GE Council

May 9, 2016, 1:00-4:00pm
Department of Higher Education
1560 Broadway – Suite 1600
Denver, CO

Webinar URL https://enetlearning.adobeconnect.com/gecouncil/
Call in Number: 1-877-820-7831; **Access code:** 368215#

NOTES – Approved

I. **GREETINGS & INTRODUCTIONS**
    Wayne Artis (CFAC-PPCC)
    Ann Bentz (UNC)
    Darcy Briggs (CCCS-ACC)
    Al Buyok (CMC)
    Helen Caprioglio (CSU-P)
    Linda Comeaux (CCCS-RRCC)
    Tony Contento (CSU-G)
    Charlie Couch (UNC-Registrar)
    Margaret Doell (ASU)
    Rhonda Epper (CCCS-CCD)
    David Gilkey (CSU-FC)
    Kurt Haas (CMU)
    Bernice Harris (MSUD)
    Bill Niemi (WSCU)
    John Lanning (UCD)
    Jeff London (CFAC-MSUD)
    Barbara Morris (FLC)
    Mary Gabriel (Aims)
    Kay Schneider (CSM)
    Patrick Tally (UCB)
    William Tammone (CCCS)
    Scott Thompson (CCCS-NJC)
    Rex Welshon (UCCS)
    Mike Lightner (CU System)
    Ian Macgillivray (CDHE)
    Tim Flanagan (CDHE)
    Maia Blom (CDHE)

II. Adoption of last meeting's notes *[See handout: 2016-04-11 – GE Council NOTES – draft.docx]* Approved.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. GE Council – Summer Schedule
- August 8 meeting – **CANCELLED**.
- July 11 meeting – Keep this meeting on the schedule and dedicate it entirely to GT Pathways re-review planning.

B. Fall 2016 Fac2Fac scheduled for October 28, 2016 with its focus being CLEP/DSST credit discussions.
- Discussion held regarding the possibility of adding a second fall 2016 date to allow for GT Pathways re-revision discussions. GEC is holding the afternoon of Thursday, October 27, 2016, 1:00 – 4:00 pm as a possible addition to the October 28 date.
- Regular venue options (ACC and Lowry Conf Center) are not available. Darcy Briggs (ACC) will re-investigate the options at ACC. Rhonda Epper (CCD) will investigate the Tivoli/Turnhalle option.

C. Legislative Update (Kachina Weaver)

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Math Pathways Task Force Final Report & Recommendations
- Endorsement from GE Council? Yes, GEC will endorse the report. CDHE staff will write draft endorsement language for GEC to review.
- Next steps:
  - Address the STAA/DwD math requirement issue
  - Remedial policy revision
  - Modeling course created as an addition to math curriculum

B. STAA/DwD Math Requirements, Next Steps [*See handout*: ..\..\Fac2Fac\2016 Spring F2F\NOTES - STAA-DwD Math Requirements - 2016 Spring F2F - final.docx]
1. See handout: Handouts\example -ANTHROPOLOGY.docx
2. Vet revised STAAs with faculty to confirm accuracy? If "yes," due May 18.
3. Once confirmed, CEOs and CAOs sign off and CDHE posts new versions? Or can we do it administratively?
4. UCCS: please confirm College Algebra is required for Psychology, BA.
5. UCD: please confirm College Algebra is required for Psychology, BS.
Ian revised math requirements to MAT 135: Intro to Stats except where there's a different requirement or preference. Will forward to GE Council for one last vetting with faculty before having CEO's & CAO's sign off on revisions.

C. Updated GT Pathways content & competencies timeline:
- **Phase 1**: F2F participants provide feedback to CDHE on content area and competency criteria. CDHE posts draft revised content area and competency criteria on website. CDHE also posts attendance sheets for each content area group from the fall 2015 F2F conference. **DEADLINE: December 11, 2015 – tasks completed.**

- **Phase 2:** *On-campus faculty review*; includes all faculty at every IHE and in every department. Faculty feedback is provided to CDHE.
  DEADLINE: March 1, 2016.
- **Phase 3:** *FINAL review by Lisa & Shelly.*
  DEADLINE: May 13, 2016.
- **Phase 4:** *FINAL review by GE.*
  DEADLINE: May 18, 2016.
- **Phase 5:** *CCHE approval June 2, 2016.*

D. Options for Review of GT Pathways Revised Syllabi
  1. Revision, re-submission and re-review of GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 courses slated for fall 2016.
  2. Re-review at the campus level (do we need some kind of assurance that each campus has a mechanism/policy/process in place to do that and to get an idea of HOW institutions currently handle that)? What about a rotating 'oversight' role by looking at a small number of syllabi over a period of time. GEC voted "No." Most felt there would be a lack of objectivity in the review process.
  3. Completely online – Using the online platform (that College Board uses for AP reviews) that was suggested is cost prohibitive.
  4. Hybrid – online & face-to-face (how reviews are currently being conducted) – most favorable option (about 85% do how currently doing it and about 15% do reviews completely online).
  5. Completely face-to-face
  6. Comment at Fac2Fac was that the faculty involved with the redesign of the learning and competency objectives SHOULD be the gtPathways reviewers. May help with content issues in CO1, CO2, and CO3. However, there is a significant limit as to what the same faculty are asked to do when courses are re-submitted. I believe this comment points to the need for GT Pathways reviewer training in order to get consistent application of learning objectives.

  Additional ideas/comments:
  - A training process needs to be developed and the faculty who attended the F2F conferences need to be involved in the training process.
  - New submissions need to be integrated in the re-review process.
  - IHEs may choose not to re-submit all courses currently in the GT Pathways curriculum.
  - IHEs may need to prioritize and limit the number of courses submitted for re-review. How many courses need to be "guaranteed transfer[applied]"? Criteria for prioritizing/limiting might include:
    o Course must be offered at least once per year;
    o Course must be part of a STAA/DwD; and/or
    o Course must be required by a major.
  - We could provide an incentive – the more volunteers sent from an IHE, the more courses that IHE may submit….?
  - There could be requirements for the courses submitted such as
    o Course must be taught annually.

- Course must be part of a STAA.
- Course must be part of a major degree requirement.

E. Items on GT Pathways syllabi that should be standard? (feedback from Fac2Fac)

1. A standard statement about the course being a GT course could be a reminder to all instructors of all sections that they need to meet the GT requirements. Prevents drift. GEC thinks this statement is a good idea (70% voted "yes" and 30% "no").

2. Having 1 or 2 good examples would help. (Esp. for CCCS – tie in with Common Course Numbering System?)

3. Concerns about standard assignments and weights because of academic freedom.

4. What to reasonably require across instructors/sections?

5. What can be reasonably checked, by chairs or state or ??

6. How can peer reviewers turn down a syllabus for "not enough writing" when "enough writing" isn't defined?

7. Where is the 80% rule spelled out? (that have to meet at least 80% of approved topical outline). We think it's just CCCS schools. See:. CCCS System President's Procedure #9-71, part 3c, states, "If a college wishes to offer a course already listed in the CCCNS Official Course Database, it must… Offer the course as it exists in the Official Course Database covering 80% of all competencies for college-level courses and 100% of all competencies for developmental education courses." (https://www.cccs.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/SP9-71.pdf). Someone stated that for GT Pathways courses, the expectation is to cover 100% of all competencies though this is not in writing anywhere.

Additional comments:

- Revised review forms need to have a section identifying how the course is linked to the specific SLO's for that content area. CDHE staff (Maia) will draft some sample revised nomination forms for the July meeting.
- Syllabi need to demonstrate how the SLOs for that content area will be measured.
- It might be good to have a few *varied* examples of acceptable syllabi and assignments to which faculty could refer. Need to be careful NOT to send the message that they are merely examples and there's no requirement to use those syllabi.
- It was noted that standard syllabi language might include any federal requirements.

F. Non-Regionally Accredited Institution Participation in GT Pathways

- HLC Criterion 4.A.3: The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

- HLC Assumed Practice A.5.d: The institution makes readily available to students and to the general public clear and complete information including:

d. policies on acceptance of transfer credit, including how credit is applied to degree requirements. (Except for courses articulated through transfer policies or institutional agreements, the institution makes no promises to prospective students regarding the acceptance of credit awarded by

examination, credit for prior learning, or credit for transfer until an evaluation has been conducted.)

- HLC Assumed Practice B.1.f: The institution has a process for ensuring that all courses transferred and applied toward degree requirements demonstrate equivalence with its own courses required for that degree or are of equivalent rigor.

Comments:

- Courses from non-regionally accredited IHEs are reviewed individually by the majority of schools.
- Accreditation encompasses much more than course review: faculty quality, role & mission of the school, etc. It provides a certain guarantee of overall quality of a school.
- Perhaps the criteria/processes used by national accrediting agencies and regional accrediting agencies are what need to be compared.
- GEC feels this issue is best addressed by the Academic Council.

V. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

  A. Phase 3 – Draft Agmt/Final IHE Review
   - **ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURE – LANDSCAPE BUSINESS** – STAA sent to participating schools with cc to GEC on 5/2/16. Deadline: Friday, May 27, 2016.
   - **EQUINE SCIENCE** - STAA sent to participating schools with cc to GEC on 5/2/16. Deadline: Friday, May 27, 2016.

  B. English STAA/DwD [*See handout*: Handouts\English prescribed curriculum.pdf]
   - Requires 9 Arts & Humanities credits from GT-AH1, 3 & 4 only, which prohibits students from taking AH2 courses with a HUM prefix. Was this the intent? Or was it simply to prevent students from taking courses with a LIT prefix?
   - Chair of Humanities at ACC wants students to be able to take GT-AH2 courses with a HUM prefix.

   This STAA should be re-sent to English faculty to verify that they did <u>not</u> intend to exclude <u>humanities</u> courses (HUM) from the Gen Ed curriculum section of the agreement. Maia will do this.

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?