



GE Council

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

AGENDA

1. Greetings and Introductions
2. Adoption of last meeting's minutes – October 10, 2011 [see handout]
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**]
 - 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.
 - 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
 - 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.
 - e. gtPathways website:
 - i. Compare Approved Degree Programs List for 60+60 Planning (CCCS) v. DHE's list.
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://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/Students.html>
 - iii. Progress on adding credits column? 6 schools have responded (ASC, CCCS, CSU-P, FLC, UCCS, UCD)
 - iv. Idea to link original approved syllabus with each gtPathways course
 - f. Articulation Agreements
 - i. Current count and status of Statewide Articulation Agreements [**see handout: Status Matrix**]
 - ii. Suggestions for 4 more degrees to pursue as Statewide Articulation Agreements [**see handout: Top 10 Majors**]
 - 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
 - 4. French –deadline for final review: 11/7/11; Phase 3 version sent to GEC on 10/18/11
 - 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.
 - 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.

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