



GE Council

July 9, 2012, 1:00-4:00pm
Department of Higher Education
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600
Denver, CO

MINUTES

1. Greetings and Introductions
 - Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)
 - David Moon for Tom Christensen (UCCS)
 - Erin Frew (CSU-P)
 - Alan Lamborn (CSU-FC)
 - Jeff London (CFAC-MSU Denver)
 - Kevin Nelson (WSCU)
 - Barbara Morris (FLC)
 - Frank Novotny (ASU)
 - Todd Ruskell (CSM)
 - Sunny Schmitt (CMC)
 - Tom Smith (UNC)
 - Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)
 - Sheila Thompson (MSU Denver)
 - Sandy Veltri (CCCS-FRCC)
 - Steve Werman (CMU)
 - Ian Macgillivray (DHE)
 - Emmy Glancy (DHE)
 - Maia Blom (DHE)
2. Adoption of last meeting's notes – June 11, 2012 [See handout: *June 11 minutes*]
Adopted.
3. Information Items
 - a. Follow up from Faculty-to-Faculty Alignment Meetings for Mathematics and English/Rhetoric/Communication.
 - Individual meeting reports will be issued in the next two weeks and will be vetted with the meeting participants. They will be posted on the DHE website. A final report combining all three meetings will also be drafted and posted on the DHE website.

- Second step will be to include high school math and language arts faculty in the process. DHE is applying for grants that will fund this second step as well as provide funding to include a 4th region – the Western Slope.
 - These P-20 Alignment Faculty-to-Faculty meetings will also inform the admissions requirements revision work currently underway.
 - Comments/Feedback:
 - The meetings were not framed in a way to get optimal faculty feedback. Some faculty thought that gtPathways was being “re-hashed” – and that we were trying to re-invent the wheel. Some faculty thought their high school counterparts would be present.
 - One opinion is that to go from the common core standards or CO’s revised academic standards to revising gtPathways misses a step. We need to know if the standards work; then revising gtPathways and realigning expectations for high school graduates can be considered.
 - Both vertical *and* horizontal alignment need to be considered, e.g., the CO1, -2, -3 sequence doesn’t need to be standardized but the specific outcomes for each need to be clarified and established.
 - The overall discussions held among the faculty were very meaningful and rich. One consideration – should faculty from other disciplines where writing is a critical skill be invited to these meetings as well (and not just English/Communication faculty)? Could the same question be considered for the Mathematics group?
- b. August 13, 2012 meeting cancelled. July 10 Academic Council meeting cancelled.
- c. Statewide Elementary Education Agreement and “other 19” document tweaked [See handouts: *new front page for ELED agreement* and *Qualifying Courses That Satisfy Other 19...*].
- These two documents were approved. They were sent out to GE Council to be forwarded on to advisors and other appropriate individuals, as well as the ELED programs at the 4-years.
 - Ian followed up with a 4-yr ECE faculty from CSU who works with the P3 Committee of the Early Childhood Leadership Commission and reports, “There is a work group on the ECE degree and another on competencies, and I am a member of both. [Another faculty] from Metro has attended some of those meetings. But its goal is not to create one degree for all institutions. I think that UNC already is going forward with their version of the degree, Metro is working intensely on theirs, UCD has said they plan to offer it, and we've just begun work on one. The hope is to align all of these programs in terms of competencies, rather than specific courses, which, honestly seems like a more realistic approach for 4 year schools and also will help us articulate with community colleges (which would include some of the same competencies in their courses).”
- d. Follow-up on gtPathways waivers from CCHE. Academic Council members are preparing lists of degrees following this outline:
- i. Institution
 - ii. School or College
 - iii. List of degree programs

iv. Additional info (optional), e.g., accreditor, number of credits, narrative

4. Discussion/Action Items

- a. Common understanding of gtPathways requirements in regard to each institution's general education requirements. C.R.S. 23-1-125(1)(e), "Students, upon completion of core general education courses, regardless of the delivery method, should have those courses satisfy the core course requirements of all Colorado public institutions of higher education;"
- The Transfer Policy must be revised.
 - Procedures for how to address "sticky" scenarios must be created.
 - Much discussion was held regarding this topic. Some of the main points:
 - There are two different interpretations of gtPathways program: 1) gtPathways is a mandatory Gen Ed curriculum that must be imbedded in every public IHE's core (Gen Ed) curriculum; or 2) gtPathways is a guaranteed transfer program for a Gen Ed curriculum and is an option for students to follow – IHEs are not required to imbed it into their core (Gen Ed) curriculum but it must be available to students through the offering of approved gtPathways courses.
 - These varying perceptions of the gtPathways program are a result of different interpretations of the gtPathways statutes depending on who the Executive Director of the DHE was/is.
 - Initially, the understanding was that IHEs were required to have gtPathways courses available for students to take. Then the interpretation was that each IHE had to imbed the gtPathways curriculum in their core (Gen Ed) curriculum. This interpretation can be found in the Performance Contracts. UCCS does not believe it was told unambiguously that the gtPathways curriculum must be imbedded in its core curriculum. UCCS was told that it must have gtPathways courses available so that students could pursue the gtPathways curriculum if that was their choice. CSM does not have the "imbedding" requirement in its Performance Contract.
 - Issue of vocabulary – for example: what is meant by "Gen Ed curriculum" (cafeteria-style, range of options within a set of categories)? What is meant by "core curriculum" (specific courses that every student must take to graduate from a particular school)? Some schools make a distinction between these two; others don't.
 - There are 3 "flavors" or categories to consider when looking at transfer: 1) Statewide Transfer Articulation Agreements (STAAs) – which can include Degrees with Designation (DWDs); 2) general AA/AS degrees; and 3) Gen Ed (gtPathways?) credit transfer – course-by-course review.
 - The Gen Ed (gtPathways?) curriculum is only transferred in full when it is part of a STAA.
 - gtPathways courses are guaranteed to transfer *up to the credit hour limit for the content area.*

- All schools except UCCS and CSM (and maybe WSCU) have understood themselves to be restrained in their Gen Ed (core) curriculum by gtPathways; they had to imbed gtPathways in their Gen Ed (core).
 - **This conversation will continue at the next GE Council meeting in September.**
 - The transfer policy and applicable gtPathways statutes need to be compared and contrasted.
- i. The issue: Gen Ed core requirements and “participation in gtPathways” at some institutions (UCCS and CSM so far) have raised questions about what gtPathways statute means. Also, the gtPathways Scenarios that Maia sent out for comment generated much discussion and fine details that need to get worked out. DHE proposes that GE Council work out all these issues in detail to the extent possible and record them in a revision of CCHE’s gtPathways/transfer policy or a set of procedures to accompany the policy.
- ii. UCCS discussion on June 11 brought up the following points:

- One IHE’s understanding: gtPathways is a guaranteed transfer program not a mandatory Gen Ed curriculum. Consequently, students have a choice for Gen Ed: gtPathways (which is possible to complete at any institution) or the institution’s own Gen Ed curriculum that is approved by faculty, which may or may not be the same as the gtPathways courses/credits listed below.
- Another IHE’s understanding: gtPathways is a mandatory Gen Ed curriculum and it replaced their own Gen Ed curriculum.
- The original intent of gtPathways legislation: to facilitate transfer (assuming a student followed the set of rules).
- gtPathways is a means for students to follow a curriculum that is guaranteed to transfer. The “guaranteed transfer” idea is mandated by legislation.
- There are some language issues with gtPathways, i.e., what does “core” mean? Does it always mean “general education?”
- Is it necessary to “force” the gtPathways curriculum (as it’s listed below) on all IHEs just for those few students who might transfer? There are no systemic problems with transfer between institutions in the state. Even though institutions may have different Gen Ed cores, it’s similar to the case of out-of-state students transferring to Colorado—each institution can figure out which of the out-of-state student’s courses fit into its Gen Ed core and those classes from out of state obviously are not gtPathways approved.
- Do we all agree that the gtPathways curriculum must be available at each IHE? If not, what might be the consequences?
- It is critical that the state policy aligns with statute – policy indicates how statute is interpreted.
- This issue will be discussed again at the next GEC meeting.

- a) Follow up question from UCCS discussion on June 11: UCCS's Gen Ed core does not require a history course. So, "If a UCCS student completes UCCS's Gen Ed core without taking a history course, will a receiving institution require that student to complete a history course?" Why or why not?

- Several 4-yr institutions at the table said, "Yes."

(*Note that bottom of pg. 2, second paragraph up, of Jett's comments (handout below) states, "...it was generally agreed that all students needed at least one history course, no matter what other social sciences or arts and humanities courses they completed as part of their general education programs." But then see the sentence that opens the next paragraph.)

- Several institutions do not require a history course.

- b) Should we/how do we look at which institutions have configured their lower division general education core to the gtPathways ~~matrix~~ **[curriculum]**? For those who have not, how do we attempt to account for the various scenarios that come up when students transfer?

- There was much discussion around this point. One question is, "What does it mean for an institution to have *configured* their core to gtPathways?" One definition for "configured" is that somewhere in the institution's Gen Ed core it's possible for a student to complete the gtPathways competencies and criteria. Another definition is that the institution's core must contain 6 credits of COM, 3 of MAT, 3 of HIS, and so on.

- Point raised that each institution's/system's Performance Contract states they must have gtPathways credit guidelines in their core. Again, how to define "credit guidelines?" Is it 31 credits embedded however or, specifically, 6 in COM, 3 in MAT, 3 in HIS...?

- Section 5.02 in CCHE's Policy I, L: Statewide Transfer Policy...allows for additional requirements. What does this mean and what are the implications?

- There seem to be 3 big issues to bring up at the September meeting:
 - 1) Statewide Articulation Agreement Transfer with a completed AA or AS;
 - 2) Transfer of Gen Ed, course by course;
 - 3) Transfer with an AA or AS completed that is not part of a Statewide Articulation Agreement (What statutes/policies speak to this? Ian and Alan will look.).

- iii. Ian forwarded the above ideas expressed to Jett Conner for his recollection. Jett provided helpful history and insight. Please read and be ready to discuss. [See handout: *Jett Conner Response to gtPathways Questions*] **Tabled.**

- a) Of special interest, #3: "...a second stated statutory purpose also pertained to course quality and comparability." What does

“comparability” mean? *See Jett’s comments on “comparability criteria test,” top of pg. 3, first paragraph.

- b) Also, #8, as it pertains to the CSM discussion. “...and helped students know that any approved course in the program was fairly comparable in quality and requirements with any other, as identified by the matrix number).”
- c) Also, pg. 3, paragraph starting with “One concern:” Jett states, “I still seemed to notice that not all IHEs in Colorado use the course numbering matrix system developed for the gtPathways program on transcripts. This really ought to be universal in CO. It would make it so much easier to evaluate courses, and the database implications are obvious for tracking and research.” Do we do this? If not, what would it take?
- d) Also, pg. 4, end of the first paragraph, “That means the four-year IHE has to decide whether to substitute say Eng 112 taken at a community college for their upper-division writing in the major requirement. If they don't, the student who arrives with a completed AA/AS degree may still have to take more general education...” If this describes your campus, how does this get handled?

iv. Colorado School of Mines and gtPathways

- a) Guaranteeing transfer vs. review of coursework and a challenge exam to ensure adequate preparation and properly advise student as to the prudence of transferring coursework. Todd and Ian will facilitate this discussion.
 - The big issue: should a gtPathways course be accepted in transfer first and then reviewed for “equivalency” or can its “equivalency” be considered first with its transferability contingent on that review?
 - The underlying challenge: does a school follow the statute (even though a particular gtPathways course is not “up to par”) or is it more important to encourage student success with requiring them to re-take a course so they can succeed in future courses?
 - Sticky issue: some community colleges have different pre-requisites for calculus-based physics courses and this affects students’ preparation.
 - CSM agreed to find another mechanism, besides not automatically transferring in a gtPathways course, that will serve as a functional equivalent to an advising hold until the transfer student has received appropriate advising and CSM is ensured the student is adequately prepared. Todd will touch base with Ian on this.
 - CSM will relay to CCCS any concerns about rigor and quality of individual instructors or courses at 2-yr institutions.

- b) What does GE Council advise in this situation? A student took LIHU 100 Nature and Human Values from Mines that CCD accepted as ENG 121. The student is completing an AA at CCD. The student wants to transfer to UCD. Is UCD obligated to honor the class as ENG 121, now that it is part of the student's AA from CCD? Or, the larger question that keeps coming up: Does the AA/AS degree from a Colorado public community college require the receiving baccalaureate institution to award all lower division general education credit as a 'package' even though transfer, non-gtPathways courses are included in the AA/AS degree? (see what statute says below and note that it's in regards to articulation agreements)
- There are two receiving institutions in this scenario. Is the second receiving institution required to accept a course that the first receiving institution accepted in transfer? Answer was "No."
 - GEC feels that since the student completed an associate's degree then UCD should accept the course in question, especially since the student had to take and pass GT-CO2 in order to get the associate's degree. (The precedent this sets needs further consideration, however.)
 - Distinction to consider: did the student actually *take* a gtPathways-approved course or was he/she given gtPathways transfer credit for a course deemed "equivalent?"

23-1-108. Duties and powers of the commission with regard to systemwide planning

(7) (b) (I) A student who completes an associate of arts or associate of science degree that is the subject of a statewide degree transfer agreement and who transfers from the state institution of higher education that awarded the degree to a four-year state institution of higher education shall, if admitted, be enrolled with junior status. Successful completion of an associate of arts or associate of science degree does not guarantee the degree holder admission to a four-year state institution of higher education.

(II) A state institution of higher education that admits as a junior a student who holds an associate of arts degree or associate of science degree that is the subject of a statewide degree transfer agreement may not require the student to complete any additional credit hours of lower-division general education courses; except that the institution may require the student to complete additional lower-division general education courses if necessary for preparation in the degree program in which the student enrolls so long as the additional courses are consistent with published degree program requirements for native students and do not extend the time to degree completion beyond that required for native students in the same degree program.

b. Degrees with emphasis or concentration participating in agreements

- i. Scott, Jeff, Nish, Alan & Kevin...anything to report or discuss?

- This subcommittee is continuing to work and will probably have something to report at the September meeting.

c. **ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS**

i. **Phase 4: Procurement of Signatures – NONE**

ii. **Phase 3: Final Review**

- a) **Criminal Justice** – still need to hear from MSU – they need more time to review & discuss on campus.
- b) Need to figure out what to do with the paragraph following the prescribed curriculum chart indicating that the 9 hours of electives may not apply to the major and this seems inconsistent with the conversations we've had about the Philosophy agreement and others. It may also contradict the statement in the narrative portion that all elements of the prescribed curriculum will apply to the major but courses taken outside of the prescribed curriculum may not.
 - It was recommended: in the **Additional Required Courses** section – delete the CRJ courses listed in the “9 credits – choose 3 courses from the following...” row.
 - In the “**Please note**” paragraph: change the “may” to “might.” This change also needs to occur in the template.
 - Once these changes are made, the CRJ agreement (Phase 3, V.2) needs to be re-distributed for a final review on the campuses. Scott and Sheila will help Maia draft an e-mail to the discipline group explaining the rationale for these changes so the discipline group understands.
 - John needs to weigh in to see if these changes addressed UCD’s concern.

iii. **Phase 2: ICIR – NONE**

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

Maia will send follow-up emails in August to those schools that have not yet responded. She’ll copy the respective GEC reps on those emails.

- a) **Agriculture** – update?
 - Alan and Scott have contacted the AG discipline group. They will attend the AG group’s next meeting. They are still waiting to hear when that will be.
- b) **Art History** – Put on hold until DWE subcommittee has come up with a protocol.
 - Still on hold pending the DWE subcommittee’s determination of a final protocol for handling DWEs.
- c) **Biology/Physics** – to be reconvened at spring 2013 Fac-to-Fac.

- d) **Chemistry** – Summer sessions to be facilitated by John Lanning and Martha Jackson-Carter.
- e) **Communication** – draft CWS sent to discipline group for verification. Deadline – April 27, 2012. Draft CWS re-sent 4/30/12 to those IHEs who have not yet responded. Still waiting to hear from ASU, CMC. Draft CWS re-sent 6/13/12 to ASU and CMC.
- CMC is in agreement.
 - ASU rep is on vacation.
- f) **English** – Richard Nishikawa was to review all email discussions to this point; Nish was also to talk to John Lanning re UCD's new issue. Nish and John were to report back to GEC. **Nish and John did not make the meeting.**
- g) **Geography** – draft CWS, V.3 sent to discipline group for verification on 5/29/12. Deadline: June 8, 2012. Draft CWS, V.3 re-sent 6/13/12 to CCA, FRCC, and UCD. Still need to hear from FRCC. **Sandy will follow-up.**
- h) **Geology** – draft CWS sent to discipline group on 5/4/12; deadline 5/21/12. Re-sent on 5/29/12; still need to hear from CCA, PPCC. Draft CWS re-sent to CCA & PPCC on 6/14/12; still waiting to hear. **Wayne and Sandy will follow-up.**
- i) **Philosophy** – GEC decided to put Philosophy on hold until Alan Lamborn could talk to Dr. Archie.
- Philosophy group will need to re-convene at fall 2012 Faculty-to-Faculty conference.
 - They need to address which Philosophy courses will satisfy all majors. They need to address Dr. Archie's questions/concerns.
- j) **Studio Art** – draft CWS, V.2 sent 5/29/12; deadline June 1, 2012. Re-sent 6/5/12; deadline 6/8/2012. Need to hear from Aims, CCD, FRCC, OJC, PPCC, CMU, CSU-FC, CSU-P, UNC. Draft CWS, V.2 re-sent 6/14/12. Still need to hear from OJC, CMU, CSU-FC. **Sandy, Steve & Alan will follow-up. Maia will send email reminders the 2nd week of August to allow people time to return from summer vacations.**

5. Other Business?