



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education

GE Council

September 30, 2015, 1:00-4:00pm

Department of Higher Education

1560 Broadway - Suite 1600

Denver, CO

Webinar URL <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/gecouncil/>

Call in Number: 1-877-820-7831; Access code: 368215#

Approved NOTES

I. GREETINGS & INTRODUCTIONS

Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)
Ann Bentz (UNC)
Margaret Doell (ASU)
Lisa Donaldson (CCCS-PPCC)
Bernice Harris (MSUD)
Melanie Hulbert (WSCU)
Lori Kester (CCCS-CCD)
John Lanning (UCD)
Jeff London (CFAC-MSUD)
Barbara Morris (FLC)
Kathy Pickering (CSU-FC)
Jeff Reynolds (Aims)
Kay Schneider (CSM)
Jeff Smith (Aims)
Patrick Tally (UCB)
Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)
Sandy Veltri (CCCS-FRCC)
Mike Lightner (CU System)
Ian Macgillivray (CDHE)
Maia Blom (CDHE)

- II. Adoption of last meeting's notes *[See handout: 2015-08-10 - GE Council - NOTES - Draft.docx.]* Approved. Add Margaret Doell to August.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Institutional Transfer Guides

1. Templates approved by GE Council May 11, 2015.
2. Completed templates were due September 15, 2015 (agreed to May 11).
3. UCCS has completed their guides and posted them at:
<http://www.uccs.edu/transfer/transfer-credit-advising/community-college-students/colorado.html>



4. Ian will get 2-year advisors to review these.

Original email with templates was re-sent to GE Council 10-1-2015. Please get your revised guides posted on your website and let Ian or Maia know the link.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- A. gtPathways Review - FLC courses (64), changing credit hours from 4 to 3.
1. Do they really need to be resubmitted? When FLC changed from 3 to 4 credits, the courses were not resubmitted for review.
 - GEC agreed this FLC credit change can be done administratively without going through a gtPathways peer review because there is no change to how the courses meet the content and competency criteria.
 - Maia will revise Notification of Change form:
 - If credit hour plus content & competency change, then probably requires review.
 - If just credit hour change, probably doesn't require review.
- B. Planning for October Fac2Fac & Next Steps in gtPathways Revisions
1. Survey Monkey results, purpose, and plan for moving forward [[See handout: SurveyMonkey Results Matrix 2015-09-03.docx](#)]
 2. Susan Albertine believes we can recommend:
 - a) Written Comm rubric/competency will be required of all Written Comm gtPathways courses and those faculty will decide on the final version of the competency for their coursework.
 - b) Same as above for Quant Lit for Mathematics gtPathways courses.
 - c) Same as above for either Inquiry & Analysis or Problem Solving for Natural & Physical Sciences.
 3. Given 2 above, Susan believes we can encourage, but not mandate, the other areas choose one rubric/competency that no other group already has and "own" it. That way, all 11 LEAP VALUE Rubrics we considered will be "owned" by one of the areas. It may end up that no one wants a particular competency or two (like Oral Communication) and Susan believes that would be okay. Then, each area can choose to also use one of the other competencies already "owned" by another area if it so chooses.

GEC agreed we should proceed with a follow up survey with the Written Communication and Quantitative Literacy competencies (and Writ Comm and Mathematics faculty) excluded to see where the other content area faculty land given the exclusions.
 4. Susan's final note: She finds persuasive the "recommendation of two competencies and at least 3 outcomes per competency. The plan has the virtue of elegance and directness (no second survey needed). Some places choose to examine fewer than the full set of outcomes on each rubric, but you will get a more valuable picture of learning if you address the set. The designers of the rubrics were told to think holistically and developmentally about student learning under the heading of that competency. The

dimensions of the rubric outcomes were designed together to capture that learning.”

5. Question: If each gtPathways area (e.g., GT-AH1) has only one required competency, how will that affect peer reviews of proposed gtPathways courses, if at all?
 6. Review draft Invitation to Participate. [*See handout: 2015 Fall F2F Conf - INVITE - 2015-10-22&23 - draft.docx.*]
- Point made that neither the competencies nor the content can be finalized (recommended for approval) independent of one another and to highlight this point at Fac2Fac.
 - Question for Susan Albertine: When we say that a competency/VALUE rubric will be required of a course for purposes of assessment, what does that mean for the faculty member’s teaching? Will that one competency/VALUE rubric be assessed to the point that faculty will have to teach less of what they would otherwise teach (content and other competencies that are not required but they think are important) and focus on teaching to that one required competency/VALUE rubric?

Susan’s response:

The reason we worked so hard to develop the rubrics with faculty all over the country was to find a way to free faculty of such worries! Because the rubrics really don’t specify content, they don’t constrain teaching. They do, however, encourage active learning and inquiry—activities that from a developmental perspective are linked to achievement of essential learning in college. The rubrics are often helpful to guide assignment design. If, for example, you are hoping to develop critical thinking, it is helpful to see the learning expectations of that outcome so that you are addressing those capacities in the work you give to students in a course. The work to develop those outcomes should flow naturally in the course and not dominate it. It often helps to have a group of colleagues sit with the rubric and think about how it aligns with what they are already doing. Then it may be easier to be intentional about, say, asking students to learn how to assemble evidence before they produce a report. The rubrics help people to scaffold and develop learning, which is why I believe they are so popular. They help to make an approach to content more meaningful.

- Logistical considerations for planning Fac2Fac agenda:

Day 1

- Start with objectives, goals, history, overview, timeline/process for final recommendation:
 - Need to clearly identify the end goal for the 2 days.
 - We’re not creating a final policy.
 - We’re gathering faculty’s recommendations for the GE Council to recommend to CCHE - “we heard you.”
 - Clarify timeline - faculty make recommendation to GEC by December 2015; GEC recommends CCHE approve recommendations in spring 2016; re-start gtPathways reviews using revised content & competency criteria in fall 2016.

- Continue competency revision:
 - Suggest/recommend: one (1) “owned” competency by content area, then 1-2 extra competencies, if desired.
 - Be sure to clearly define “ownership:” Owner content area has primary ownership of the student learning outcomes of the owned competency and is responsible to assess owned competency in the content area/course.

Day 2

- Math Pathways Task Force recommendations
- Continue content revisions:
 - GT-MA divided to align with math pathways.
 - N&PS faculty may differentiate content for SC1 vs. SC2 courses and also for:
 - Biology
 - Chemistry
 - Physics
 - Earth Sciences/Geology
 - Geography
 - Psychology (where appropriate)
 - Biological Anthropology
- Last: Where did we end up & next steps?

C. Prior Learning Assessment Policy and Common Cut Scores

1. Update

- Need to involve registrars and those who are deeply involved in transfer credit.
- There will be a huge impact on high school counselors, admissions people, and on community college people as well.
- Need consistency on transcripts. Need to show AP/IB scores on transcripts.
- Even though we may reach agreement on some decisions (like common cut scores) we should not implement anything until we’ve worked through all the phases of the CCHE-approved process and involved all parties in a full discussion of implications to prevent unforeseen negative consequences.

V. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS - none currently in the pipeline.

VI. gtPATHWAYS APPROVED COURSES - NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES - none currently needing GEC review.

VII. FOR FUTURE PLANNING (PARKING LOT)
A. Fact Sheet for Pre-Collegiate Advisors

Record notes here:

The advantages/disadvantages of AP courses v. Concurrent Enrollment courses.

- CE courses can exclude students from receiving freshman scholarships if they don't get a high grade because they will then have a college transcript with too low of a GPA to qualify.
- CE courses are guaranteed to transfer - not necessarily so with AP courses.
- When a STAA exists, there is no need for an IHE-specific transfer guide.

B. Update Current STAAs

1. Revisit gateway math courses to ensure appropriateness. Also, current CCCS AS degree requirements prevent Intro to Stats from fulfilling the math requirement for an AS. GEC agreed (6/8/2015) that if it's only 1 or 2 four-year institutions that have a different math requirement from everybody else, it's okay to footnote them.
2. Over the four years of STAA development, some language and general education requirements have changed. Should there be an effort to bring all STAAs into a common, updated, more student-friendly format?

C. Science Courses in Current STAAs

1. When the original STAAs were made, the CCCS system had no GT-SC2 (non-lab) science courses, so there was no way to finish the Science requirement in 7 credits. Now that the CCCS system has non-lab GT-SC2 courses, it is possible to complete an associate's with 7 science credits. Older STAAs might benefit from revising these course options?

D. GPA Calculation for Transfer Students

1. Some 4-year institutions recalculate students' community college GPA upon admission.

E. Track Transfer Complaints (quantity, nature of complaint, etc.)

1. Provide regular updates to GEC (every 6 months? every 3 months? once a year?)

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS?