



## GE Council

**August 12, 2013, 1:00-4:00pm**  
Department of Higher Education  
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600  
Denver, CO

### MINUTES

- I. Greetings and Introductions
  - Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)
  - Rhonda Epper (CCCS)
  - Erin Frew (CSU-P)
  - Alan Lamborn (CSU-FC)
  - Kathy Pickering (CSU-FC – to be Alan Lamborn’s replacement)
  - John Lanning (UCD)
  - Jeff London (CFAC-MSU Denver)
  - Susan Looney (CMC)
  - Terry Schliesman (WSCU)
  - C. David Moon (UCCS)
  - Barbara Morris (FLC)
  - Richard Nishikawa (UCB)
  - Jeff Reynolds (Aims)
  - Sheila Thompson (MSU Denver)
  - Steve Werman (CMU)
  - Ian Macgillivray (DHE)
  - Maia Blom (DHE)
  
- II. Adoption of meeting notes from May 13, 2012 meeting. In June, GE Council attended the Core to College State P20 Regional Partnerships State Summit instead of having a regular meeting. [\[See handout: May 13, 2013 GEC meeting draft minutes.\]](#)  
Minutes adopted with minor changes to Section C.
  
- III. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS
  - A. **Phase 4: Procurement of Signatures** - NONE
  
  - B. **Phase 3: Final Review**
    1. **Geology** – V.1 sent 7/25/13 to **GEC members** for review; deadline 8/9/13.
  
  - C. **Phase 2: ICIR**
    1. **Chemistry**

- a. Draft CHEM agreement ready for **GEC review** (not the campus review yet). [See **handout: STAA – CHEMISTRY – Phase 2, ICIR, V.1 – 2013-07-10.**]
  - b. Some background info: May 6, 2013 meeting between John Lanning, Martha Jackson-Carter, Geri Anderson, Rhonda Epper, Ian Macgillivray, and Maia Blom to discuss:
    - Guarantee to community college student that gtPathways general education would transfer to the baccalaureate program as a ‘block’ even though the gtPathways courses and AS degree are not complete. The GEC felt the agreement should not be based on the reverse transfer of two courses to earn the AS degree as the foundation of ‘guarantees’ for the community college student.
    - The agreement may need to be called something other than ‘statewide transfer articulation agreement’ to identify the unique (so far) nature of this agreement.
    - The modified narrative portions of the agreement need to be reviewed by the GEC, rather than only focusing on the prescribed curriculum worksheet.
  - It was agreed to remove the language, “and to regain the guarantees afforded community college students with the AS degree after transfer to the 4-yr institution” at the end of the first paragraph under Part One: Guarantees and also remove “and (2) the two gtPathways courses above are ‘reverse’ transferred to the community college, and the AS degree is awarded” from the bottom of pg. 2 (under Part One: Guarantees, 2) and from footnote #2 on pg. 4. The reason was that the ability to offer this STAA does not rely on the participating student to reverse transfer their credits and get the associate degree. However, there should be language in the STAA advising students that it is in their best interest to take advantage of the reverse transfer function and get their associate degree once they’ve completed the gtPathways Arts & Humanities course and the gtPathways Social and Behavioral Sciences course and have accumulated at least 70 credits in total (the 70 credits is a requirement of the reverse transfer statute, §23-1-131(3)(a), C.R.S. John Lanning will come up with this language and send it to Maia Blom.
  - Ian added this after the 8-12-13 meeting: The language should probably also state something to the effect of nothing in this agreement shall change if “the student declines the associate degree at the time of the notification that they are eligible for an associate’s degree” [23-1-131(3)(b), C.R.S.].
  - Issues considered: the guarantees in this (Chemistry) agreement are based on the agreement itself, not on the “reverse transfer” completion of an AA/AS degree. Reverse transfer will not retroactively apply any guarantees that come with the standard completion of an AA, AS, or DWD.
  - CCCS is concerned that a STAA is required for a DWD to be approved by the State Board. DHE staff reviewed §23-1-108(7) and determined statute is broad enough to allow the unconventional nature of the Chemistry agreement to fit within the STAA guidelines.
2. **Communication**
- a. V.2 (incorporating CSU-FC proposed changes) re-sent to GEC 7/25/13; deadline 8/8/13.
  - b. What about the title of this agreement? Title should just be **Communication**. The specific bachelor’s degrees to which the agreement applies will be listed on the cover page. Also, agreed to change “Please note:” language on pg. 2 to:

**Please note:** Additional COM courses beyond the 4 courses (12 credit hours) identified above, in the **Additional Required Courses section**, may not count toward

the **speech** Communication major at the receiving 4-year institution. See explanation in Limitations section.

3. **English** –

- a. UNC cannot make this agreement work; UCB is having a hard time making it work also because the curriculum has become more and more vague. UCB would prefer more specificity in the STAA curriculum – the goal of STAAs is to provide specific guidance on what a student should take for their degree. Larger discussion: The intent of the gtPathways curriculum is General Education, not specialized courses like “Literature & Film.” One of the issues with the gtPathways approved-courses list is that more and more courses are being approved for the gtPathways curriculum that really are not appropriate for a *Gen Ed* curriculum, e.g., Literature & Film. Often this course is an upper-division course and should not really be a part of a Gen Ed curriculum. Consequently, specific courses should be listed in the prescribed curriculum of the STAAs to help students have a solid basis in their major.
- b. The CU System campuses (UCB, UCD, UCCS) and UNC will propose an alternative prescribed curriculum for ENG, one that has a bit more specificity.

Ian sent email (8/13) and attached latest version of agreement to Joonok, Tracey and Jim at UNC to point out the new language in the Additional Required Courses section, to see if that language might make a difference for UNC. When Ian hears back from UNC, he'll be in touch with Nish to let Nish know if he should follow up with his faculty. Ian heard back from Joonok at UNC who indicated they might be able to make this work and let Nish know 8/20.

4. **Geography** – V.2 (incorporating language from Spanish STAA re licensure tracks) sent to GEC 7/26/13; deadline 8/13/13. **Have heard from ASU, UCCS, UCD, and UNC.**
5. **Philosophy** – V.3 (ICIR) sent to GEC on 2/22/13, deadline 3/8/13. Still need to hear from UCB, UCCS, and UCD. Reminder email sent 7/26/13. Still need to send courtesy copy to discipline group. **Have heard from UCB, UCCS, and UCD. Agreement can move forward to Phase 3.**

D. **Phase 1: Curriculum Worksheet Creation & Verification**

1. **Art History** – Degrees with emphasis recommended for inclusion in STAA for following campuses: CMU, CSU-FC, CSU-P, MSU Denver, UCCS, UCD, UNC, WSCU. Degree with emphasis not recommended for inclusion in STAA: ASU.
  - a. CSU-FC request: would like to see some changes in the wording of the footnote in order to further clarify the issue: Students planning on transfer to CSU will be required to complete a 200 level foreign language for completion of the BA in Art – Art History. Students will be expected to be prepared upon completion of the associate's degree to take an intermediate foreign language or be able to pass the CSU Foreign Language placement exam at the sophomore level. It may not be possible to complete the BA in Art – Art History concentration in two years without this prior foreign language competency.
  - b. All campuses present at the first F2F in 2011 have verified the CWS. Some additional campuses were present at the spring 2013 F2F; the CWS was not discussed at this second F2F. Should Phase 1 verification stage be re-done or should this (revised) CWS move directly to Phase 2 (ICIR)? **[See handout: Art History – Phase 1 Draft CWS – 2013-04-05, V.3]**  
**Move agreement to Phase 2 – ICIR.**
2. **Biology**

- a. Not recommended to move forward *yet*. The discipline group agreed the basic structure of the agreement was fine and the prescribed curriculum in Phase 3 was okay. They concluded the labs should be more inquiry-based. Key faculty and CCCS reps will continue to meet and work out solutions. Rhonda Epper and Norma Hollebecke will debrief and be in touch with Ian M. if any coordination from DHE is requested.
  - b. Next steps?  
DHE will arrange a meeting for a small group of Biology reps to discuss what a more “inquiry-based” online lab would look like. Norma Hollebecke (CCCS/CCOnline) needs input on what the faculty want. Meeting participants will include CSU, CU campuses, 2 CCCS faculty, Rhonda Epper, Norma Hollebecke, DHE staff. Ian emailed (8/15) Rhonda, David, Alan, Nish to get this moving along.
3. **Physics** –recommended to move forward with some issues to work out:
- a. PHY 213: Physics III: Calculus Based (a.k.a. Modern Physics) is a required course but there has never been enough enrollment in it for it to be taught. Idea is to offer it online and there are no objections to that. RRCC would be interested in developing an online course. The STAA won’t work if there is not an online option.  
This issue is the biggest challenge for the Physics agreement. Modern Physics needs to be a part of CCCS course offerings and it must be offered online. Modern Physics is on the agenda for the fall CCCS 2+2 conference; it is also on the development schedule for CCOnline.
  - b. First 60 splits the Chemistry sequence but many receiving institutions don’t require the second course in the sequence. This issue is not that big of a deal.
  - c. Some receiving institutions require a Computer Science course and this should have a footnote. This issue is not that big of a deal and can be dealt with.
  - d. Next steps? It is possible to move this agreement along through the different STAA phases while a Modern Physics course is developed at CCCS.
4. **Music** – draft CWS, V.3 and notes sent to discipline group on 3/7/13 – deadline 3/29/13. Reminder email sent 8/1/13 to CMC and CSU-FC.  
In the future, the music discipline group wants to do a STAA in Music Education; such an agreement would serve a lot of students well.
5. **Studio Art** – Degrees with emphasis recommended for inclusion in STAA for following campuses: CMU, CSU-FC, CSU-P, FLC, UCCS, UCD, and WSCU. Degrees with emphasis not recommended for inclusion in STAA: NONE.
- a. All but one campus present at the first F2F in 2012 have verified the CWS. Some additional campuses were present at the spring 2013 F2F; the CWS was not discussed at this second F2F.
  - b. Should Phase 1 verification stage be re-done or should this (revised) CWS move directly to Phase 2 (ICIR)? [See handout: *Art Studio – Phase 1 Draft CWS – 2013-04-05, V.3*]
    - Move agreement to Phase 2 – ICIR.
    - CSU will see if their BA will work for this agreement or if they’ll need to see if their BFA can work. Maia will send the name of the CSU rep to Alan.
    - Agreed to remove the footnote at the bottom of pg. 2. Determined it was there by mistake.

6. **Theatre** – draft CWS + notes sent to discipline group for verification on 12/17/12; deadline 2/8/13. Reminder email sent 2/25/13. Another reminder email sent 8/1/13. Still need to hear from UCCS. **David agreed to follow up.**

E. **Phase 0: For Future Planning**

1. **Engineering** – Before Fall 2013 Fac2Fac, convene **Civil & Mechanical** Engineering advisors, Associate Deans & key faculty- maybe use webinar or questionnaire- for guidance and to identify key points needing resolution. Volunteers: Todd R., Wayne A., Chris D. at UCCS and Mary S. at UCB.  
**DHE to convene a small group of Civil and Mechanical Engineering reps from MSU Denver, CSM, CSU-P, CSU-FC, UCB, UCCS, and UCD to consider if STAAs in mechanical and civil engineering would be possible. Engineering STAAs will not be considered at the F2F. Prior to the meeting, schools will send their engineering degree requirements to DHE (Maia sent email 8/16 to all campuses with civil or mechanical engineering degrees requesting this info). DHE will disseminate these materials to all for review prior to the meeting. Ian pulled April 1, 2004 CCHE agenda and minutes regarding credit waiver discussion for engineering degrees. Will need to address requirement of completing engineering degrees in 4 years.**
2. **ECE & ELED** – These may need some revising once some 4-year institutions have created their new bachelor's degrees in ECE and ELED. The state has money to revisit ECE in 2014.
3. **Music Education**
4. **Mass Communication**

IV. Discussion/Action Items

A. Transcript Codes for gtPathways Courses

1. Is the GEC's collective understanding that all gtPathways courses should be identified on transcripts? **It is not required to put gtPathways course codes on transcripts; some schools put them on transcripts, some schools do not. It would be very expensive for those who do not to make this change.**
2. Are there GT-SC1 courses with an optional lab section so that students might get credit for having taken GT-SC1 but they took the section without the lab? **No, the lab is required. However, it sometimes happens that students sign up for the wrong lab section or if the lab is graded and transcribed separately from the co-requisite course, the student could fail the lab and still pass the course. Such situations can cause issues if the student then transfers. Transcript review folks are encouraged to look at the catalog policies at the sending institution.**
3. Anything else?

B. Articulation Agreement Template (p. 5, section "Addendum to Agreement")

1. The current wording in the first sentence of this section implies the 4-year school can require more than 120 hours for the degree. Suggest this change:

The guarantee that the number of credits required to graduate will be at the State-mandated ~~minimum~~ maximum for this baccalaureate degree program applies only to students who complete the AA/AS degree and the complete curriculum prescribed in this agreement.

It was decided that this language be removed from the CHEM agreement; should it also be removed from the template?

C. gtPathways Course Categories & Reviews - Points for Clarification

1. ANT 130 (spring 2013 gtPathways review) – need to address discrepancy regarding this type of course – is it SS3 or SC1/2?

a. Review Results for ANT 130 - Deferred:

- CONTENT VALIDITY:
  1. N/A.
  2. The lecture portion of the course MEETS each of the six (1a-1f) content criteria for state guaranteed transfer as a science course. Comments: The syllabus did a good job of providing detail to verify the content criteria are met.
  3. N/A.
- COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS:
  1. Critical Thinking: Met.
  2. Mathematics: Not met. Comments: The nomination form is a little vague as to the mathematics skills required in the form, but does state the course uses calculations and statistics. The syllabus lacks details to verify the mathematics competencies.
- SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Deferred. Comments: The ANT 130 nomination form is for “Introduction to Physical Anthropology,” while the syllabus is for “Introduction to Biological Anthropology,” and the reviewers weren’t sure if the syllabus was consistent with the nomination form. The nomination form (sections C4-8) was filled out for all competencies, making it difficult to determine if the course was truly a science course. The resubmission of ANT 130 is the result of UNC seeking to change the gtPathways knowledge area from SS3 to SC2. Anthropology, especially a physical/biology anthropology course contains natural and physical science content. The ANT 130 nomination did not identify what changes had been made to the course to warrant changing from social science to physical science. There is a discrepancy across 2-yr and 4-yr institutions as to whether a physical/biological anthropology course should be SS3 or SC2, and it is the opinion of the chair (JAL) that consistency should be discussed at the GE Council level.

**[See handouts: 1) ANT 130 Nomination Form; 2) ANT 130 Syllabus.]**

A course must transfer according to the content area in which it was approved. The “submitting” institution must clearly mark the content area on the nomination form. They also should be clear on the nomination form, if the IHE is requesting a change in content areas, that the course is being withdrawn from the previous content area. One course cannot satisfy two content areas. Ian will follow up with Tom at UNC (8/16).

2. Also, FOAN 180/180L – SS3 course but includes a lab. GEC needs to discuss.

a. Review Results for FOAN 180 – Deferred:

- CONTENT VALIDITY:
  1. The content criterion for SS3: Met.
  2. The course DOES provide students the opportunity to use the social or behavioral sciences to analyze and interpret issues.
  3. The course DOES provide students with the opportunity to use the social or behavioral sciences to understand diverse perspectives and groups.
- COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS:
  1. Critical Thinking: Not met. Comments: The paper description on page 10 of the syllabus describes elements of critical thinking competencies but the paper



described in [the] nomination form does not. It appears to be a different kind of paper. The weekly assignments appear more grounded in personal reaction than critical analysis. There is no provision for a lab in Social Sciences so critical thinking competencies apparent in lab component are not considered in course review. Lab component issue will be referred to General Education Council.

2. Written Communication: Not met. Comments: There is a lot of confusion about the nature of the paper: does not address primary/secondary source component; no mention of application of writing competencies. The weekly assignments do not seem to reflect the intent of the written communication competency. Syllabus lists critical thinking as a competency but not writing.
3. Technology: NA.

- SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Deferred.

**[See handout: *FOAN 180 Nomination Form (including syllabus)*.]**

**The lab component of this submission needs to be addressed as a co-requisite for the course. Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC) will get together with Steve Werman (CMU) to give some guidance for the resubmission.**

#### D. Requiring Students to Save Previous Coursework for Transfer

1. At least one institution maintains that reviewing previous coursework (syllabi, exams, homework) for transfer students is in the best interest of the students (to ensure adequate preparation for and success in subsequent coursework). The institution agreed not to do this for gtPathways courses. Is it common practice to do this for other (non-gtPathways) courses?

**For gtPathways courses, requiring students to save their syllabi and other coursework is not acceptable. For non-gtPathways courses, it is an accepted practice, which is more common for major courses and less so for gen ed courses (those that are not gtPathways approved).**

#### E. CCHE Policy I, L: Statewide Transfer Policy **[See handout: *i-partl\_revision\_2013-07-23.docx*]** **Tabled until the next meeting due to time constraints.**

1. Recall that the last time GEC met (May 13, 2013), the Council discussed and gave feedback on sections 7.00 through 8.02.03. Ian still has that feedback recorded.
2. Today's tasks are to:
  - Re-evaluate section 7.01.03 based on CCCS possibly going with highest cut scores.
  - Re-evaluate section 8.01 based on new information.
  - Pick up where we left off with section 8.03.

#### V. Other Business?

- **The Civil & Mechanical Engineering STAA discussions will be held outside of the fall F2F venue. Consequently, discussion was held regarding what else could be done at F2F. Ian and Maia will follow up.**
- **On the Curriculum Worksheet Template, add a note referring students and advisors to the front cover of the agreement for the name of the bachelor's degree at the receiving institution. For example:**

PHASE 2: Issues-Resolved\_CWS ICIR, V.2  
For a Bachelor's Degree in COMMUNICATION

**\*Refer to cover page for the name of the bachelor's degree at the receiving 4-year institution.**