



## GE Council

**March 11, 2013, 1:00-4:00pm**  
Department of Higher Education  
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600  
Denver, CO

### MINUTES

I. Greetings and Introductions

Gerri Anderson (CCCS)  
Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)  
Rhonda Epper (CCCS)  
Alan Lamborn (CSU-FC)  
John Lanning (UCD)  
Jeff London (CFAC-MSU Denver)  
David Moon (UCCS)  
Barbara Morris (FLC)  
Richard Nishikawa (UCB)  
Todd Ruskell (CSM)  
Ann Bentz (UNC)  
Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)  
Sheila Thompson (MSU Denver)  
Sandy Veltri (CCCS-FRCC)  
Steve Werman (CMU)  
Ian Macgillivray (DHE)  
Maia Blom (DHE)

II. Adoption of last meeting's notes – [See handout: *2/11/13 draft minutes*]  
Approved. Add "CCCS" to Sandy Veltri's name.

III. Information Items

- A. Reminder: Ian and Maia are happy to come to your campus and conduct a training on gtPathways, Statewide Transfer Articulation Agreements, and transfer. If you set it up and get the right advisors, faculty, and other folks there (from your campus and surrounding campuses; high school counselors from nearby?), we'll be there!  
GEC would like an idea of what would be presented at these workshops: PPT, how much time, etc. They would be very happy to promote such a training. The following groups should be invited: admissions department staff, transfer evaluators, registrars, advisors

(faculty and student), faculty, high school counselors, etc. Ian M. and Maia B. will develop a presentation to show GEC.

B. Update on upcoming gtPathways review / F2F conference

- ❖ **gtPathways Review:** deadline for reviewers is extended to Friday, March 15, 2013. The 4-year IHEs will work on recruiting reviewers. Course submission materials are due Friday, March 15, 2013.
  - AHUM (14 courses) – Rhonda E. will assist Scott T. with this review group. None of the reviewers have experience. One more 4-year reviewer would be ideal. The review will be held in-person at DHE. Scott T. will make arrangements for a date/time with Maia B.
  - COMM (4 courses) – Jeff London is GEC rep. 4-YEAR REVIEWERS ARE NEEDED.
  - MATH (2 courses) – Geri Anderson is GEC rep. 4-YEAR REVIEWERS ARE NEEDED. This review will be held electronically. Geri A. will train the reviewers who don't have experience.
  - N&PS (6 courses) – John Lanning is GEC rep. This review will probably be electronic. John L. will contact Maia.
  - S&BS (9 courses) – Wayne A. is GEC rep. This review will be held in person at DHE on April 12, 2013.
- ❖ **F2F Conference:**
  - RSVPs due March 22, 2013. The same participants who attended in the past should attend this conference as well.
  - It was agreed that transfer guides and degree plan requirements/curricula should be gathered for all disciplines. Deadline for sending these documents to Maia is March 29, 2013.
  - GEC was satisfied with the “day’s charge” on the invite for each discipline group.
  - The invite will be revised to emphasize the remote lab demo/presentation being done at the conference and to encourage faculty to visit the remote lab website.
  - GEC reps for the conference: Scott T. & Jeff L. for Art History and Studio Art; Richard Nishikawa for Biology; John L. for Chemistry; Todd Ruskell for Physics.

IV. Discussion/Action Items

- A. Addendum B of Performance Contracts [see handout: *CCHE Addendum B\_Final 2-26-13*]
- ❖ Most IHEs will be adopting this Addendum B for their Performance Contract.
  - ❖ The gtPathways curriculum is no longer required for LAS degrees at 4-year IHEs, but the gtPathways curriculum must still be offered as an option for those students who choose it.
  - ❖ Related topic: Part D of Addendum B has implications for federal funding and Perkins funding. Ian M. and Geri A. will follow-up on this issue.
  - See pg. 2 of handout, Commission Policies, Exemptions, I. Academic Affairs, Part L: Statewide Transfer Policy.

- This means the 31-credit gtPathways core shall not be mandatory for Liberal Arts & Sciences baccalaureate degrees as long as the institution continues to offer a full gtPathways approved core curriculum for LAS students who choose it (in the event the student thinks he/she may transfer, for instance).
- Except for this provision, all institutions are still held to the requirements of 23-1-125 (Student Bill of Rights, 120 credit cap for baccalaureate degrees except if there is a waiver, transfer of core courses, etc.) and 23-1-108.5 (ability to participate in GE Council and gtPathways course numbering system, review, approval, transfer, etc.).
- The Institution will clearly communicate on its general education website that students planning to transfer should choose the gtPathways approved courses and curriculum if they want to guarantee transfer credit. This is in addition to the requirement of 23-1-125(3), C.R.S. that institutions “shall identify the specific courses that meet the general education course guidelines,” which is being done currently with asterisks and other hard-to-see identifiers in the catalog. This necessitates some clarity in the catalog to help students understand exactly what gtPathways is and what it guarantees to them.

B. Top four Engineering programs for Fall 2013 Fac2Fac (based on last enrollment file in SURDS, pulled by CIP):

- ❖ The four engineering disciplines to be considered at the fall 2013 F2F: Mechanical, Civil, Chemical, Electrical. Computer Science Engineering might also be considered; Ian M. will pull data concerning CIP code: 11 – for Computer Science.
- ❖ Engineering students at community colleges are currently encouraged to transfer right away; for them to transfer with 60 credits in Engineering is not in their best interest.
- ❖ Dual enrollment is the best option for community college Engineering students.
- ❖ Are statewide transfer articulation agreements in these four Engineering disciplines really possible? Options: 1) do some research in these discipline areas re transfer before convening at a F2F; 2) bring faculty together once for discussion to find out what the issues are for these disciplines; 3) start the discussion with associate deans, etc. – they sometimes have a better idea of the issues; 4) provide a questionnaire to campuses to start the discussion. Ian M. will draft some initial questions that Todd R. will review.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION (*Note: CIP codes are not used consistently across institutions)	ENROLLMENT
Mechanical Engineering. (CIP = 14.1901)	1688
Engineering, General. (CIP = 14.0101) (BS Engineering at CSM & FLC)	1618
Civil Engineering, General. (CIP = 14.0801)	859
Chemical Engineering. (CIP = 14.0701)	728
Engineering, Other. (Mechatronics at CSU-P and Engineering at UCB)	699
Electrical and Electronics Engineering	608
Petroleum Engineering.	528
Aerospace, Aeronautical and Astronautical/Space Engineering.	434
Engineering Physics/Applied Physics.	367
Bioengineering and Biomedical Engineering.	338

Environmental/Environmental Health Engineering.	301
Computer Engineering, General.	289
Biochemical Engineering.	241
Geological/Geophysical Engineering.	241
Architectural Engineering.	184
Metallurgical Engineering.	134
Mining and Mineral Engineering.	104
Engineering Science.	73
Industrial Engineering.	42

### C. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

- The name of the degree program to which the STAA applies will be added to the cover page of the articulation agreements. CIP codes for these degrees will be maintained at DHE but not put in the agreement. Ian sent out these email requests 3-12-13.

#### 1. **Phase 4: Procurement of Signatures**

##### a. **Agriculture Agreements (Animal Science, AG Business, Soil & Crop Science)** – sent for signature to Academic Council on 2/25/13.

- Still need signatures from CSU-FC. Alan L. will follow up with Rick Miranda. Need the signatures by next week in order to go to the April CCHE meeting.

#### 2. **Phase 3: Final Review** – NONE

#### 3. **Phase 2: ICIR**

##### a. **Communication** – V.2 sent to GEC 2/28/13; deadline 3/29/13.

- Communication faculty usually prefer to refer to COMM degrees as “Communication Studies” or “Oral Communication” not “Speech Communication.”
- “Communication” needs to be changed to “Written Communication” in the gtPathways curriculum. This change needs to be made on all forms/templates, etc.

##### b. **English** – V.2 sent to GEC; deadline 3/8/13. UCCS and UNC need to report if they can make this agreement work on their campuses. FLC and WSCU have indicated that their campuses can make it work. Still need to hear from UCB and UCD.

- UNC cannot make this agreement work.
- UCD can make it work but they are not very comfortable with it.
- UCB is having a difficult time making it work when the curriculum is made to be more and more vague. UCB would prefer more specificity in the STAA curriculum – the goal of STAAs is to provide specific guidance on what a student should take for their degree.

- Larger discussion: The intent of the gtPathways curriculum is General Education, not specialized courses like “Literature & Film.” One of the issues with the gtPathways approved course list is that more and more courses are being approved for the gtPathways curriculum that really are not appropriate for a *Gen Ed* curriculum, e.g., Literature & Film. Often this course is an upper-division course and should not really be a part of a Gen Ed curriculum. Consequently, specific courses should be listed in the prescribed curriculum of the STAAs to help students have a solid basis in their major.
  - Most IHEs can make the ENG curriculum work, but they are not comfortable with it; it does a disservice to students.
  - To be considered: could we be reaching the end of the road for achieving more statewide transfer articulation agreements? We have accomplished the 14 required by statute. Maybe we are trying too hard to make more work when it really is not feasible or in the best interest of the student.
  - It might be time to finish up the STAAs that are currently in the works, and then take a break from them. It might be time to re-assess the courses in the gtPathways curriculum.
  - The CU System campuses (UCB, UCD, UCCS) and UNC will propose an alternative prescribed curriculum for ENG, one that has a bit more specificity.
- c. **Geography** – UNC has a proposed footnote, which raises a larger question. The proposed footnote is:  
 “Students interested in transferring to UNC for a Geography BA with Secondary Licensure should take HIS 101, ECO 201, and POS 111 for those categories and take GIS 110, HIS 201, HIS 202, and WST 200 among their electives.” [See handout: *STAA – GEOGRAPHY – Phase 2 Issues-resolved CWS – ICIR – 2012-11-28.*]

According to UNC’s online catalog, the Geography degrees with emphasis at UNC are:

- [Geography B.A.](#)
- [Geographic Information Science Emphasis](#)
- [Liberal Arts Emphasis](#)
- [Secondary Teaching Emphasis](#)

Questions this raises:

1. Should every agreement be footnoted with options that cover each degree with emphasis at each institution? If we include the above footnote for the B.A. Geography with Secondary Teaching Emphasis at UNC, why not include a footnote telling students what they need to do to get the emphasis in Geographic Information Science emphasis?
2. If we start including these footnotes for each emphasis area at each institution, there will be pages full of footnotes. So, should we limit each agreement to the emphasis areas within a degree that have the same requirements for the first 60 credits?

3. This applies to last month's discussion on the Communication agreement. Going forward, should we indicate on the front page, exactly what degree and emphasis area (by name and CIP code) the agreement is for at each institution? Example for Geography agreement:

<p><b>COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION</b></p> <p>Colorado Mesa University          Metropolitan State University of Denver          University of Colorado Colorado Springs          University of Colorado Denver          University of Northern Colorado (B.A. Geography with Liberal Arts emphasis, CIP 45.0701)</p>
---

- The STAAs were never meant to apply to licensure degrees.
- The language from the Spanish agreement will be added to the template and each agreement currently in force:

PLEASE NOTE: The degree tracks in [Spanish] for the Professions and [Spanish] with Secondary Teaching Licensure have different requirements and are not included in this agreement.

- GEC approved of adding the degree name after each campus name (see box above) to the cover page of the STAAs. (DHE will keep track of the CIP codes for each degree.)
- All campuses need to provide a list of their degree names and CIP codes, as relate to the current STAAs. Ian M. will send an email requesting this information.

- d. **Geology** – sent to GEC on 12/13/12 for ICIR; deadline 2/8/13. Reminder email sent 2/28/13. Still need to hear from CMU and UCB.
- e. **Philosophy** – V.3 sent to GEC on 2/22/13, deadline 3/8/13. Still need to hear from AIMS, CMC, CSU-FC, MSU Denver, UCB, UCCS, and UCD. Still need to send courtesy copy to discipline group.

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

- a. **Art History** – re-convening at spring 2013 Fac2Fac.
- b. **Biology/Chemistry/Physics** – to be reconvened at spring 2013 Fac2Fac. Any updates from other discussions?
- What, if anything, does new Addendum B mean for footnotes 1 & 2 on Chemistry curriculum worksheet in regard to the first 60 credits not satisfying either gtPathways or the AS degree, for the community college and the receiving 4-year institution? [See handout: *STAA – CHEMISTRY Phase I Draft CWS – 2013-04-05 Proposal.*]
  - Perhaps we need to discuss:
    - Online laboratories for articulation are limited to first-year courses: General Chemistry, General Biology, and Calculus-Based General Physics. Thus, science majors may be required to repeat online courses above these first-year courses upon transfer: Organic Chemistry, Modern Physics, Cell or Anatomy/Physiology, etc.

- Official transcripts do not identify online delivery; however the degree audit system in CCCS should be able to identify online delivery.
- The only research reference to be provided to the science faculty at the F2F will be the NANSLO website – this link will be included in the invite.
- If the “grading issue” arises again, it will be addressed spontaneously: it was a personnel issue and has been taken care of.
- The assertion to be made is that there is no evidence that online coursework or take-home lab kits/remote labs lead to lower academic achievement or students who are unprepared for subsequent coursework.

### Online Science Courses, Take-Home Lab Kit/Remote Labs & Other Lingering Issues

1. Extant literature reveals no significant differences in student success/preparedness between traditional vs. online courses or science take-home lab kits vs. traditional labs (actually, much of the literature show a selection effect that students who self-select into online coursework have higher GPAs and the discipline to be successful in an online environment). [See handouts: 1) *Lit Review for Online Science Courses*; 2) *Simulation of laboratory assignments to support students’ learning of introductory inorganic chemistry*; 3) *Virtual Labs are equivalent to Authentic Labs.*]
2. DHE study of SURDS data concluded, “There were no statistically significant differences in students’ Science GPAs across instructional method (online vs. traditional). This suggests that online CCCS students perform just as well in Science classes at four-year institutions as their on-campus counterparts.” [See handout: *Online vs Traditional Science Study Report*, pg. 10]. \*This report was shared with GE Council September 11, 2012.
3. Weights given to labs identified at April 2011 meeting: Should this be an institutional decision or should this be explicated in gtPathways science content criteria for science with labs at ALL institutions?
4. Grading policy identified at April 2011 meeting: This was swiftly corrected in house.

DHE’s Position: Let’s be fair. If we’re going to publicly pick apart science courses, labs, curricula, weighting of assessments, grading policies, etc. at one institution, then let’s do it across the board. CCCS has been very generous but this has to stop at some point and faculty need to respect institutional autonomy and the gtPathways approval process.

- c. **Music** – draft CWS, V.2 and notes (re-)sent to discipline group on 12/14/12 with changes discussed at December GEC meeting; deadline 2/8/13. New issue arose re MUS 121/122 – email sent to discipline group on 1/23/13 – deadline 2/8/13. Reminder email sent 2/26/13. Still need to hear from UCCS.
  - The MUS 121/122 issue was resolved by the discipline group.
  - V.3 of the draft CWS was sent to discipline group with a 3/29/13 deadline.
- d. **Studio Art** – re-convening at spring 2013 Fac2Fac.

- e. **Theatre** – draft CWS + notes sent to discipline group for verification on 12/17/12; deadline 2/8/13. Reminder email sent 2/25/13. Still need to hear from TSJC, UCB, and UCCS.

V. Other Business?

- Revision of Transfer Policy:
  - The revised Transfer Policy needs to align with the revised Admissions Policy and the revised Remedial Education Policy.
  - A Transfer Policy Review Subcommittee was formed: Barbara Morris, Wayne Artis, Scott Thompson.
  - Ian M. will share his changes to the Transfer Policy with this group to start the revision process.