that visibility disappears, some of them may not fill as easily as they do now. Having some kind of

> streamlined process to transfer them into their respective subunits would be really important to this proposal.
>
> My department is against getting rid of the modern language requirement. We're talking about how few people still need to fulfill the language requirement when they come to CU Denver. I don't see the logic of eliminating it as a requirement, if only a quarter of entering students need to take the language courses. Then only a quarter of students are affected by the additional credit hours they need to take. If there are issues associated with disability access or ability to take exams to test out, those are things that we could address separately without getting rid of the requirement. Why don't we do something to support those few who have these needs?
>
> In theory capstone requirement sounds wonderful and would be a fantastic experience, but I have zero idea as to how we would facilitate it. Faculty members are already at the brink with master's thesis students and other responsibilities. Getting everybody who's graduating through some kind of capstone experience is a lot to ask of a department and its faculty.

One person commented that he often has students who are in our College of Engineering, Design, and Computing, and are looking to potentially switch to physics. Many don't because it's a really tough shift to enter CLAS, where they'll need to fulfill a language requirement and other extra CLAS-specific requirements. If a student hasn't satisfied the language requirement through some other means, it requires them to stay (and pay for) an extra semester. It's more common than you might think. About 10 students try to switch to physics each year, and this makes for a rough advising conversation.

Another member noted making the language requirements a part of departmental major requirements is interesting to explore but sets departments against each other in competition for majors. Our department is in the process of trying to reduce our number of credits to make us more competitive against other programs. Language is important in anthropology, so if we add that to our requirements, the burden moves from CLAS and puts it on the department instead, but does that create an environment of competition that could be detrimental among departments? It was commented how much we all care about language instruction and about the health of the college.

A number of majors already have robust capstones. Those would be able to send the syllabi to EPCC who would designate them as fulfilling the CLAS capstone. We realize not all programs want or have capacity to run their own capstone. CLAS would then administer some CLAS prefix interdisciplinary capstones with a couple of variations to provide students flexibility.

Students are very clear that they begrudge each dollar they spend on a class that they don't want to take. It gives them a reason for not going into a particular program. Rich collected data that that show how students are really frustrated having to pay for credits that they don't want. We, as faculty, believe we know what is best for students and we have our curriculum, but providing flexibility makes sense.

The capstone options would be an interdisciplinary project capstone that would be run by CLAS, or it could be rethought of as a series of three, one-credit classes throughout the student's CLAS career. The idea is to have a first-year or transfer CLAS student take an introduction to liberal arts and sciences perspectives course, extolling the value of a liberal arts degree.

Then, as they're approaching junior into senior year, students would have a one-credit course that would be designed to get students to think about how they could put together a package of their coursework in a tangible way for the rest of their lives, for employers, for community members, for all

their work. This would involve having them do some mapping exercises of the classes they've taken, to see what skills they have and what they learned from an interdisciplinary perspective.

The third would be one final credit in which students would be preparing to launch into their careers, translating their academic experience into their professional and personal lives and careers. We saw it as being like this flexible array that could address all these other things.

The disabilities issue is a serious, recurring concern that the Disability Studies Committee has been working on a long time. I study disability rights and disability rhetorics, and I feel passionate about this. It's infuriating that we are not granting exceptions to students with certain disabilities, without expensive tests that are beyond the means of our students and beyond the means of our college and campus to provide. I would love it if we could fix this, and if the Disability Studies Committee on campus wants to take up this issue, that would be great.

One of the things that was really striking to the working group (and we have thousands of pages of documents that Rich and others had assembled) were the cases of all the students who had taken extra courses. It's not just language courses it can be math or writing as well. We had students whose intelligences didn't align with that form of assessment, so they took the class 3 times and failed, and they never graduated. I want to fix that system.

There was a question about the proposed capstone. While these capstone courses sound great, who is the person who evaluates the documents that the student produces and who provides them guidance through the development of that process? That's where the burden comes. If a department doesn't want to start a capstone project, and they do an interdisciplinary project, you still require expertise from those disciplines to evaluate their capstone. What is the connection?

Guiding the capstone would count in load for faculty. We'd send out a call for people who were interested and have negotiations with chairs. Someone would coordinate with a cluster of faculty from different disciplines who are each assigned to oversee sections. That would help with the interdisciplinary assessment pieces because they could talk to each other and share. We also talked about setting up sections by division, like: Capstone for Humanities – take sections 1 to 3; Capstone for Social Sciences – take 4 to 6. This could help the disciplines that don't want to run it themselves. It would be a class you would teach and count toward load but not be on top of your teaching assignment. It would be coordinated by a committee in the college.

It was noted that departments who have very few faculty members cannot often afford to have load reduced, because there's nobody else to teach the classes. This may discourage some departments from participating in those kinds of things. We'll all need to work together logistically and evaluate whether this works for us. The intention of the capstone is to support the transition from academics to first destinations, e.g. grad school and careers. Some agreed we need to consider students who are already frustrated about spending money on credits they don't want to take. Do we know how they will feel about taking the 3-credit capstone series that's not administered directly by their department? There's some evidence for the capstone being attractive to many students and parents, because it's directly tied to workforce readiness. We would be devoting time to working with students to package themselves for this next phase of their lives.

History Department Concerns regarding the APWG Proposal: Dale Stahl

History generally agrees that many of the CLAS graduation requirements present an undue burden for students. There was also agreement with most of the working group's recommendations around the duplicative distribution requirements, communicative skills, and residency and upper division credits.

They support changes that could foster creativity and interdisciplinary collaboration and may enhance program viability across the college. History was less convinced by arguments about enrollment, since other factors may play roles in the decline in CLAS enrollment including student costs, choice and flexibility, and time to graduation.

History is concerned about a potential arms race with majors expanding to capture the newly opened credits from cutting grad requirements. This could create a situation where the core curriculum, lower grad requirements and the high credit major take up all 120 credits. It doesn't leave enough credits within 120 to do certificates, minors or badges. By taking the 35-credit University Core, 3-6 credits in CLAS (capstone or language), and 60 credits in a major, a student still has 19-22 credits left to take a certificate or minor. If major programs increase required credits, this becomes unworkable.

- Create a credit cap or moratorium to limit SCH in majors to allow an ecosystem and college-wide culture where students have choice and flexibility, where they're able to obtain multiple credentials within the 120-credit window, and where programs can support one another by creating innovative collaborations.

  Make it possible for students to explore 2 majors/fields such as biochemistry and anthropology, biology and ethnic studies, public health and sociology, environmental science and history. That's not possible under our current requirements and won't be possible if majors add SCH.

- *Keep the language requirement*. We think language is a fundamental intellectual and civic competency. We proactively support math and writing with tutoring centers, but offloading language requirements to the current Core Curriculum has some negatives.

  The Core knowledge areas for language classes – Humanities, Cultural Diversity and International Perspectives – have 2-3 times the number of Core courses than knowledge areas in Arts, Behavioral Sciences and Natural and Physical Sciences. This disproportionately affects humanities and social science programs, which already compete within a saturated market.

  Our preferred proposal is to retain the modified six-credit language study requirement, perhaps in lieu of the capstone requirement since several disciplines already have capstones. Then we also need to support language learners better with a language center or a language network.

  Option B is to push hard for language to be included in the new Core as its own category, like other important competencies, such as writing in the English language.

History's dream scenario is to support the new openness in the curriculum, add a cap or moratorium to safeguard that openness into the future, encourage innovative combinations and credentials, and emphasize the synergies that are possible at a liberal arts and sciences college. Let's work together to think and speak proactively about language study and maintain its place at our university, all while serving students with lower costs, greater choice, and more flexible paths to graduation.

Discussion of History proposal:

There was a comment that if the goal of restructuring the CLAS requirements is to give the students more flexibility, the CLAS capstone feels out of step with that stated motivation.

We tried to design the capstone to help address the value of a liberal arts degree in a maximally flexible way and were motivated more by retention than enrollment. Philosophy lowered its major requirements by 6 credits. We looked at our peers and within the system, we had the most. Most of our graduates don't go to grad school in Philosophy, so 10 courses just seemed like enough.

Another member stated, I doubt that COMM would be interested in adding more major credit hours, everybody understands that these are counter to student retention and increasing our graduation rates. I think folks commonly agree that we need to lower required credit hours.

Another person wondered would majors make themselves less desirable by raising credit hours? Others agreed that more credits make a major less attractive. It was noted that Economics has been talking constantly about lowering major and minor requirements.

There was a suggestion that our existing First Year Experiences (FYE) are a proven method for retention. Why not invest in FYE rather than creating a new Capstone series? Also, FYE would have a higher impact on retention than a Capstone taken in the last year. FYE is not a CLAS program and is being revised by a working group, so we are hoping there will be more there in the future.

It was noted that Physics is committed to student choice and will not engage in the "arms race." Two students earned degrees in physics and in philosophy last year, and both had to stay an extra year. I'm excited if we can have double majors without the extra year.

Our data show that students already take more humanities than needed.

Some agreed with the History proposal but noted, they were unsure about language becoming part of the University Core Curriculum, stating we shouldn't take any action until we've explored that option.

Kathy Kelsey will make sure we have the History proposal available on Teams and distribute it in the college. She noted that to ensure that changes are in the catalog for next year, we need to vote on during the next meeting. The Council will need to be in touch before then. Everyone needs to be responsive to email. Other agenda items we did not get to today will be rescheduled.

The question was raised about when Councilmembers vote on this proposal, are we going to vote on it as an entire package, or will we be able to vote on pieces of it?

Kathy answered that the working group has asked for a vote on the entire package. As a Council, we are able to take the suggestions that have come from History. I want to reflect that this request was advanced to Council, but we also have the ability to suggest amendments to it and vote on that.

People were encouraged to take these proposals back to their departments, to discuss with their faculty because we represent our departments and their interests. It is important to remember we are here to represent those department voices.

Lindsey Tollefson, representing CLAS Academic Advising as a guest for the purpose of discussing this proposal, stated that we are regularly denying students graduation. The challenges from the faculty lens are understood, but we are not meeting student needs. Bringing that to the forefront is essential.

Adjourned at 10:30 am