



GE Council

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

MEETING NOTES

Approved

I. Greetings and Introductions

Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)
Ann Bentz (UNC)
Margaret Doell (ASU)
John Lanning (UCD)
Jeff London (CFAC-MSU Denver)
Barbara McDonnell (CCCS)
Barbara Morris (FLC)
Richard Nishikawa (UCB)
Kathy Pickering (CSU-FC)
Jeff Reynolds (AIMS)
Todd Ruskell (CSM)
Terry Schliesman (WSCU)
Rae Shevalier (MSU Denver)
Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)
Sandy Veltri (CCCS-FRCC)
Rex Welshon (UCCS)
Steve Werman (CMU)
Ian Macgillivray (DHE)
Maia Blom (DHE)
Kim Regier (UCD) – guest
LaTasha Baldwin (DHE) – guest
Brenda Bautsch (DHE) – guest

II. Adoption of last meeting's notes: *see handout: 2013-11-11 – GEC Meeting – Draft Minutes.*
Adopted.

III. Information Items

A. Reimbursement for Review of CTU's gtPathways Submissions [See handouts: 2013 Reimbursement to Publics for gtPathways Review of CTU Courses.docx and 2013 November gtPathways worksheet for charges.pdf.]

1. The dollar amounts on pg. 2 of the document titled “2013 Reimbursement to Publics...” has been sent to the controller at your institution. It would be nice if you used it to reimburse faculty/departments for reviewers’ travel and other expenses. **Ian sent names of controllers on the individual campuses to GEC on 12/10/2013. For community colleges, the money went to the individual campuses and not the CCCS office.**
 2. The document titled “2013 November gtPathways worksheet for charges” is just for your own information so you can see the fee structure CCHE approved for charging private institutions for this work and how Ian calculated the charges.
- B. CCHE approved the courses from the fall 2013 review recommended for inclusion in gtPathways. [See handout: *COURSE STATUS SHEET – gtPathways Review – 2013-11-15 – RESULTS.*] **The recommended courses will be added to the DHE’s gtPathways database.**
- C. Update on P20 Regional Partnership work and implications for April 2014 Faculty-to-Faculty Conference
- **Emmy Glancy left DHE; her position will be filled.**
 - **IEBC (a consultant group) has been facilitating the P20 work. Ian will meet with IEBC to see how to transition the work from the P20 Regional Partnerships to the spring Faculty-to-Faculty conference (4/18/14) where faculty will continue the work started for Math (College Algebra, Intro to Stats & Math for Liberal Arts) and Written Communication. Will consider how the P20 work might inform the revision of gtPathways content and competency criteria for Math and Written Communication. Ian will update GEC on final outcome of P20 Regional Partnership work.**

IV. Discussion/Action Items

- A. From last meeting: CCCS would match the cut score the 4-years accept for Gen Ed application. Barbara M. will check with CCCS to see if an AP cut score of 4 can be used across the board. Adina Chapman, Director, Higher Education Policy Analysis, College Board (achapman@collegeboard.org) offered to provide research and data on AP exam scores that would inform the conversation. **CCCS has discussed using a cut score of 4 across the board but no final decision has been made. This decision will not be made until the new Provost assumes his position.**
- B. Your homework for today was to find out how your campus handles this scenario: *A student transfers to your institution with a completed AA or AS. As part of the associate degree, the student received credit for a gen ed course by passing a nationally normed test (e.g., AP, IB, CLEP) with a cut score that was acceptable for the sending institution but too low for your receiving institution. How do you accept the student at junior standing (and apply 60 credits to the degree) and get them through the bachelor’s degree in no more than an additional 60 credits (assuming a 120 credit bachelor’s)?* Here is one response received so far:
- Our transfer policy in the Catalog: “Students who complete an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree with 60 transferable credits will transfer with junior standing, provided that the student has earned a C- or better in each course, and will be able to complete a baccalaureate degree by taking 60 additional credits, unless

the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has approved additional requirements.”

- Our procedure in the Registrar’s Office is: In Banner, the AA/AS comes in as a whole entity. They are indicated as having met gen ed at our institution in degree audits. But then we transcript the courses in one by one. Many students do not get 60 credits, because included in their AA/AS are courses with D grades, etc. If a student wants to transfer in credit based on credit by examination, they need to submit their testing transcripts and be evaluated against our score grid.
- It was agreed that the ways in which the campuses handle this situation is appropriate and does not affect the current language of the statewide transfer policy.
- Stemming from this discussion, the idea was floated that it is a good time to have the discussion about having a state-wide cut score for Advanced Placement exams. (Eventually we will consider CLEP, too; but will start with AP only. IB is used so infrequently, it’s not a concern.)
- This conversation is not discipline-specific; thus, it would not be an appropriate topic for a Fac2Fac conference. GEC agreed they would start this conversation on their individual campuses with admissions and institutional reporting reps.
- CSU will share their data protocol (for collecting/analyzing differing cut scores) with Ian (request made to Kathy P. on 12/10/13). Ian will share the protocol with DAG to see if the protocol addresses readily accessible data at each IHE.
- Ian will send the DHE table of each IHE’s accepted cut scores and CSU’s data gathering protocol to GEC.
- Ian will get a letter (from Exec. Director or CCHE) for GEC to use to leverage support for this discussion on their campuses.

C. CCHE Policy I, L: Statewide Transfer Policy

- DHE has not received any more feedback. Depending on the discussion in Item B above....
- Is it okay to put the final draft version on the January 2014 GEC & Academic Council agendas for one last vetting and then take it to CCHE for final approval at the Commission’s March 2014 meeting?

GEC agreed that the draft policy language (Section 8.04) regarding (1) the transfer of associate’s degrees and (2) that each campus will follow its own policy for assessing credit awarded for prior learning is sufficient. A final draft version of the policy will be on the GEC and AC agendas in January 2014 and is slated for CCHE approval in March.

D. gtPathways Review Nomination Form: Science courses and co-requisite lab issue; how should science courses be submitted? [See handout: #COURSE NOMINATION FORM – ... - Revised 2013-11-26 DRAFT – SC1 SC2 ISSUE.]

It was agreed that this issue will be reconsidered at a future meeting.

- During gtPathways reviews, it often occurs that the nominating IHE’s design for SC1/SC2 courses does not match the review team’s interpretation of SC1/SC2 courses.
- Original intent of SC1 designation: an *integrated* lab and lecture course.
- Original intent of SC2 designation: a science course *without* a lab.

- The co-requisite designation needs to be clarified. Students can separately register for and/or drop co-requisite courses. Some IHEs cannot have co-requisite courses be designated separately as SC1 and SC2.

E. In the interest of giving us all a break and giving us time to address quality/consistency in gtPathways, how does everyone feel about putting the brakes on the quantity by stopping (at least for a year or two) any future gtPathways course nominations, reviews and approvals, except in special cases such as:

- If an institution doesn't have any gtPathways course in a category (probably only affects CTU);
- If an institution/system makes substantive changes to an already approved course that most/many students utilize to fulfill gen ed requirements;
- Other?

GEC members will share this idea on their campuses and the topic will be decided at a future meeting. The spring 2014 review will take place as planned.

V. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

1. Phase 4: Procurement of Signatures – NONE

2. Phase 3: Final Review

- Geography – agreement will move to V.2 – final *campus* review.
- Geology – agreement will move to Phase 4.
- Philosophy – agreement will move to V.2 – final *campus* review.

3. Phase 2: ICIR

- Art History – sent to GEC 10/23/13; deadline 11/22/13. Still need to hear from CSU-FC, ~~FLC~~, MSU Denver, UCB, and UCCS.

In response to UCD's comments, the following language, in red, will be added to the first row of the Prescribed Curriculum chart (Arts & Humanities Gen Ed courses):

Two gtPathways Arts & Humanities courses

(GT-AH1, GT-AH2, GT-AH3, GT-AH4) **EXCEPT the courses listed in the Additional Required Courses section below.**

- Chemistry – John Lanning has provided Maia Blom with new language for the agreement based on last month's discussions. Maia will get the new version circulated soon.
- Communication – agreement will move to Phase 3.
- English – UNC indicated they could make V.2a work. Still need to hear from UCB. **Richard N. is still working on getting feedback.**
- Music – Issues-resolved CWS sent to GEC on 12/04/13; deadline 1/31/14.
- Physics – sent to GEC on 10/23/13 for ICIR; deadline – 11/22/13. Still need to hear from **ASU**, CSU-P, MSU Denver, UCB, UCCS, UCD, and ~~WSCU~~.

In response to CSU's questions/comments, the following points were clarified and agreed to by GEC:

1. CCCS confirmed PHY 213 (Modern Physics) will be ready for spring 2014 semester. It will not be submitted for inclusion in gtPathways. It will be available online at all 13 community colleges.
 2. A footnote 1 will be added to the Prescribed Curriculum in place of the current asterisk (*). The current language for the asterisk will still be used: “*PLEASE BE ADVISED: If you choose to take one of these courses it will put you over 60 credits. The courses will transfer but the extra credits may not. That is, the receiving institution may still require the completion of 60 credits for the major.”
 3. A footnote 2 will be added to the last row of the Additional Required Courses regarding the CSC 160 or CHE 112 choice. For example: “² Students planning to transfer to _____ must take CHE 112 (not CSC 160) to fulfill this requirement.” All schools will send their requirement to Maia so precise information will be included in the agreement. Then, whichever course is indicated as the requirement for the fewest number of schools, insert the names of those schools in the blank above and indicate which course they should take at those schools.
- g. **Studio Art** – sent to GEC on 10/24/13; deadline – 11/22/13. Still need to hear from CMU, FLC, MSU Denver, UCB, ~~and UNC~~.
1. Comments from UCD:
CU Denver has a suggestion that will not alter approval if denied. The last course under Additional Required Courses is an open-ended (no specific number) for any 3-hr studio art course. Given the large number and variation in studio art courses offered at the community colleges, CU Denver suggests a note stating that it is important to check with the 4-yr institution to determine the best choice and verify applicability toward the baccalaureate major for this studio art course.
 - It was agreed by GEC to add a footnote to the Prescribed Curriculum at “Any 3-credit studio art course...” that uses the above language in red.
 2. Comments from CSU-FC:
A footnote is missing on the Electives credit:

³Students planning to transfer to CSU-FC for completion of the BA in Studio Art must complete two semester of one foreign language for their electives OR be able to pass the CSU-FC Foreign Language placement exam at the sophomore level. It may not be possible to complete the BA in Studio Art in two years without this prior foreign language competency. With this addition, CSU-FC approves of the agreement in Studio Art.

 - It was agreed by GEC to put this footnote back in the agreement.
- h. **Theatre** – Issues-resolved CWS sent 12/4/13 to GEC; deadline 1/31/14.
4. **Phase 1: Curriculum Worksheet Creation & Verification**
- a. **Biology** –~~10/11/13 meeting—report out:~~

- i. Latest concern expressed was, “If these labs that the 4-year faculty agree to are approved for these courses, will all sections of these courses that are taught online, through CCCS Online **or through individual community college campuses**, be required to use these approved online labs?”
- ii. The response was, “Here at CCCOnline, all our science courses are taught from a master course thus standardizing the content in all sections - the instructors are not permitted to omit or change any content. As far as the campuses, most do not offer fully online science courses; however, if they do offer fully online science courses, it is their prerogative as to how to achieve the competencies and requirements as outlined by the CCNS [Common Course Numbering System].”

CCCS will verify that science courses offered fully online by any community college meet the standards of the CCCOnline science courses.

- iii. CSU-FC is willing to move forward with the agreement.

Kim Regier (UCD faculty) is working on a dissertation regarding online labs and transfer students. The GEC/DHE and Kim might try to coordinate their efforts concerning this issue.

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

- a) **Engineering (Civil & Mechanical)** [*See handout: Initial Analyses of Mechanical and Civil Engineering Degrees.docx.*] The group that conducted an initial analysis concluded it is probably best to:
 - i. Try to come up with a Statewide Transfer Articulation Agreement for both Civil and Mechanical that DOES NOT lead to any two-year degree but that provides a clear, guaranteed transfer path to students. The community colleges would still get credit for transferring out students to a 4-year institution; or
 - ii. Give up on the idea of trying to make something at the state level work for everyone, and stick with inter-institutional agreements by region. This makes good sense from the state’s perspective, too, because rather than the Community College System having to come up with new engineering courses that would be acceptable to every 4-year institution (which could stretch resources), students could concurrently enroll at the 2-year and the 4-year institution and take the 4-year institution’s lower division engineering courses (which already exist).

GEC agreed that Fac2Fac would not be helpful for this discussion. It might be good to add a few more folks to the working group listed above to come up with 3-5 options. Main points are:

- Until GEC gets this possible revision figured out, maintain and update current Engineering agreement.
- GEC needs to be creative with this agreement. The current format/process (STAA leading to Degree with Designation) is not going to work.
- Students need some engineering in their first two years of an engineering degree.
- Maybe GEC could come up with a list of courses common to all/most institutions’ degree plans to help inform the first two years?
- Regional, inter-institutional agreements (for concurrent enrollment or other) will likely be the best option for engineering?

- The hardest part of concurrent enrollment agreements is the administrative aspects (like financial aid).
 - Ian will do a little more analysis and reach out to some more folks to help decide a way forward.
- a. **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.
 - b. **Physical Anthropology** – It was decided at a previous meeting that it is up to the nominating institution to decide in which content area they want their course to be submitted. The content area review group must honor the nominating institution’s decision. From the 8/12/13 meeting minutes: 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.
 - c. **Music Education**
 - d. **Mass Communication**

A. Other Business?