



COLORADO

Department of  
Higher Education

## GE Council

March 9, 2015, 1:00-4:00pm  
Department of Higher Education  
1560 Broadway - Suite 1600  
Denver, CO

Webinar URL <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/gecouncil/>

Call in Number: 1-877-820-7831; Access code: 215368#

### NOTES - Approved

#### I. Greetings and Introductions

Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)  
Al Buyok (CMC)  
Margaret Doell (ASU)  
Rick Kreminski (CSU-P)  
John Lanning (UCD)  
Mike Lightner (CU System) - guest  
Jeff London (CFAC-MSU Denver)  
Jerry Migler (CCCS)  
Barbara Morris (FLC)  
Bill Niemi (WSCU)  
Richard Nishikawa (UCB)  
Kathy Pickering (CSU-FC)  
Jeff Reynolds (Aims)  
Kay Schneider (CSM)  
Rae Shevalier (MSU Denver)  
Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)  
Sandy Veltri (CCCS-FRCC)  
Rex Welshon (UCCS)  
Steve Werman (CMU)  
Ian Macgillivray (CDHE)  
Maia Blom (CDHE)

#### II. Adoption of last meeting's notes *[See handout: 2015-02-09 - GE Council NOTES - Draft.docx]* Approved.

#### III. Information Items

A. gtPathways Course Review. 33 courses submitted to be completed by April 17, 2015



#### IV. Discussion/Action Items

##### A. CRJ Statewide Transfer Articulation Agreement - N&PS Gen Ed credits

###### 1. Initial observation:

- a. I think that there is an error in the natural and physical science section of the CRJ agreement where it states that 8 credits are required and then notes that students may choose one SCI1 and one SCI2 course. This could add up to 7 credits which is what I believe we have in the transfer guides.

###### 2. History of the STAA:

- a. It took three years to accomplish and during that time the CCCS system added courses to SC2 category, thus making it possible for students to hit the 7 credits mark for their science GEN ED. The CRJ intentionally picked the 7 credit option to leave extra credits in electives so that students can experience more social science courses. All agreed, all schools signed, they are good to go.
- b. In that case, then, the final agreement does need to be edited because the N&PS Gen Ed credits are listed as 8 and not 7....
- c. It does. They agreed to the 7, knowing the change was coming, but I think we were required at that time to list it as 8, because the change didn't take place until over the summer after the agreement was signed.

###### 3. Can the STAA be revised without consulting CRJ faculty?

**Yes. The changes that will be made: 1) Natural & Physical Sciences credits in the Gen Ed section will be "7-8," and 2) electives credit will change to "0-1."**

##### B. April 24 Fac2Fac Conference-Planning

1. Faculty from all 6 gtPathways content areas - vet revised gtPathways competencies and their distribution across the content areas.
2. Guest: [Susan Albertine](#), AAC&U (overview of LEAP, assessment & do activity)
3. Directors of Assessment w/GEC members facilitate small groups
4. CDHE cannot reimburse for travel but will provide light breakfast & lunch
5. Who/how many to invite? Who can champion this on their campus? Work with Directors of Assessment on your campus to invite best folks.

###### **120 total we think we can accommodate**

- 12? GEC members

- 10? Directors of Assessment

- 3 (Ian, Maia & Susan Albertine)

95 faculty (how to divide between 2- & 4- years and 6 content areas (CO, MA, AH, SS, HI, NS))

2-yr: 13 CCCS schools, Aims, CMC = 15

4-yr schools = 13

##### C. Questions about gtPathways and STAAs/DwDs

1. Discussion (Rae Shevalier): Should a criterion for a recommendation for approval, as part of the gtPathways review process, be that all institutions agree the course recommended for approval will fulfill that gtPathways category? **Yes, but with some guidelines?** [Issue: MSU Denver doesn't accept Anatomy & Physiology in fulfillment of GT-SC1.]

Many 4-years don't accept their own Anatomy & Physiology course as fulfilling Gen Ed requirements.

Question for reviewers: Is this a legitimate Gen Ed course? This is more of a content issue, and more an issue in science than other content areas. Currently, if an IHE nominates a course for approval, it is understood that the course meets Gen Ed requirements at that IHE; the review group is not to question the GE determination by the nominating IHE.

Anything that is usually an upper-div course at a 4-year, might need some additional scrutiny? How affected by any pre-req or lack thereof? ACEN (nursing accreditor) told CCCS to reduce associate of nursing credit hours so CCCS removed BIO 111&112 as pre-reqs. CCCS advisors still advise non-nursing students to take BIO 111&112.

Slippery slope of 4-yr faculty "cherry picking" courses they don't want? Can GE Council set some guidelines? Revised competencies and content can help set some guidelines.

Option: Remove pre-req but make health track more rigorous (John).

Course of action: 1) Revise N&P content document to include the question, "Is this a legitimate Gen Ed course? (have this discussion with N&PS faculty next time. Will need a clear definition of what a gen ed course is.) And 2) enforce? Yes, must apply to gen ed requirements.

When a course is approved it must be transferred and applied to its respective Gen Ed requirement. "Cherry picking" courses for Gen Ed application is not acceptable.

2. Has CCCS dropped all approved pre-requisites or let individual campuses choose pre-reqs? [Issue: A CCCS course, that was gtPathways-approved with pre-requisites, is listed in the Common Course Numbering System website with the pre-requisites as approved. If CCCS wants each CC campus to have options for pre-requisites for gtPathways courses, then should each CC campus submit the course for gtPathways review?]

As part of the general discussion about gtPathways approval, need to include the issue that CCCS courses come from system but then individual campuses are allowed to choose/change their own pre-reqs for approved courses after they've been gtPathways approved.

3. The increased number of general education credits for the AA (37 cr) and AS (39 cr) degrees by CCCS is creating problems: (1) inconsistency in AA or AS requirements between the new AA and AS requirements and those requirements developed for the STAAs, and (2) lack of discussion at the GE Council level and how increasing general education requirements impacts transfer students outside the STAAs. The original discussion around the 31-hr gtPathways program was a joint discussion between 2-yr and 4-yr faculty. For example, the CU Denver Transfer Guide for the BS degree in public health requires 43 hours of general education course work for the AS degree.

Statute limits Gen Ed to 40 credits. Ian will find the statute later. (Ian's note added after GEC: Found the statute and put it in the notes. Not sure if there are implications.)

23-1-125(3), Colorado Revised Statute:

*Core courses. The department, in consultation with each Colorado public institution of higher education, is directed to outline a plan to implement a core course concept that defines the general education course guidelines for all public institutions of higher education. The core of courses shall be designed to ensure that students demonstrate competency in reading, critical thinking, written communication, mathematics, and technology. The core of courses shall consist of at least thirty credit hours but shall not exceed forty credit hours. Individual institutions of higher education shall conform their own core course requirements with the guidelines developed by the department and shall identify the specific courses that meet the general education course guidelines. Any such guidelines developed by the department shall be submitted to the commission for its approval. In creating and adopting the guidelines, the department and the commission, in collaboration with the public institutions of higher education, may make allowances for baccalaureate programs that have additional degree requirements recognized by the commission. If a statewide matrix of core courses is adopted by the commission, the courses identified by the individual institutions as meeting the general education course guidelines shall be included in the matrix. The commission shall adopt such policies to ensure that institutions develop the most effective way to implement the transferability of core course credits.*

Increased Gen Ed requirements for AA/AS are precluding minors and options and flexibility.

Historically, only difference between AA & AS was 1 credit of math. CCCS faculty wanted to differentiate the degrees and put more science into the AS degree and required a sequence of science courses.

For which majors do 4-yrs need to create Institutional Transfer Guides? There's no guidance for this. Engineering doesn't lead to an AA or AS, for example.

4. Flexibility with course requirements in STAAs/DwDs. See Dwd Business math requirements below:

It is generally understood that no substitutions are allowed with STAAs, however, exceptions have been made depending on individual circumstances and with the agreement of the receiving institution.

Mathematics	4	MAT 121 <u>or</u> MAT 123	College Algebra <u>OR</u> Finite Mathematics
	4	MAT 125	Survey of Calculus <u>OR</u> a higher level Calculus course

Scenario: Student placed into and completed MAT 201: Calculus I. Does student have to "go back" and take MAT 121 or MAT 123 to be awarded the Dwd?

Long-term solution: Revise this requirement to account for students who don't need College Alg or Finite Math. Will need to take this to Business faculty to make sure.

Short-term: CLEP or challenge out of MAT 121 & MAT 123 requirement. CCCS can handle on a case-by-case basis.

5. Should/could STAAs/DwDs lead to a bachelor's in an individualized degree program where students can choose coursework leading to an "option" that is essentially a major? Example: Proposed STAA in Fermentation Sciences leading to BA/BS Individualized Degree Program (IDP) with "Brewing Operations" option.

Probably ok if all the IDP and option courses are laid out in the Dwd format. Caveat about "this is what your diploma is going to say."

GEC says ok as long as the Fermentation Sciences curriculum is specifically identified.

6. UNC's MATH 181: Fundamentals of Mathematics I: Number and Operations and MATH 182: Fundamentals of Mathematics II: Algebra, Probability and Data Analysis (used for educator preparation programs) are both 3-credits, both gtPathways approved, but both need to be completed (6 credits) to satisfy gtPathways math content/competencies and institutional gen ed requirements even though gtPathways only requires 3 credits. This is confusing and can lead to transfer problems. Ex: Students from out of state who take one of these 3-credit courses online from a Colorado institution and then have it refused by their home institution as fulfilling the gen ed math requirement because the home institution looked at Colorado's website and saw that the student needed BOTH courses. [Issue: Approving gtPathways credit on the assumption that more than one course is required is problematic for transfer.]

What does it say in UNC's catalog?

Circle back with Ann.

Question for Math Pathways TF: What about math for educator prep students?

7. Original intent of SC1 designation: an integrated lab and lecture course. The co-requisite designation needs to be clarified. Students can separately register for and/or drop co-requisite courses.

#### GT-SC1 Possibilities:

- a. Combined lecture/lab (one registration)

Example: CHEM 111: Introductory Chemistry (5 cr.) [SC1 at ASU]

- Is it important to know how much credit the course vs. lab is worth? Problem here is some institutions allow students to drop one component. ASU and FLC have lab as 0 credit hours so can't get grade for one without completing both.

- b. Co-requisite course and lab (two registrations)

Example: GEOL 120/121: Exploring Earth: Physical Geology/ Introductory Geology Laboratory (3 cr.) [SC1 at CSU]

- Is it important to know how much credit the course vs. lab is worth? Yes, and course nomination form does not clearly ask for this breakdown. Faculty reviewers want to see at least 25% of course grade coming from lab. Is it ok for a student to pass the co-req course without having attended the lab? Syllabi need to be explicit about how credit for lecture vs. lab is awarded.
  - Should the course, since it's listed separate from the lab, be designated SC1 or SC2?
  - Should a lab, if it's a separate registration, always be coded SC1?
- c. Course alone and lab alone (two registrations)
- d. Are we missing anything?  
John, Ian & Jeff R. will play with some wording and bring back to GEC for consideration.

**GT-SC2 Possibilities:**

- a. Course without lab (one registration)  
Example: SCI 105: Science in Society (3 cr.) [SC2 at CCCS]

D. Timeline and Org Chart for Developing a Prior Learning Assessment Statewide Policy [*see handouts: forthcoming*]

- Seems DHE is asking CCHE to approve the goals. Seems we should have a process to come up with goals first rather than have goals from the beginning.
- Other stakeholders could completely outnumber DHE's primary stakeholders (GEC, AC, Student Affairs Council, etc.)
- "Appointees by governing board" does not equal "appointees per campus."
- Disagreement about should appointees be from governing board or from individual campuses. Depends on how work will be done, too. How to engage faculty by campus if there's a campus without a rep on a subcommittee?
- Seems GEC is left out of this process. Would like to see a formal role in this process. GEC involvement should be explicit.
- GEC should drive the process.
- Could GEC be the Task Force?
- Should be concerned about student success rather than getting something done quickly. Student success not just completion, it's completion with quality/learning.
- Concern about not having faculty from some disciplines on a subcommittee. Faculty must be involved in this process. Faculty from each discipline need to be a part of each subcommittee.
- Have a review by GEC and AC and CFAC built into the process before draft policy goes to CCHE. Consider roles for CFAC and DAG. We're going to need data.
- May not be productive to have commissioners (who are politically linked) or elected officials as part of the process. Disagreement about this - helped with 1319 implementation.
- Better to include faculty and do from bottom up, rather than top down.
- Should have a communication plan in place. Need to involve faculty.

- There's "what's reported" and there's "what's happening on the ground." Feedback from FL: GEC rep spoke with engineering faculty in FL who said they're advising students with 3 on AP to take the class anyway.
- Hope that one recommendation out of this is that CDE and CDHE issue joint statement to K12 students who are considering AP credit to know what it means and doesn't mean. Parents need to understand what the impact is.
- Want faculty to have the time to look at AP tests and look at the data. Suggest more time to look at the content of the tests by discipline.
- The matrix can be a guide.
- Definition of success varies by situation—whether for Gen Ed credit vs. for major vs. for further education (grad school?).
- What are employers looking for as a measure of success? For instance, HP not interested in C graduates. Do employers want a piece of paper or a level of performance it should ensure?
- Need input, calibration from employers/workforce about what it is they want/expect. For instance, what do employers expect of different institutions' graduates? Need to keep in mind the quality of the credential, might mean differentiation by discipline.
- Adding employers onto the portfolio assessment subcommittee would be helpful.
- This resembles the 1319 project, which was successfully implemented.
- Members said 1319 was impossible to do it at the beginning but we got unanimous agreement amongst CEOs. If this is carefully run and managed and everyone gets a say, we have a good chance of doing this right. Depends on how deeply we want to dig—for instance, what does a 3 on an AP test get you and at what institution and how is it applied, etc.
- But 1319 does not parallel this. It was a different set of issues. Don't think TF will be effective at pulling out the questions and posing them to the subcommittees.
- We might need to remind whoever is choosing reps for the various groups to consider stakeholder group members.
- Where is the faculty involvement on the committees if stakeholder group reps are populating the committees?
- Be explicit about "governing boards" versus what is really meant. Explicit about who makes decision really.
- March and April are bad for faculty engagement.
- Should be an assessment component to review how whatever is decided upon is serving students and ability to go back and revise.
- March 2016 is not a realistic deadline.

## V. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

### A. Phase 0: For Future Planning (Parking Lot)

1. ECE & EI Ed Agreements: Maia Blom and Robert Mitchell (CDHE) are coordinating with the faculty to revise these agreements. Goals are to remove

MATH 155&156 and SCI 155&156, see if we can reduce the “Other 19 Credits” for the Elem Ed agreement and the “Other 6 Credits” for the ECE agreement.

2. **Update Current STAAs**
  - a. Revisit gateway math courses to ensure appropriateness. Also, current CCCS AS degree requirements prevent Intro to Stats from fulfilling the math requirement for an AS.
  - b. Over the four years of STAA development, some language and general education requirements have changed. Should there be an effort to bring all STAAs into a common, updated, more student-friendly format?
3. **Science Courses in Current STAAs**
  - a. When the original STAAs were made, the CCCS system had no GT-SC2 (non-lab) science courses, so there was no way to finish the Science requirement in 7 credits. Now that the CCCS system has non-lab GT-SC2 courses, it is possible to complete an associate’s with 7 science credits. Older STAAs might benefit from revising these course options?
4. **Revisions to STAA template**
  - a. Nomenclature question: degrees with designation v. statewide transfer articulation agreements.
  - b. CMC question - offering both AA/AS degrees and Bachelor’s degrees. Maybe we need to tweak the front page and list CMC with the 4-year institutions. We could change: COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION to COLORADO PUBLIC BACCALAUREATE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

## VI. OTHER BUSINESS?