



GE Council

September 9, 2013, 1:00-4:00pm
Department of Higher Education
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600
Denver, CO

MINUTES - Approved

I. GREETINGS AND INTRODUCTIONS

Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)
Ann Bentz (UNC)
Margaret Doell (ASU)
Rhonda Epper (CCCS)
Erin Frew (CSU-P)
John Lanning (UCD)
Jeff London (CFAC-MSU Denver)
Barbara Morris (FLC)
Richard Nishikawa (UCB)
Kathy Pickering (CSU-FC)
Jeff Reynolds (Aims)
Bill Niemi (WSCU)
Todd Ruskell (CSM)
Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)
Sandy Veltri (CCCS-FRCC)
Rex Welshon (UCCS)
Steve Werman (CMU)
Ian Macgillivray (DHE)
Maia Blom (DHE)
Guest: Erik Juergensmeyer (FLC) re P20 Regional Partnerships

II. ADOPTION OF LAST MEETING'S NOTES

[See handout: 2013-08-12 - GE Council - Draft MINUTES]
Adopted.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Update on Work of the Core to College P20 Regional Partnerships & Implications for General Education (Emmy Glancy)
1. First state summit was held June 10, 2013. The four regional partnerships have been meeting since. Next state summit currently scheduled for Friday, October 18, 2013.

2. Colorado is a national leader on things like supplemental academic instruction, reverse transfer, educator effectiveness and degree completion. Let's not lose our edge when it comes to general education and assessing student learning.
3. The work of these groups can provide a place to start for a revision of the gtPathways content criteria and competencies, at least for GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 (gateway math courses only). Faculty could begin this process at Spring 2014 Faculty-to-Faculty Conference?
4. Faculty could also consider multiple math pathways and whether or not the gateway math courses, at least for the STAAs, are the most appropriate? (rather than often defaulting to college algebra)
5. The work of the Regional Partnerships can also inform ideas for assessment of student learning, signature assignments, etc., as they consider revised entrance and exit competencies for GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 courses.
6. Implications for potential review of GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 mentioned below? Could a re-review of these currently approved courses and the process of revising gtPathways content criteria and competencies inform one another?

The regional groups are identifying gaps between high school and postsecondary Math and English Language Arts curricula. The overall goals of this P20 work are to have high school graduates be college and career ready, to identify gaps and to align exit and entrance competencies for K12 and postsecondary students. There needs to be both vertical and horizontal alignments with competencies. At the October 18 summit, the four regions will compare their work thus far. Discussion was held about including CFAC in this summit. It will be held at CCCS Lowry Conference Center.

Erik Juergensmeyer (Western Slope regional lead – English group) joined the meeting via phone to report on the Western Slope's progress. There need to be more opportunities for these kinds of conversations. The group has identified 5-7 core competencies for English (CO-1, -2, -3). They've also identified the similarities and differences in how these courses are taught. The charge given to this group was not to rewrite the current gtPathways content criteria and competencies but to explore if the existing outcomes can be identified, made more specific, and how they might be measured. Erik reported some concerns of the Western Slope group:

1. We need more opportunities for faculty-to-faculty conversations about this topic.
2. We need more opportunities for communication with high school teachers (they comprise only about 15% of this group's membership).
3. The group favors "authentic assessment" rather than national instruments. They want to keep it "local."

GEC discussion:

- The work being done by the P20 Regional Partnerships groups could inform the revision of the current gtPathways content and competency criteria. The spring Faculty-to-Faculty conference could "piggy back" on this work by gathering together a wider array of COMM/Math faculty to discuss the findings of the P20 groups.
- The current gtPathways content/competency criteria were created in 2000/2001. It was a year-long process and there was a lot of disagreement at the time. Thus, the criteria are vague and "squishy."

- These criteria do need to be reconsidered, and possibly revised.
- The current criteria (learning objectives) for the CO courses need some rethinking. For example, the variations between CO-2 courses from campus to campus are too great sometimes.
- Point made that HLC is paying greater attention to competencies and student learning and the current gtPathways content criteria and competencies will soon cease to satisfy HLC's concerns about general education and student learning.
- Any new gtPathways competencies that get developed need learning outcomes and assessment plans. We're probably more likely to get agreement among faculty if the focus is on competencies/learning outcomes rather than content.
- Are there lessons from other states? (Ian will follow up with SHEEO and WICHE).
- Discussion re Math criteria: when they were developed, there was more agreement among faculty for the math criteria than there was for the CO-1, -2, -3 criteria. However, Math needs to cover three areas: math for the liberal arts, math for social and behavioral sciences (statistics), and math for the STEM disciplines (college algebra). There needs to be a statewide conversation concerning what students need to know about Math by the time they graduate. This conversation needs to include more than just Math faculty – it needs to include liberal arts faculty as well. This conversation will also inform math remedial education and Supplemental Academic Instruction. This discussion on multiple math pathways could also lead to agreement on different gateway math courses for certain degrees and Statewide Transfer Articulation Agreements. This discussion can also inform the discussion on differentiated cut scores on math placement tests based on the type of degree program.
- We might also considering splitting GT-MA1 into buckets that match multiple math pathways. Might also do this for different disciplines in natural sciences?
- Students should be encouraged to complete their Math and CO requirements within their first two years because these courses are foundational for many disciplines.
- Possible **Spring 2014 Faculty-to-Faculty**: continue conversation regarding Math and CO criteria/learning outcomes; share P20 groups' outcomes with all Math/CO faculty. This conversation should also include faculty from supporting disciplines (natural sciences, social & behavioral sciences, AHUM). DHE will prepare a rough draft for how this conference could transpire.
- Talking about “measurable learning outcomes” with faculty instead of “content” outcomes (criteria) might help them come to agreement concerning criteria for CO/Math courses. The big issue is competency-based education for students with clear learning outcomes and assessment plans.

B. Set dates for 2014 gtPathways reviews

1. Proposal for Spring 2014: re-review currently approved GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 (gateway math courses only). **No – there's no point in this until we have revised competencies.**

- GE Council “...shall annually review the list of general education courses and the course numbering system, including the criteria, adopted by the commission and recommend such changes as may be necessary to maintain the accuracy and integrity of the course numbering system. The council's annual review shall include

consideration of the course descriptions, and the council may request summaries of course syllabi for further review.” [23-1-108.5(3)(c)(II), C.R.S.

2. Proposed dates for a “regular” gtPathways course review: See handout: *2014 gtPathways Review Dates*. **Approved.**

- C. Time to review STAA template [See handout: *TEMPLATE – FINAL-FINAL3 – 2013-07-25*]

Changes that will be made:

- Minor changes to formatting and some language to provide consistency.
- Part 3: Prescribed Curriculum:
 - Add this sentence to the Note at the top of the page: “Please refer to this agreement’s cover page for the name of the Bachelor’s degree at the four-year institution to which this agreement applies.”
 - Remove “but not MAT 155 or 156” language from the chart.
 - Remove “Please note” at bottom of page.
- Addendum to Agreement:
 - Remove paragraph 1 (“The guarantee that the number of credits....”)
 - In former paragraph 2: change “each category” to each “content area.”

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Important Dates for Fall 2013

1. Faculty-to-Faculty – Friday, October 11, 2013 (Cancel or keep for Mechanical & Civil Engineering?). **Cancelled.**
2. gtPathways review process will begin on September 13, 2013 – to be completed by November 8, 2013. [See handout: *2013 gtPathways Review Dates – take 2*]

B. Colorado Technical University & gtPathways

1. CTU has indicated it wants to continue to participate in gtPathways and will submit courses for review for the fall 2013 cycle. CTU currently has two gtPathways approved courses -- LITR 2205: Introduction to Literature and PSYC 1005: Introduction to Psychology. Both were approved December 2, 2011.
2. This summer DHE reviewed CTU’s general education core course requirements and gtPathways approved courses to ensure that they continue to meet the general education core course guidelines, pursuant to §23-1-125(5), C.R.S. DHE found:
 - Colorado Technical University’s general education core course requirements do not meet Colorado core course guidelines because CTU does not require a History course. CTU shall require a History course in its general education core courses if it wishes to continue to participate in gtPathways.
 - It could not be determined if the two currently approved courses meet gtPathways content criteria and competencies for GT-AH2 and GT-SS3. The current syllabi for the courses differ from the originally approved syllabi in course number, course name, assignments, course schedule, course description and course objectives. CTU shall submit these courses for formal review in the fall 2013 review cycle if it wishes to continue to participate in gtPathways.
3. CTU agreed to these terms and paid the invoice to reimburse the state for its time.

Question to pose to CTU: are the syllabi they are submitting for review used on all Colorado campuses? In other words, are syllabi consolidated across all Colorado campuses?

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. CCHE Policy I, L: Statewide Transfer Policy [See handout: *i-partl_revision_2013-09-09_IKM*]

- Would this policy, or an associated “advising guide,” be a good place to encourage completion of freshman communications and math within the student’s first 30 credits?

Some issues to consider:

- credit for prior learning / prior learning assessments.
- Section 8.04: this section needs to be discussed with CCCS before any changes are made to it.

VI. 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 GEC only review; deadline 8/9/13. Still need to hear from F. Novotny, Scott T., Rhonda E., Sandy V. Next step will be Phase 3, V.2 – the final campus review.

C. Phase 2: ICIR

1. Communication – V.3, 2013-08-12, incorporates changes requested at August GEC meeting. V. 3 sent to GEC on 9/6/13; deadline 9/27/13.
2. English – UNC indicated they could make V.2a work. Still need to hear from UCB.
3. Geography – V.2 (incorporating language from Spanish STAA re licensure tracks) sent to GEC 7/26/13; deadline 8/13/13. Still need to hear from CCCS. **Need to add both CO-1/-2 and CO-2/-3 sequences to the Prescribed Curriculum grid.**
4. Philosophy – Agreement can move forward to Phase 3. Still need to send courtesy copy to discipline group. Still need degree titles from CSU-FC and UCCS.

D. Phase 1: Curriculum Worksheet Creation & Verification

1. Art History – agreement will move to Phase 2.
2. Biology – 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 (8/15/13) Rhonda, David, Alan, Nish to get this moving along.
 - Waiting to hear from CSU and UCB who their reps will be.
 - Kim Regier (UCD) should be added to this committee.
3. Chemistry – agreement will move to Phase 2.
4. Physics – It is possible to move this agreement along through the different STAA phases while a Modern Physics course is developed at CCCS. **Shall the CWS verification process be repeated or shall this CWS move to Phase 2, ICIR?**
 - CWS will move to Phase 2, ICIR.
 - Modern Physics course is in process and should be active in 2014?????
5. Music – the CWS is now verified and will move to the next step of Phase 1.
6. Studio Art – agreement will move to Phase 2

7. **Theatre** – the CWS is now verified and will move to the next step of Phase 1.

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

1. **Engineering** – 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. Have heard from CSM, CSU-P, and MSU Denver; still need to hear from CSU-FC, UCB, UCCS, and UCD. **Rhonda Epper will be the CCCS rep until a new provost is hired.**
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. **Physical Anthropology** - There is a discrepancy across 2-yr and 4-yr institutions as to whether a physical/biological anthropology course should be SS3 or SC2. (This came up at the Spring 2013 gtPathways review. Maybe a good topic for a future Fac2Fac?).
4. **Music Education**
5. **Mass Communication**

VII. OTHER BUSINESS?