

**GE 25 Council
June 12, 2006
MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting Attendees:

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

Action Items:

* Broad Policy Statement for review of course nominations, (to be given as a charge to faculty reviewers at this fall's (and future) gtPathways reviews:

Policy statement for review of course nominations:

- 1. In keeping with the spirit and stated intent of the gtPathways curriculum, faculty reviewers are required to consider all courses nominated for inclusion in gtPathways only on the merits of their compliance with Content and Competency criteria. Content and Competency Criteria in gtPathways are not based on course prefix. The gtPathways review process does not consider such institutional issues as prerequisites or credentials of faculty teaching the course. The issue of whether a course is properly a general education course is a decision for the submitting institution.**
- 2. gtPathways does not allow a course to be designated in more than one category. The focus or primary emphasis of a course must clearly lead to learning outcomes that lie in the one content category for which it has been designated.**
- 3. In the case of courses previously nominated but not recommended for inclusion in gtPathways, faculty reviewers will evaluate them only on the basis of whether or not the submitting institution has adequately addressed the reasons for which the course was not previously recommended.**

Changes were made in accordance with our discussion and revisions made at the GE 25 Council's June 12th meeting, (end of first paragraph; in the second paragraph). It was also noted by the GE 25 membership that the statement made by the first sentence of number one should address concerns raised by J. Lanning regarding so-called "studio courses".

(Thank you to David, Linda and Wayne for taking the time to author this policy statement).

* Request from Communication Content Group to insert the word written throughout the Content criteria and wherever the word "communication" appears (see attached draft of minutes).

Vicki will ensure that the recommended changes, (addition of the word “written” is inserted into the Communication content criteria as the gtPathways webpage is revised).

Information Items:

* All gtPathways courses were formally recommended for placement into the gtPathways curriculum bring our total course listings to 597.

* The webpage is not currently down, but it is under construction, (and there should be a disclaimer attesting to such that folks can access when they visit the site). As campus personnel are in the process of up-dating catalogs, I’m requesting that any/all questions seeking clarification regarding information currently posted at the site please contact me, (my contact information is currently available at the site).

*** The Arts and Humanities faculty who were present at the April 14 meeting in Denver unanimously supported the following:**

Percentage of written work that should be required in Arts and Humanities/gtPathways courses: 50% to include formal essays written outside of class, formal analyses, essay test questions and study questions.

GE 25 Council agreed that the above statement concerning written work in the AHUM category first needs to be clarified and/or more clearly explained. They pointed out problems with the wording of the statement, asked questions about its relevance with regard to studio courses, (discussed previously), found the statement to be “overly prescriptive”, and found that the statement lacked a definition of the minimum standard. Vicki will contact Nancy McCollum and Gordon Cheesewright, co-chairs of the AHUM group, in order to pass along the issues raised during our discussion of Nancy McCollum’s AHUM notes from the 4/14 review. Information obtained from the discussion with Nancy and Gordon will be placed on the GE 25’s August agenda, (as there is no meeting in July).

An additional comment from some faculty relates to the syllabi for course recommended for inclusion in gtPathways:

The course requirements for every course should be listed and described in detail sufficient for both students and reviewers to understand the content, format, and purpose and how the course meets the specific competencies (i.e., reading, writing, critical thinking) established for courses in the category.

(Any discussion needed on the above/official GE 25 action needed?)

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

* Should we have both July and August 2006 meetings? *The GE 25 Council decided to cancel their July 2006 meeting and resume the monthly schedule of GE 25 meetings on August 7, 2006.*

* Should “Studio Courses” be considered for review in gtPathways reviews (Submitted by John Lanning, discuss established practice by previous AHUM review committees). *GE 25 decided yes, (refer to the Policy Statement, page one, approved by unanimous vote of GE 25 on June 12, 2006).*

* Communication Content Committee requests a rationale about why the “placement” courses of communications, mathematics, and modern languages are treated differently in gtPathways. (see attached draft of minutes). *GE 25 agreed to have **Michel Dahlin** author a draft of a proposal for discussion at our August 7, 2006 meeting. It was further discussed and agreed that Vicki would pass along the information to the Registrars/Advisors group so that they could assist us with transcribing issues. It was further decided that Vicki would consult with the Registrar’s group concerning the transcribing of lab/non-lab science courses and how we should proceed with the listing of such courses as the gtPathways website is revised.*

* CCHE sponsored “workshops” relating to gtPathways (Request submitted by John Lanning). Note: I realize we discussed this a few months back and the thinking at the time was that such a thing wasn’t necessary, however, John believes that the workshops would be helpful....any other thoughts?) *All – what was our resolution on this?*

- 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)

GE-25 members believe that decisions about placement into CO2 should properly remain an institutional responsibility (Note: At the request of John Cooney and Alan Lamborn, this statement was added as an amendment to our June 2006 meeting minutes)

- Institutional cut scores used to (opt in/test out)

* What do your catalogs state w/ regard to English/Math test-out options?

Assignment Items:

Members of GE 25 were asked to recommend experts from their respective composition programs so that Vicki can convene a meeting and facilitate a discussion concerning: 1) Test Out Options for CO1 and 2) credit options for test out. To date I’ve

received names from FLC and CSU-FC. I will need additional names prior to scheduling a meeting/discussion.

- FAQs for gtPathways website (Please send me some sample questions!!)
- Please take a few minutes to periodically review the gtPathways link at the CCHE website (as we will be working on the content for the better part of the summer months). Note that Rita Beachem will be out of the office beginning June 15-July 4, returning July 5, 2006. As she is the web mistress for CCHE, please know that the web page won't see much progress until she returns in July.
- **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

NEXT MEETING **August 7, 2006**
