



## GE Council

**February 13, 2012, 1:00-4:00pm**  
Department of Higher Education  
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600  
Denver, CO

### MINUTES

1. Greetings and Introductions

Steve Werman (CMU)  
Jeff Reynolds (AIMS)  
Sunny Schmitt (CMC)  
Kevin Nelson (WSC)  
Tom Smith (UNC)  
Wayne Artis (CFAC/PPCC)  
Alan Lamborn (CSU-FC)  
Tom Christensen (UCCS)  
Scott Thompson (CCCS/NJC)  
Frank Novotny (ASC)  
Barbara Morris (FLC)  
Jeff London (CFAC/MSCD)  
Erin Frew (CSU-P)  
Todd Ruskell (CSM)  
Richard Nishikawa (UCB)  
Sheila Thompson (MSCD)  
John Lanning (UCD)  
Ian Macgillivray (DHE)  
Maia Blom (DHE)

2. Adoption of last meeting's minutes – January 9, 2012 [**see handout**]

Adopted.

3. Information Items

a. Revised Notification Form [**see handout**]

This form was originally created to avoid inundating GE Council with non-substantive changes to gtPathways courses. Non-substantive changes can be defined as changes to course titles (including grammatical changes), course numbers, or course prefixes. Substantive changes include changes to content and/or competency criteria, and possibly credit hours. Substantive changes could

also be defined as any changes that diminish the ability of the course to meet its content and competency criteria. Substantive changes could require a re-review of the course by GEC and possibly a re-submission to a gtPathways review. DHE will be the first filter for the Notification Forms to determine if the course needs re-reviewing. Maia and Ian will revise the Notification Form per GEC's suggestions.

- b. Additions to "Related Laws and Policies" on gtPathways website [see <http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/>] Ian will keep this updated given future legislative changes.
4. Discussion/Action Items
- a. Procedure for gtPathways Review
    - i. What can be asked for? [see **handout: revised Course Nomination Form**]
      - It needs to be crystal clear what documentation is needed for the review of a course for inclusion in gtPathways. This idea needs to be clarified with reviewers at the opening meeting.
      - The opening meeting at gtPathways reviews needs to be very explicit about the reviewers' "charge" – what is being reviewed and how.
      - Reviewers must provide explicit, detailed reasons for deferring a course from inclusion in gtPathways.
      - DHE needs to maintain an accurate list of approved courses and an accurate history of reviewed courses.
      - The most important documentation to keep on file is the course outline with a week-by-week schedule that verifies the content and competency criteria for the course. (Course *syllabi* often don't provide the specifics needed to verify content and competency criteria. Instead, they often reflect the unique views of different professors concerning pedagogy.)
      - The Nomination Form will be revised again to change "syllabus" to "course outline."
    - ii. C.R.S. §23-1-108.5(3)(c)(I): ...In identifying said general education courses, the council shall review the course descriptions, and may request summaries of course syllabi for review, focusing first on lower division general education courses...
  - b. Articulation Agreements
    - i. **Phase 4, Procurement of Signatures/CCHE Approval**
      1. Political Science – just need UCB signatures
      2. Sociology – just need UCB signatures  
UCB has signed these two agreements. They will be presented to the CCHE on March 2, 2012 for approval. Their effective date will be August 2012.
    - ii. **Phase 3, Final Review**
      1. Anthropology – still need confirmation from UCB.
      2. French – still need confirmation from UCB.

- a. Additional issue raised by Nish [**see handouts: Email string re French agreement; French Articulation Agreement, Phase 3**]:

It was decided to drop the AH4 (Foreign Languages) subcategory from the AHUM Gen Ed requirements in the French articulation agreement. The reason for doing this is to ensure that the required courses provide the breadth of experience one expects from a Gen Ed curriculum. The Spanish agreement will be amended in the same way. Amendments to already approved agreements, such as this, will be taken to CCHE as “information items,” not re-approval.

iii. **Phase 2, ICIR, V.2**

1. **Criminal Justice**

- a. Review and approve V.4 edits re “additional CRJ courses” language [**see handout – CRJ agreement, V.4**]
- The “additional CRJ courses” language was approved with minor grammatical changes.
  - CMC was added as a signatory to the agreement.
  - WSC was removed as signatory to the agreement. WSC’s degree is a degree in Sociology with an emphasis in CRJ. WSC’s curriculum was reviewed by two GEC members – they felt it was not strong enough in CRJ courses. See “b” below. The rest of the GEC agreed.
  - Some discussion was held on how to handle “degrees with emphases.” It was agreed to request course curricula along with transfer guides for review and discussion at the Faculty-to-Faculty conferences in the case of degrees with emphases.
- b. Feedback on WSC’s CRJ degree plan:
- i. It is possible for a student to complete with only 3 courses that would be part of a traditional CRJ degree. Even a minor in CRJ at most institutions would require at least 15 credits. It is very light in CRJ courses.
  - ii. A larger requirement in CRJ type classes in WSC’s Sociology degree with CRJ emphasis would make sense. By the time a student finished the AA there really wouldn’t be any more CRJ for a student to take once they transfer.
  - iii. There are three major pillars to the most generic of CJ curriculums (Policing, Courts, & Corrections). WSC’s curriculum barely skims the surface of two out of three.

- iv. POLS 301 Constitutional Law II course is not an acceptable alternative for helping students understand the criminal court system in America.
- c. Discussion points for GE Council:
  - i. How much scrutiny do we give majors in four-year institutions when we are “allowing” institutions to take part in statewide agreements? I believe the answer is none. As long as professionals in the field have created the curriculum we make the assumption, and rightly so, that it is appropriate.
  - ii. Why is this different for an emphasis within a major? Again, as long as professionals in the field have created the curriculum, why is the “state” getting involved in determining whether or not this curriculum is appropriate for these agreements?
  - iii. It seems to me that as long as we are transparent in what a student gets at the four-year institution, whether the degree is a major or an emphasis in a major should make no difference.

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

1. Art History –

- a. For “degrees with emphasis” – it was decided that the discipline group needs to review the curricula for those programs. Still waiting for curriculum from CSU-FC. **CSU-FC forwarded curriculum to DHE. Curricula review will take place under supervision of GEC Art History discipline reps (Scott Thompson, Jeff London).**

2. English – need final verification from discipline group (still waiting to hear from ASC, MSCD, UCD); next step is having GEC reps forward to those schools who didn’t make it to F2F (UCCS)

3. Philosophy – next step is having GEC reps forward to those schools who didn’t make it to F2F (UCCS, CMC)

4. Physics – need final verification from discipline group (waiting to hear from UCB, UCCS, UCD); next step is having GEC reps forward to those schools who didn’t make it to F2F (ASC, CMC, CSM, UNC, WSC)

**An issue was raised by faculty at CSU-P regarding the Modern Physics requirement. Erin Frew will address this issue with the Physics chair at CSU-P. She will keep GEC informed. John and Todd will also speak with the physics chair at CSU-P regarding Physics III and how to handle it.**

v. **Spanish Articulation Agreement** – amend to “coincide” with French agreement? [see handout – Spanish articulation agreement]

- **It was decided the Spanish agreement needs to be amended so that the AH4 (Foreign Languages) subcategory is removed as an option**

for fulfilling the AHUM Gen Ed requirements section of the prescribed curriculum.

- DHE will make the amendment in the agreement and then forward amended agreement to GEC for review on their respective campuses.
- GEC members will email Maia with the results of these reviews.
- Once all the institutions have agreed to this revision, the revised version will be posted on DHE's website.

*From the June 13, 2011 GEC meeting minutes:*

An issue has arisen for language agreements: IHEs are not required to use the same language placement tests. Was this issue considered when the Spanish agreement was being discussed? **No longer an issue.**

5. Other Business?

- a. Maia will draft new steps for the articulation agreement protocol that involve 1) the review of curricula for “degrees with emphases,” and 2) amendments to already approved articulation agreements will be taken to CCHE as “information items” only, not re-approval.
- b. Maia will remove the step in the protocol regarding “re-calibration.”