I. URO dates
   a. Chris will send out an email early next week when dates are finalized.

II. GEC to MAC Express
   a. Anthropology is now in the crosswalk

III. Discussion: MAC process for reactivating courses
      Course Inactivation policy: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1e-KqAumVn38gC53zh4tANwg_kLL7XUxh/view
      a. What is the process for a course that needs to be reactivated and then approved for MAC?
      b. The Council’s policy could inform the MAC implementation process. Aaron will bring this to Council to discuss establishing a policy.
      c. It was previously understood that courses were active, banked, or inactive but the amended policy refers to courses only as active or inactive. Council will discuss and determine the process of designating the previously inactive course as MAC once it’s approved as active in the next catalog.
      d. As long as the course meets the criteria, it should be designated MAC: 100- or 200-level course, 3 credits

IV. Discussion items for GEC
    a. Will there be a petition/approval/appeal process that will allow upper-division courses to be designated MAC?
       i. Jodi tried to draw up criteria for this but what she came up with continued to identify lower-division learning, not a 300-level (or above) course.
       ii. It will be difficult to create a list that could be objectively applied to a course to help GEC faculty easily arrive at a conclusion.
       iii. Language courses seem to be the only exception that comes to mind in regards to a 300-level course that could be considered general education.
       iv. How is the exception helping the student? A lot of these arguments seem to be about helping the department in terms of getting their 300 hours, seats, overall credit hours, etc. Why do you want a MAC designation on this course?
       v. Begs the question, if it is truly a foundational course, why is it not at the 100- or 200-level? It’s difficult to reconcile needing an upper-division course in general education.
       vi. An argument could be made that this exception would benefit transfer students but this concern should be addressed another way.
       vii. We should be focusing on the level of learning in the course and numbering accordingly. If you are teaching upper division 300-level, the goal of that course isn’t foundational so it shouldn’t be in the MAC program
       i. Would thinking about a course as third-year vs. a junior-level course impact the decision to approve a 300-level MAC course? Is a third year course more appropriate for a gen ed program vs. a junior level course? Does this matter?
ii. Calling out courses by year (second-year, third-year, etc) is becoming increasingly popular and breaks the courses down by credit hour
   1. Helps create a more inclusive language environment and sets benchmarks in the path to learning outcomes
iii. Using the year vs classification is easier for data organization
iv. If an exception process is created, do so judiciously because it will open us up to internal and external scrutiny

V. Pre-reqs for MAC courses
   a. MAC courses should not be pre-reqs for other MAC courses.
   b. MAC courses can be pre-reqs for non-MAC courses, particularly intermediate and upper-division courses
   c. There are some pre-reqs for the Quantitative Reasoning competency. For example, Calculus has a pre-req: you either pass the placement test or pre-calculus.
      i. But since pre-calculus would also fulfill the QR competency, this pre-req is acceptable.
      ii. Foreign language is similar. For example, SPA 204 needs a pre-req or placement.
   d. 300-level courses may drop to 200-level but keep the same pre-reqs so IC will need to be clear about faculty not being allowed to do this.

VI. Prior Learning Outcomes, Alternative demonstration of competency
   a. Nan Travers with the System Office is working on this with Jodi to put together a group of people who can discuss what needs to be in place.
   b. Meeting date in October and Jodi is recruiting the group now. There is already representation from UNCG Online.
   c. Chris has built functionality in Banner at a previous institution around this work.
   d. Students can present a portfolio of some kind or take a test that faculty can assess, but the key is getting a rubric, some kind of evaluative tool for each competency.

VII. Discussion: Awarding MAC credit for AP/IB articulation
   a. For example, a 3 on an AP exam must be articulated for credit but we don’t have to award MAC credit.
   b. We need our own way to test the competency of the student. We anticipate students bringing in enough credit to satisfy the MAC but we need to set them up for success by actually evaluating their competency to move forward in that area of knowledge.
   c. Discussing whether we should test them on the competency when they try to bring in the credit for MAC or do we make MAC mandatory at UNCG anyway so students can bring in the credit but only fulfill MAC here.
      i. Plenty of schools require college course credit only as satisfactory for their general education programs, not placement.
   d. Maybe we should look at it from a program level, not from the perspective of MAC or articulation where the student still gets the articulation as required, but the program requires
them to still take specific courses. For example, 5 on a Chemistry AP exam will award the credit but the CHE department still requires you to take a college-level chemistry course.

e. Giving a student credit for the course but not credit for the competency becomes a major hurdle for progress towards graduation. There are also financial aid implications if a student is forced to take a course they have already received credit for. The federal government will not give money to students to retake a course they’ve already received credit for.

f. What if we put a max on the MAC credits? Say students are only allowed X number of general education credits fulfilled through articulation and/or X number of MAC credit hours must be completed at UNCG.

   i. This goes against our articulation agreement with NC Community Colleges and our philosophy of a competency-based general education program.

g. Ultimately, we’re worried that the students don’t value general education and will transfer a ton of credits to skip out of the MAC but then struggle because they may not actually be competent in the subject matter.

h. Council should discuss non-course credit ways to satisfy MAC. What kinds of tests are appropriate? Would CLEP work or does it need to be an exam from the actual course? Portfolio? If portfolio, how to evaluate competency?

VIII. Enrollment caps on Oral and Written Communication courses

   a. Tabled for next week.

---

Next meeting: Thursday Sept. 17, 2020