



GE Council

January 13, 2014, 1:00-4:00pm
Department of Higher Education
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600
Denver, CO

MEETING NOTES

Approved

I. Greetings and Introductions

Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)
Ann Bentz (UNC)
Margaret Doell (ASU)
Erin Frew (CSU-P)
John Lanning (UCD)
Jeff London (CFAC-MSU Denver)
Jerry Migler (CCCS)
Pete McCormick (FLC)
Kathy Pickering (CSU-FC)
Jeff Reynolds (AIMS)
Bill Niemi (WSCU)
Rae Shevalier (MSU Denver)
Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)
Sandy Veltri (CCCS-FRCC)
Steve Werman (CMU)
Ian Macgillivray (DHE)
Maia Blom (DHE)

II. Adoption of last meeting's notes: *see handout: 2013-12-09 – GEC Meeting – Draft Minutes.*
Approved.

III. Information Items

A. Public Backlash against Common Core State Standards/Colorado Academic Standards

- 45 states (including Colorado) and DC have adopted CCSS in Mathematics and English Language Arts (www.corestandards.org/)
- The CCSS are embedded in Colorado's Academic Standards (<http://higher.ed.colorado.gov/Academics/P20/resource/StandardsFAQ.pdf>).
- Faculty support for the standards would help. Resources include a blog (<http://isupportthecommoncore.net/>), Facebook page

(<https://www.facebook.com/ISupportTheCommonCore>), and twitter feed (@isupportccss).

- Melissa Colman, PhD, Executive Director, Teaching and Learning Unit at CDE (Colman_M@cde.state.co.us) seeks to identify supporters of the Common Core within the higher ed community so that CDE may engage them in its communications efforts. Can you assist with this?
 - Colorado is a PARCC state; we will use the assessments developed by PARCC for math and English Language Arts. PARCC assessments will go live in CO in 2014/15.
 - States have been free to choose if they will adopt the CCSS.
 - Follow Ian M. on Twitter to get more information about this issue: @DrMacgillivray
 - Public backlash against the CCSS is increasing – some states are threatening to pull out of PARCC/Smarter Balance. Some public backlash is going in the opposite direction – the CCSS are seen as not being rigorous enough.
 - Higher Ed community is encouraged to contact the CDE to assist with spreading positive communications about the CCSS/CAS in their regions.

IV. Discussion/Action Items

A. Update on P20 Regional Partnerships and Planning for April 2014 Faculty-to-Faculty Conference

1. DHE is trying to schedule a statewide summit on Supplemental Academic Instruction on April 17, 2014 (the day before Fac-to-Fac). Should we cancel April GE Council and Academic Council meeting so folks who travel don't have to do it twice in one week?
 - “Co-requisite Instruction” is the national term for Colorado’s “Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI).” This CO summit will focus on what Colorado is doing with SAI. It will be too soon to have any data from those schools that have started doing SAI (like MSU Denver).
 - **April 7, 2014 GEC meeting is cancelled. GEC members might plan on participating in the SAI summit and the April 18 F2F.**
 - F2F will be held at Arapahoe Community College.
2. Do we agree that the goals for revisiting GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and College Algebra, Intro to Stats and Math for Liberal Arts, are to ensure quality (and thus enhance student learning) and to ensure consistency between campuses (and thus enhance transfer and degree completion)? **Yes. Although, we might consider doing away with the GT-CO3 category.**
3. Is part of this revision to develop common competency/learning goals statements describing expected entrance and exit competencies that will be used across the system?
 - Point made that the goal is more on measurable learning outcomes (aka exit competencies), which then become the entrance competencies for the next course in the sequence.
 - Entrance competencies are tools for high school teachers. Perhaps entrance competencies are only necessary for the first course in a sequence?
 - Point made by Academic Council at its 1/14 meeting that Math for Liberal arts does not have a sequence.

4. What about common activities or demonstrations that should be expected of students to show mastery? Are there assessments or individual items currently being used that faculty might consider embedding in GT-CO1 or College Algebra, for instance?
 - There is a disconnect between the gtPathways criteria and the practicality of “applying” these criteria when faculty are assessing a course or a student’s work.
 - Within the gtPathways content and competency criteria, there needs to be a balance between specificity and vagueness. Many such discussions were held by the Social & Behavioral Sciences group when the criteria were being created. S&BS criteria could serve as a model for the Math and Written Communication discussions.
 - We need measurable learning outcomes to be able to agree on any type of common activity or demonstration for assessment. For instance, Social and Behavioral Sciences content criteria contains more explicit requirements for competency in Written Communication. See: <http://higherred.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/gtPathways/Criteria/Content/socbehsci.pdf>
 - Also need to consider multiple math pathways, which may help with remedial. (Ian asked Wayne to say more here.)
5. Should we follow a national model (or tweak one to suit our needs) to guide this work, like AAC&U’s [LEAP initiative](#), Lumina’s [Degree Qualifications Profile and Tuning](#) initiatives, Cal-PASS Curricula Guides for [Mathematics](#) or [English](#), or [WICHE’s Interstate Passport Initiative](#)? Other?

It is dangerous to give faculty a model to tweak; it is better to have components of several different models for them to consider and provide some structure for the meeting and break-out discussions for that day.
6. Faculty have been asking for more robust competencies. Does it make sense to build off of the new 21st Century Learning & Behavior Skills embedded in the Colorado Academic Standards? They are:
 1. **Information Literacy** (e.g. Find and Use Information & Information Technology)
 2. **Invention** (e.g. Creativity and Innovation)
 3. **Collaboration** (e.g. Communication)
 4. **Critical Thinking** (e.g. Problem Solving, & Global and Cultural Awareness)
 5. **Self-Direction** (e.g. Personal Responsibility, Civic Responsibility, Work Ethic)

Are the current competencies still relevant? Can ask faculty at F2F if/how these have a place in gtPathways. The Technology competency in gtPathways has always been an “orphan” of sorts. Moving toward “Information Literacy” might be better.
7. The only statutory guidance is: “...The core of courses shall be designed to ensure that students demonstrate competency in reading, critical thinking, written communication, mathematics, and technology... [23-1-125(3), C.R.S.]” Statute does not define the competencies or preclude faculty from adding more of them. Statute is silent on content of courses.
8. Budget & Participation planning ideas [*See handout: Fac2Fac Budget-2014 Spring.docx.*]
 - General discussion about F2F and revision of gtPathways content and competency criteria:
 - Ian M. will procure the results for the P20 regional partnership groups for GEC to review. The P20 work could inform a starting place for the F2F conference.
 - The P20 groups are each having a final meeting. It would be good for some GEC members to attend those meetings in their respective regions. January 29 is the last meeting for the northeastern region . Ian M. will attend this meeting. Ian M.

will find out when the other groups are meeting and send the dates to GEC. Western region is done meeting.

- The “daily charge” for the F2F should not be too specific.
- The revision of the Math and Written Communication content and competency criteria should be presented in such a way that the faculty will not see it as a mandate, and they will still feel they have ownership of the gtPathways curriculum. For example: the content and competency criteria have not been reviewed for about 12 years – it is time to look at them again and make sure they still apply to current educational practices.
- The pushback on revising the gtPathways criteria may not be strong if a revision is presented in the right way: 1) give history/background of how the gtPathways criteria were created; 2) indicate that it has been awhile since they have been reviewed; 3) address some of the current challenges with the criteria. Ian M. will start a draft of this background for use at F2F; he will share it with GEC for comment.
- A “SAVE THE DATE” email needs to be sent to GEC for distribution. The same date needs to be posted on the DHE website.
- Jerry Migler will research whether CCCS awards stipends to participating faculty. DHE should have this information before sending the “Save the Date” email. It would be helpful if the “save the date” email had info of what discussions will be held and whether DHE will provide a stipend to the faculty.
- Faculty from the other content areas (History, S&BS, AHUM, N&PS) need to be included in the F2F because Math and Written Communication are fundamental to these other content areas.

B. Discussion on state-wide cut scores for Advanced Placement exams [*See handouts: CLEP-AP-IB Exam Spreadsheets_6-12-2012.docx and Exploring Common AP Cut Scores Letter from Lt Gov.pdf.*]

1. GEC agreed they would start this conversation on their individual campuses with admissions and institutional reporting reps.
2. CSU will share their data protocol (for collecting/analyzing differing cut scores) with Ian (request made to Kathy P. on 12/10/13). Ian will share the protocol with DAG to see if the protocol addresses readily accessible data at each IHE. (Ian sent email 1/15)
3. Ian will get a letter (from Exec. Director or CCHE) for GEC to use to leverage support for this discussion on their campuses.

The idea is to agree on a common cut score for each AP exam (i.e., AP Bio, AP Chem, and etc.). Ian M. will create a new document for just AP exams. The information on this document will consist of, per institution, the cut score for each category of AP exam; the course to which the cut score equates (what course does the student get credit for?); and the credit hours. The ASU cut score document will be used by IHEs as a template to gather this information and send it to Ian M. Ian asked College Board for data on students who took an AP exam, their cut score and how they did in subsequent coursework (1/15).

C. Names of “Common Degree Programs” on Front Pages of Current STAAs [*See handout: Name of “Common Degree Programs” on Front Pages of Current STAAs.*]

1. How should we handle ensuring the information is correct? Do they need to be re-signed?
DHE will make these administrative changes and re-post the STAAs to the website. The STAAs do not need to be recirculated.

- D. CCHE Policy I, L: Statewide Transfer Policy [*See handout: i-partl_revision_2014-01-06_IKM.docx.*]
1. Will be on Commission's March 7, 2014 agenda for approval.
Some minor edits were made: the language in footnote 9 on page I-L-7 was used to create footnote 22 on page I-L-21, Section 8.06.
- E. What do you think about these ideas that other states are doing that may help with completion and advising:
1. Add a page to STAAs that reinforces the idea that "full-time is 15" and contains a structured schedule? [*See handout: Structured Schedule.docx.*]
GEC was not in favor of this idea. Remediation (which most CC students need) messes up this idea. CCCS's Banner "Degree Works"/degree audit does this. Students can do it on their mobile app. The federal definition of "full time" is 12 hours (for financial aid) and this could confuse students. Four-year institutions noted some courses might be on an every three semester rotation.
 2. Revise Institutional Transfer Guides like structured schedules so they not only indicate what courses to take as part of the associate's, but what courses to take as part of the bachelor's and during which semester?
The transfer guide template could possibly be revised; it's been awhile since it's been reviewed. Transfer guides need to be updated every year and maintained on individual IHE websites; correct links to these updated transfer guides need to be sent to DHE for its website.
 3. Note also the new DHE webpage for all the guided pathways:
<http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/Students.html>

V. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

A. **Phase 4: Procurement of Signatures**

1. **Geology** – Final STAA sent to IHEs on 12/16/13. Still need signatures from CMU, UCB, and WSCU. UNC still needs to provide the signature from the President – they have only sent a signature from the CAO.

B. **Phase 3: Final Review**

1. **Communication** – V.1 sent to GEC on 12/23/13 for GEC review; deadline 1/31/14. Still need to hear from Scott T., Kathy P., Jeff L., Terry S.
2. **Geography** – V.2 sent to GEC for final *campus* review; deadline: 1/31/14. Still need to hear from CCCS, CMC, UCB, and UCD.
3. **Philosophy** – V.2 sent to GEC for final *campus* review; deadline: 1/31/14. Still need to hear from CCCS, CMC, CSU-FC, FLC, MSUD, UCB, and UNC.

C. **Phase 2: ICIR**

1. **Art History** – V.2 sent to GEC on 12/20/13; deadline: 2/7/14. Still need to hear from CCCS, CMC, MSUD, UCD, and UNC.
2. **Chemistry** – V.3 sent to GEC on 1/2/14; deadline 2/14/14. Still need to hear from CCCS, CMU, CSM (?), CSU-FC, MSUD, UCB, UCD, UNC, and WSCU.
3. **English** – UNC indicated they could make V.2a work. Still need to hear from UCB. DHE emailed UCB on 12/31/13. Maia B. will follow up with Richard Nishikawa at UCB.

4. **Music** – Issues-resolved CWS sent to GEC on 12/04/13; deadline 1/31/14. **Still need to hear from CCCS, CMU, CSU-P, UCB, UCCS, and WSCU.**
5. **Physics** – V.2 sent to GEC on 12/30/13; deadline – 2/5/14. **Still need to hear from CCCS, CMC, CMU, CSU-FC, and UCB.**
6. **Studio Art** – V.1 sent to GEC on 10/24/13; deadline – 11/22/13. V.2 with some additional footnotes will be sent out once the following comments from CMU and UCD are addressed.
 - a. Comments from CMU & UCD:
 - i. . . . any transfer student, as with other students who enter the studio art program at CMU as freshmen, have to pass a sophomore review to continue in the program as a junior. So, on the agreement there might be a footnote that may need to be added that a transfer student must pass this review upon matriculation at CMU to continue in the program.
 - ii. Question that arises out of previous comment: Why would a CC student transfer to a baccalaureate program without first knowing that they pass the portfolio review, audition, etc.? The articulation agreements are program/major specific and only hold for students who continue in the area/major defined by the articulation agreement. If the student can't continue in the area/major after admission (can't pass the review/audition), what benefits are there for the student?
It was decided that no footnote should be added to the STAA. Such a footnote really pertains to what happens after a student has already been accepted; therefore, it really is not a transfer issue but rather a catalog policy of the institution. Consequently, it is not really necessary in a STAA. Four-year schools might consider adding such language to their transfer pages as something a student should expect when he/she arrives at the school.
7. **Theatre** – Issues-resolved CWS sent 12/4/13 to GEC; deadline 1/31/14. **Still need to hear from CCCS, UCB, UCCS, UCD, and WSCU.**

D. Phase 1: Curriculum Worksheet Creation & Verification

1. **Biology** – CCCS (Scott Thompson) will verify that science courses offered fully online by any community college meet the standards of the CCCOnline science courses.
Biology will move forward to Phase 2 – ICIR.
 - a. Latest concern expressed was, “If these labs that the 4-year faculty agree to are approved for these courses, will all sections of these courses that are taught online, through CCCS Online **or through individual community college campuses**, be required to use these approved online labs?”
 - b. The response was, “Here at CCCOnline, all our science courses are taught from a master course thus standardizing the content in all sections - the instructors are not permitted to omit or change any content. As far as the campuses, most do not offer fully online science courses; however, if they do offer fully online science courses, it is their prerogative as to how to achieve the competencies and requirements as outlined by the CCNS [Common Course Numbering System].”
 - c. Front Range Community College reports it does not offer any science classes with lab separate from CCCS online courses. “We offer hybrid classes in BIO, CHE, PHY where lectures are online and students meet on campus for labs once a week.”
This is true at every CC campus. Only exception is one astronomy class at RRCC.

- d. A “quick and dirty” analysis of SURDS data appears to reveal that taking community college science courses online appears not to have a negative effect on GPA in subsequent science courses at a four-year institution. [See *handout: Online Student Course Grades.docx*.]

E. **Phase 0: For Future Planning**

1. **Engineering**

- a. The group that conducted an initial analysis concluded it is probably best to let 2- and 4-year institutions work out inter-institutional agreements, similar to ones between CSM & RRCC/FRCC and UCCS & PPCC. Ian is unsure that DHE has the capacity to do anything to assist, other than encouraging these. If anyone has any ideas/resources, please share.
- b. In the meantime, what do you think about replacing the current agreement with this one and then getting rid of the current links to matrices and each institution links to degree requirements for each type of engineering degree they offer or whatever they feel is most appropriate (matrix, transfer student portal, etc.)? [See *handout: Statewide Engineering Articulation Agreement_2009-02_revised 2013-01-06.docx*.]
- c. Mines identified coursework NOT included in the previous Engineering agreement, but that would now be applicable. Mines requests time to run this by faculty. How shall we proceed?

John Lanning will make an attempt at a draft Engineering guide. It will include 30-40 credits of common engineering-friendly credits (including appropriate Gen Ed courses) to see if a guide of this ilk would work instead of the current Engineering STAA.

- 2. **Early Childhood Education** – Beginning sometime in the first quarter of 2014, CDE has money available from the federal Early Learning Challenge Grant to support 2- and 4-year faculty in the development of inter-institutional transfer agreements. These inter-institutional agreements could supplant or supplement the current ECE Statewide Transfer Agreement. It sounds like CDE may give money to institutions that agree to work on an agreement and neither GE Council nor CDHE need facilitate. More details to come. For more information on this money, contact Nancie Linville, CDE’s Office of Early Learning and School Readiness (303-866-6239) or linville_n@cde.state.co.us
A discussion was held concerning the new ECE degrees being offered at four-year campuses. Given the arrival of these new degrees, it might be worth revisiting the ECE STAA. No decision was made.

3. **Music Education**

4. **Mass Communication**

VI. Other Business?