

**GE 25 Council
May 8, 2006
MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting Attendees:

R. "Nish" Nishikawa, CU-B; John Cooney, CU system; Michel Dahlin, CU system; John Lanning, UCDHSC; John Sowell, WSC; Linda Curran, MSCD; Cristina Martinez; Alan Lamborn, CSU-FC; Jeff Reynolds, AIMS; Wayne Artis, PPCC; David Caldwell, UNC; Roger Carver, CCD; Frank Novotny, ASC and Stephen Roderick, FLC, Sherrie Schneider, CCCS; Carol Futhey, MSC (phoned in).

Introductions:

-Rita Beachem, Academic Affairs

Rita Beachem was introduced as the new staff member for Academic Affairs. I shared with GE 25 that she will be providing assistance to the gtPathways program including specific support to the re-building/revising of the gtPathways web page.

Action Items:

- Approve the **process and form concerning changes to courses** that are made AFTER they have been recommended for placement into the gtPathways curriculum (see attachment). *The form was unanimously approved by the membership of the GE 25 and folks were given the green light to complete the form and submit courses that are in need of such changes. All changes will be part of the larger group of corrections and revisions that will be addressed as the web page is revised.*

Information Items:

GE 25 Faculty Advisory Sub-Committee

-Chairs (see attached sheet listing Content Group co-chairs)

-meeting (4/14/06-Overview in April 2006 GE 25 minutes)

I provided a brief overview of our informal meeting (w/ the faculty co-chairs) at the April 14th review. The following faculty co-chairs attended the meeting:

Faculty	Content Committee	Institution
Wayne Artis	Social & Behavioral Science	PPCC
Nancy McCollum	Arts & Humanities	PPCC
Gordon Cheesewright	Arts & Humanities	FLC
Joan Clinefelter	Social & Behavioral Science	UNC
David Lehmpuhl	Natural & Physical Science	CSU-P
Jill Stephens	Natural & Physical Science	CCA
Gary Gianniny	Natural & Physical Science	FLC (Substitute Co-Chair)

*Carol Smith	Communication	FLC
*Doug Evans-Botanco	Communication	CMC

**Doug and Carol were not able to attend our faculty co-chair meeting as they were in the Communication group discussions. Please note also that Marsha Driskill, AIMS and Jeff Frammer, UNC, were not present at the April 14th review; Rick Reeves, FRCC served as the substitute chair of the math content committee.*

The meeting was informal; there was no official agenda, however the following items were discussed:

Communication criteria and competencies; whether or not we could conduct interim reviews electronically; the fact that we could facilitate course reviews with 3 (as opposed to 5 copies) of every courses nomination; the favorable approval of the new forms that have been recently revised by the GE 25 Council; the disqualification of 2nd reads on re-submissions, meaning that reviewers could only re-evaluate what nominators had corrected from the first review, (when the course received a “Not Recommended” designation), and, the co-chair group re-affirmed their commitment to two-year, staggered terms, including representatives from the 2 and 4 year system. No follow-up meeting was scheduled.

GE 25 Registrars/Advisors Advisory Sub-Committee

-Status

-Notification to membership

I provided a list of the individuals suggested (to date), to participate in the list serve discussions. “Conversations” with this group’s members will be facilitated and ongoing beginning this summer.

gtPathways Web Page

-Status of revisions, corrections and up-dates

Shared with the group that my primary summer project would be addressing the organization of gtPathways, including filing, revisions/changes/up-dates to the gtPathways web page and also configuring a plan for the electronic review of courses.

RESULTS OF THE APRIL 14, 2006 gtPathways Review (CYCLE IV, ROUND II):

gtPathways

Course Review

Cycle IV, Round II

April 14, 2006

BY CONTENT AREA

GRAND TOTAL

Content Area	Recommended	Not Recommended	DEFERRED	TOTAL
Arts &	20	7	14	41

Humanities				
Communication	2	3	0	5
Mathematics	6	2	0	8
Natural & Physical Sciences	13	3	0	16
Social & Behavioral Sciences	37	6	2	45
Grand Total	78	21	16	115

Shared the following with GE 25 members at our May 8, 2006 meeting:

**Please note that deferrals are due to either errors in copying or a lack of a suitable number of faculty reviewers, (2 as opposed to 3 total faculty reviewers).*

An interim review of the AHUM courses will take place on Wednesday May 10, 2006. The approved courses will be taken to the Commissioners for formal approval in June, 2006.

I will schedule in interim review for approximately 6 Natural/Physical Science courses that were deferred in February and not reviewed in April.

Issues to address:

-AHUM Deferrals

An interim review of the AHUM courses will take place on Wednesday May 10, 2006. The approved courses will be taken to the Commissioners for formal approval in June, 2006.

-Natural/Physical Science Deferrals from February 2006

I shared that I will attempt to facilitate an electronic review of these courses using three reviewers, (one of which must come from the 2 year system), as well as at least one faculty with a specialty in physics).

-Communication minutes (none received as of 5/4/06)

Emailed Carol Smith, Communication co-chair on Tuesday May 9, 2006 and Friday May 12, 2006, soliciting the written record of proceedings from the group's 4/14 discussion. Carol responded in the morning on the 12th that she will have the minutes to me shortly.

-Soc 105 (submitted as History course)

-Additional Discussion (see J. Lanning's memo)

Vicki agreed to check prior minutes of GE 25 Council meetings in order to determine if the actual writing competency of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, (as it has recently been applied in reviews), was formally articulated in writing (minutes), and passed unanimously by the members of the GE 25. This was in response to John's memo regarding concerns he had with the interpretation/application of the writing competency as it applies to the Social & Behavioral Sciences.

John (and others) recommended that the GE 25 Council provide clearly, formally articulated competencies for Nominators and reviewers that are unanimously agreed

upon by the GE 25 membership and posted accordingly at the gtPathways website. John stated that an operational definition, (how we would quantify it during the review process) should be communicated. Specifically, the interpretation and application of the writing competency for Social and Behavioral Sciences should be shared, as a charge or directive to all faculty reviewers prior to future reviews. Others agreed and recommended that the same be done for Natural and Physical Science courses and Communication, etc.

The membership of GE 25 also recommended that the focus for re-nominated courses (courses nominated as re-submissions) be only on comments from the first review of the course, when it was labeled “Not Recommended”.

A final request was made to solicit from faculty/content committee co-chairs the practices and applied policies of each group and to please share them with Vicki so that she could in turn share such with the GE 25 Council.

Discussion Items/Questions: (Continuation of April 10th meeting discussions):

- The King Bill and (4) Competency testing. THE COMMISSION SHALL, IN CONSULTATION WITH EACH PUBLIC INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION, DEFINE A PROCESS FOR STUDENTS TO TEST OUT OF CORE COURSES, INCLUDING SPECIFYING USE OF A NATIONAL TEST OR THE CRITERIA FOR APPROVING INSTITUTIONALLY DEVISED TESTS. STUDENTS SHALL BE GRANTED CREDIT FOR THE CORE COURSES THEY SUCCESSFULLY TEST OUT OF, FREE OF TUITION FOR THOSE COURSES.
ITEMS OF CONSIDERATION:

- Statewide Remediation Policy
 - King Bill (excerpt/as provided above)
 - Internal institutional practices (for placing students in courses)
 - Institutional cut scores used to (opt in/test out)
 - * What do your catalogs state w/ regard to English/Math test-out options?
- Alan suggested a “different model” for getting advice on cut scores, and recommended that the GE 25 Council shouldn’t be the place where the conversation (on cut scores begins), but rather program administrators and other “professionals” should be given the task to consider and discuss and then share their insights/expertise with the GE 25 Council. Some members agreed. Whatever path we choose to pursue, we have still been entrusted with the task of identifying test-out options for content areas/courses within the gtPathways curriculum while also being required to work within the parameters of the 31 hours (and the agreed upon/approved) breakdown of those hours across content areas as they were formally discussed/approved by the Commissioners last June 2005.*

Other discussion involved the following assignments/commitments:

Alan and Wayne agreed to work on the Social & Behavioral Sciences writing competency and 20% “rule” as it is applied to reviews. They will author a formal statement that the GE 25 can discuss and vote on at our June meeting. (Note that the minutes from the Social/Behavioral Science group’s discussion at last fall’s Faculty to Faculty Conference contain this information, but such has not been formally acted on by the GE 25.

Linda, Wayne and David agreed to author a “broad policy statement” that speaks to: how re-reviews should/can be conducted, the “center of gravity” for history courses (nominated-subcategory). This will also be brought to and discussed at our June meeting.

CONTENT SPECIFIC ISSUES/QUESTIONS (for GE 25 discussion/possible referral to faculty Content Groups):

1. **Arts & Humanities** – Discussion on category distinctions (refer to email/C. Henrichs-will be handed out at our Monday meeting);
Deferred to our June Meeting.
2. **Communication** – Draft Minutes of Communication content group discussion (2/24) will be formally approved by the group at the April 14th review; minutes from 4/14 discussion have yet to be received from co-chairs.
Deferred to our June Meeting.
3. **Mathematics** – Applied Courses...how do we want to approach this discussion? Should we draft a statement for ratification by the GE 25 that would be sent to the Math review group reminding them of their charge? (G. Gianniny) Note that we did not have resolution on this at our April meeting;
Will be addressed in the broad policy statement that Wayne, Linda and David are constructing for review at our June meeting.
4. **Natural & Physical Science** – Are 1-2 credit courses that include a lab adequate as the SC1 experience? How much time should a one (1) credit lab represent (actual seat time/contact hours)? Is a series of 12 three-hour meetings sufficient; are there state guidelines on this? (G. Gianniny, J. Lanning)
Alan agreed to provide us with a definition for this for review at our June meeting. It was also recommended that the Registrars/Advisors advisory sub-group to GE 25 be presented this issues, (via electronic list serve).
5. **Social & Behavioral Science** – CCCS’ Soc 105/courses nominated in the History category (requirements for the History sub-category).
6. **Social & Behavioral Science** – Discussion of the writing component part of the content criteria (20%). (J. Lanning, W. Artis) See John’s memo in today’s meeting packet.
Social and Behavioral Science questions will be addressed by Broad Policy Statement at June meeting.

How can we evaluate gen ed curriculum comparability @ the different institutions? (begin discussion). Note this is a requirement

of our institutional Performance Contracts (see accompanying hand-out).

The above was deferred to our June meeting.

Assignment Items:

- FAQs for gtPathways website (Please send me some sample questions!!)
- **MARK YOUR CALENDARS! The 2006 Faculty-to-Faculty Conference will be held on Friday October 13, 2006, location TBA.**

2006-2007 gtPathways Review Schedule

First gtPathways Course Review	Friday September 22, 2006 <u>Submission Deadline:</u> Friday, September 8, 2006
Second gtPathways Course Review	Thursday November 9, 2006 <u>Submission Deadline:</u> Thursday, October 26, 2006
First gtPathways Course Review	Friday February 9, 2007 <u>Submission Deadline:</u> Friday, January 26, 2007
Second gtPathways Course Review	Thursday April 12, 2007 <u>Submission Deadline:</u> Thursday, March 29, 2007

*I will post these dates at the gtPathways website. **ASSIGNMENT-** in the meantime, my request to members of both GE 25 and Academic Council is that they please place these dates on their respective campus calendars so that the recruiting of faculty reviewers can begin ASAP.*

ADJOURN

The GE 25 Membership recommended the following for June's Agenda/Topics of Discussion:

Designation of labeled courses (refer to institutional Performance Contracts).

Technology Standard/Competency Discussion

Create a statement about the 3 reviewer minimum (one of whom must come from the 2 year system)

Discuss posting dates for approved courses, official approval, reflected on the web site's "Planning Guide"

Should we expand the category of Communication (DISCUSSION)

NEXT MEETING

June 12, 2006