



GE Council

November 7, 2011, 1:00-4:00pm
Department of Higher Education
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600
Denver, CO

MINUTES

1. Greetings and Introductions
 - Steve Werman (CMU)
 - Sandy Veltri (CCCS – FRCC)
 - Jeff Reynolds (AIMS)
 - Sunny Smith (CMC)
 - Jeff London (CFAC – MSCD)
 - Tom Christensen (UCCS)
 - Tom Smith (UNC)
 - Sheila Thompson (MSCD)
 - Erin Frew (CSU-P)
 - Frank Novotny (ASC)
 - Barbara Morris (FLC)
 - Rhonda Epper (CCCS)
 - Geri Anderson (CCCS)
 - Vicki Leal (CU System)
 - Scott Thompson (CCCS – NJC)
 - Wayne Artis (CFAC – PPCC)
 - Alan Lamborn (CSU-FC)
 - Emmy Glancy (DHE)
 - Tamara White Johnson (DHE)
 - Ian Macgillivray (DHE)
 - Maia Blom (DHE)
2. Adoption of last meeting's minutes – October 10, 2011 [see handout]
Adopted given change to language in 3.b., 2nd bullet.
3. Information Items
4. Discussion/Action Items
 - a. Debrief October 28, 2011 gtPathways review & training & reimbursement. Next time would it be possible to include reviewers who call in to participate? [see handout: **10-28-2011 Reimbursement to Publics for gtPathways Review of CTU Courses – GE Council is okay with fee structure**]

- Additional handout: gtPathways Policy Statement and Guidelines for Reviewers
 - 10/28/11 Training:
 - Standards/policy needs to be set for reviews and they must be followed. It is critical that the review process be unbiased and be seen as fair. The same standards must be applied to all.
 - The course syllabi must include a weekly schedule. It must be sufficiently detailed to *demonstrate* mastery of the competencies.
 - Reviewers wanted materials sent in advance of review; GEC agreed as long as the materials are embargoed.
 - Blind reviews might be an option, but they require a lot of work and it's hardly worth it.
 - gtPathways policy needs to be read aloud, together at beginning of the review.
 - gtPathways Subcommittee was formed to iron out any kinks in course review process and revise the forms: Sheila Thompson, Barbara Morris, Wayne Artis, Tom Smith, Ian Macgillivray, Maia Blom. They will address the following:
 - gtPathways forms
 - gtPathways policy + guidelines
 - what constitutes supporting pieces of evidence
 - standards for reviews
 - **Spring gtPathways review date change: Friday, March 9, 2012 at DHE.**
 - **The submission deadline stays the same: Friday, February 17, 2012.**
 - Options for future reviews:
 - Electronic (*if* a seasoned GEC member is part of the review committee and can guide the group)
 - Webinars
 - Conference calls
 - Skyping
 - Video conferencing
- b. Decide on date for April 2012 Fac-to-Fac: **Friday, April 6 and Friday, April 13** are the only Fridays available at the Lowry Conference Center. We have a hold on both days but need to decide now.
- Friday, April 6, 2012 is the date for the spring Faculty-to-Faculty conference. Biology, Chemistry, and Physics discussions have been postponed to fall 2012 conference.**
- c. Emmy Glancy and Tamara White Johnson will give update and solicit feedback on regional Fac-to-Fac Conferences with Higher Ed and P12 faculty for P20 alignment, gtPathways, and transfer articulation. (Additional handout – “Working Toward the Alignment of P12 and Higher Education to Support College and Career Readiness and Success – Faculty to Faculty Planning Document, Years One through Three, October 23, 2011)
- The focus of these conferences has switched from a broader statewide focus to a specific regional focus. The grant providers asked DHE to focus on 3 regions, rather than the entire state. These conferences are an opportunity to consider how the K12

standards align with HE expectations for what students should know; they are an opportunity to consider what is “college ready.”

Feedback from GEC:

- Regions (Denver Metro, Alamosa, Grand Junction) need to be re-visited; the eastern plains really need to be included. These areas of the state already feel disenfranchised and need to be included from the beginning.
 - Objectives need to be revised – they are too broad, too “statewide.” These meetings need to be as focused as possible, i.e., identify the most foundational issue common to the different groups attending. A possibility: revisiting gtPathways competencies in light of the new Colorado P12 Academic Standards
 - Make sure discipline-specific K12 faculty attend together with HE faculty who teach the Gen Ed core.
- d. Progress made since last time on CFAC’s role as an advisory group to GE Council & ways to engage:
- i. Input on gtPathways content criteria
 - ii. Assist with P20 alignment issues.
 - iii. Help with gtPathways compliance on campuses.
 - iv. Help ensure appropriate advising.

Tabled for a future meeting.

e. gtPathways website:

Maybe a glossary would be useful.

- i. Compare Approved Degree Programs List for 60+60 Planning (CCCS) v. DHE’s list.
Both these lists will be removed from their respective websites.
CCCS list is at: <http://www.cccs.edu/Docs/CCCNS/4year-BABSs-for-60-60.doc>
DHE list is at <http://higher.ed.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/gtPathways/programs.pdf>
[Both lists need to have some kind of identification on it – date, dept info, etc].
Is DHE’s list necessary given that we link to each institution’s own list at <http://higher.ed.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/Guides/default.html> ?
- ii. ECE, ELED & Engineering “agreements” moved under “Other Transfer Agreements.” Nursing transfer guide will join them. See <http://higher.ed.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/Students.html>
“Other Transfer Guides” changed to “Other Transfer Agreements.”
“Institutional Transfer Guides” moved into its own section.
ECE agreement needs some minor changes: ED 238 course is now 3 credits with a 1-credit practicum.
- iii. Progress on adding credits column? 9 schools have responded (AIMS, ASC, CCCS, CSM, CSU-P, FLC, MSCD, UCCS, UCD,)
- iv. Idea to link original approved syllabus with each gtPathways course
 - Decided not to do this.

- The issue of “quality control” (oversight ensuring that current gtPathways courses/syllabi are aligned with the originally submitted and approved course/syllabus) is an *institutional* responsibility, specifically the CAOs.
 - GE Council needs to discuss this issue of quality control in depth at a future meeting (January 2012). It would be good for each campus to share how they handle oversight of gtPathways courses. Another question for each campus to consider: how do they know their faculty and advisors know about gtPathways?
- f. Articulation Agreements
- i. Current count and status of Statewide Articulation Agreements [see **handout: Status Matrix**] – **tabled**.
 - ii. Suggestions for 4 more degrees to pursue as Statewide Articulation Agreements [see **handout: Top 10 Majors**]
 - Studio Arts
 - Communications
 - Geography
 - Geology
 - Agriculture
 - Computer Information Systems
 - Criminology? *Note: After the meeting Ian couldn’t find this in SURDS and did not include it on the list of potential degree programs for articulation agreements. If anyone has examples of programs with CIP codes that would be helpful.
 - Ethnic Studies/Chicano Studies/African American Studies/Women Studies??

DHE will do a search in SURDS to see how many degrees are awarded in these different disciplines.
 - iii. **Phase 3, Final Review**
 1. Political Science – **still need confirmation from UCB**
 2. Sociology – **still need confirmation from UCB**
 3. Anthropology – deadline for final review: 11/7/11; Phase 3 version sent to GEC on 10/18/11 – **still need confirmation from 5 schools**
 4. French –deadline for final review: 11/7/11; Phase 3 version sent to GEC on 10/18/11 – **still need confirmation from 5 schools**
 - iv. **Phase 2, ICIR, V.2**
 1. Criminal Justice – 9/22/11 – V.2 sent to Scott Thompson to forward to discipline group; discipline group chair will continue discussions to reduce credit hours – this should be able to be accomplished via email. **CRJ group is having a meeting on November 18. Scott Thompson will have a report after that meeting.**
 - v. **Phase 1, Curriculum Worksheet Creation & Verification**

Draft Curriculum Worksheets are being created by DHE (Maia) and will be forwarded to discipline groups for verification.

 1. Art History
 2. English
 3. Philosophy

4. Physics

5. Other Business?

- a. Heads up for next time: Please be prepared to discuss updating the competencies and criteria as well as a plan for review/reapproval of existing gtPathways courses to ensure that what was originally approved is what is actually being taught.
- b. **The Student Success Task Force: Only the legislators (6) on this task force can bring forward legislation. Eight possibilities were brought forward. A “credit for prior learning” piece of legislation will be pursued. It requires every IHE to have a process in place to give credit for military service, work experience. These credits must be able to transfer. The legislators were very excited about this piece of legislation.**
- c. **Request from CCCS: they have a Student Leadership Conference every fall. They like to hold it on a 4-year campus. Up to now, no public 4-years have hosted this conference. CCCS would like to have a public 4-year host the conference. Please send contacts to Geri Anderson.**

Notes on CTU general education curriculum and reimbursement for gtPathways review of private institution's coursework (this was sent out as an email to GE Council on October 18, 2011):

Dear GE Council-

This is an update on the questions raised at the last meeting regarding the core courses submitted by CTU and the issue of reimbursement for gtPathways review of CTU's courses. At the last meeting, you raised the following 4 questions. Each question is followed by the response from CTU.

1. Is the "core" you submitted for all CTU campuses in Colorado or just for students in concurrent enrollment?

Answer: The Core which was submitted is a subset of CTU's overall Gen Eds specifically designed for high school students in our High School Partners/concurrent enrollment program offered through the Colorado Springs campus. The courses will be delivered as 4.5 quarter hours (equivalent to 3 semester hours) classes to help facilitate transferability to state schools.

2. On the sheet titled, Bachelor of Science General Education Requirements, are these Gen Ed courses a required part of any degree CTU offers? If so, what are the degrees?

Answer: This dovetails into the first question. On the sheet titled, "Bachelor of Science General Education Requirements", the Gen Eds are offered throughout the six existing High School Partners/concurrent enrollment Associates of Science degree programs which includes degrees in: Business; Graphic Design; Criminal Justice; Engineering Technology; Applied Technology; Information Technology. In 2012, the new General Education courses will apply to most of the AS and BS degree with a few minor exceptions. This will allow programs with specific accreditation to meet their respective requirements, e.g. the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and the Project Management Institute (PMI, and through whom we received Global PMI accreditation--attached is a listing of our accreditations and affiliations if you need them).

3. Are the courses you are submitting already created and were they approved under CTU's last national accreditation?

Answer: The courses submitted are based on courses which have been in existence for over two decades, and have been through review by their respective program committees. We have regional accreditation with the HLC of NCA, not national accreditation. National Accreditation is provided by ABET and PMI for specific programs under our regional accreditation. Regional accreditors do not approve or disapprove individual courses.

4. Who is the equivalent of "Provost" who would sign off on the courses once approved by the state?

Answer: Dr. Scott Van Tonningen, the individual identified on the course nomination forms, will sign off on the courses.

Matt Gianneschi and I discussed all of this and even though CTU will not submit any Natural and Physical Science courses until the spring 2012 review, we feel we owe it to CTU and are required, given the recent legislation, to move forward with a review of the courses CTU has submitted thus far.

In regards to reimbursing public institutions that send faculty reviewers to review CTU's courses, remember that at the September GEC meeting, I stated that DHE will reimburse the controller at the IHE for each faculty member that attends the review. Then it is up to the school to reimburse the faculty member, if the school so chooses. And to clarify, when I said, "attends the review" what I really meant was "reviews courses submitted by a private institution." DHE does not reimburse a public school for reviewing courses submitted by another public school.

The question has been posed, "What is the stipend situation for this review?" For the sake of simplicity, I propose dividing the "Cost per First Course in a Discipline" (\$524.52) and the "Cost per Each Additional Course in a Discipline" (\$344.52) by the number of reviewers for each CTU course and reimbursing the institution by that number times the number of faculty they sent to review that course. So for instance, if UCD sends 2 faculty and CCCS sends 2 faculty to review CTU's College Algebra course (the first and only course in this discipline for which we're charging CTU \$524.52 for Faculty Reviewers), then UCD would be reimbursed \$262.26 of that and CCCS would be reimbursed the other \$262.26 of that.

Another question posed was, "Will faculty (through their university) be compensated if their area has no CTU course?" The short answer is "No." The longer explanation is that DHE will only reimburse public schools who send faculty to review courses submitted by non-public schools. So for instance, since CTU did not submit any Natural and Physical Science courses, no institution will receive any reimbursement for sending reviewers to review the Natural and Physical Science courses submitted by other publics. (Please remember to explain to your faculty that the incentive for participating in these reviews is that someone from another institution will return the favor when they submit their own course for review one day). When DHE reimburses an institution for sending faculty to review CTU courses, if the public school then chooses to reimburse their faculty, then they will have to figure out how to divvy up the reimbursement themselves. DHE will stay out of that.

Please let me know if you have any more questions regarding this. And let's please help one another out by sending Maia an excellent and large cadre of new and experienced reviewers!
☺

Thanks much everyone.
Ian