



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education

GE Council

July 11, 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)
Kurt Haas (CMU)
Bernice Harris (MSUD)
Melanie Hulbert (WSCU)
Alex Ilyasova (UCCS)
John Lanning (UCD)
Jeff London (CFAC-MSUD)
Kelly Long (CSU-FC)
Dave Gilkey (CSU-FC)
Lara Medley (CSM)
Barbara Morris (FLC)
Patrick Tally (UCB)
Mike Lightner (CU System)
Ian Macgillivray (CDHE)
Tim Flanagan (CDHE)
Maia Blom (CDHE)

II. Adoption of last meeting's notes [*See handout: 2016-06-13- GE Council - NOTES - Draft.docx.*] **Approved.**

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. January 2015 Retreat Goals [*See handout: January 2015 Retreat Potential Focus Items-Goals.docx*]



- GEC has been very productive this past year: revision of GTP content criteria and competencies, PLA policy creation. Implementing quality control of GTP courses continues to be a challenge.
- Consensus was that the last retreat was a valuable experience. Having a facilitator was extremely helpful. Suggestion was made to have another retreat in January 2017.
- Aims & UNC are piloting the WICHE Passport Initiative; FLC will also participate in the passport initiative.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- A. Updated GT Pathways content criteria & competencies timeline:
1. Next: Faculty begins revising GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 syllabi.
 2. November 3, 2016 afternoon only: ½ day Fac2Fac for GT Pathways syllabus revising/reviewing/or whatever is needed.
 - Most likely, only Math and Written Communication faculty will participate in this F2F.
 - Suggestion: faculty bring working syllabi (department level); faculty develop together a common understanding of what is needed in a submission. Final submissions could be reviewed via the online platform.
- B. CSU proposes to put two (of 14) courses forward for evaluation, e.g., MATH117 (Algebra) and MATH160 as examples of pre-calculus and calculus, and request the peer reviewer committee's evaluation before submitting the remaining 12 courses. It makes the most sense to provide updated proposals for two courses, receive feedback and have time to make any needed changes to achieve approval to ensure that we avoid mistakes and rejection in the 12 remaining courses. Additionally, we would like to point out that the main gtPathways transfer is into CSU, not out of, therefore we further propose that the process should start with Algebra and Calculus 1 from the Community Colleges (whose students are the main users of gtPathways). These updates can be used as templates so the four year colleges and research universities can see what SLOs have been identified, required and expected. Well-designed, updated syllabi with SLOs that have been approved will be useful examples for guidance to other institutions and would then make the process much easier and efficient for both writers and evaluators. We need help to achieve the goal for getting a large number of similar classes through process this coming fall.
- CSU-FC is asking for a “pilot” review for all IHEs prior to the “official” review. Faculty are concerned they will put a lot of work into a revision that will not get recommended for approval. Though the possibility will exist for faculty to immediately revise and resubmit the course for a second review within the same cycle, at some institutions there will not be as quick a turnaround and there may not be any possibility to resubmit the course during the same cycle (e.g., CSU-FC requires that any changes go through the full curriculum review process on its campus).

- Discussion: the main reason for courses being deferred in the past was that some required items listed on the nomination form were missing from the syllabus. Point was made that some of the syllabi submitted for review were very poorly written, and if faculty simply follow the nomination form and get feedback from peers before submitting to CDHE then getting a course approved should not be difficult.

C. Ideas for Review of GT Pathways Revised Syllabi

Timeline for this fall:

- September 2016: CDHE/GE Council give notice of review and release nomination form and instructions. Institutions begin process of selecting which GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 courses will be submitted for review.
- October 2016: Faculty work on syllabi with peers on their own campuses. CDHE/GE Council get involved as requested. Math faculty should be working with Math Pathways Task Force Curriculum Working Group and paying special attention to the task force's recommendations.
- November 3, 2016 (noon - 4pm): Faculty-to-Faculty Conference for GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 faculty to get feedback on their revisions. (Maybe we could also invite GT-SC1 & 2 faculty who will soon be starting their own revisions?)
- Mid- to late-November into December 2016: CAOs submit syllabi when they are ready for review. Peer reviews could begin at this time.
- January 30, 2017: Deadline to submit GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1 syllabi for review.
- January - February 2017: Complete reviews of GT-CO1, 2 & 3 and GT-MA1.
- January 2017: CDHE/GEC and Institutions start process over again for:
 - **GT-SC1: ~33 courses**
 - GEOG: ~5 courses
 - GEOL: ~22 courses
 - Other (meteorology, oceanography, etc.): ~6
 - **GT-SC2: ~110**
 - BIO: ~16 courses
 - CHEM: ~19 courses
 - PHYS: ~14 courses
 - GEOG: ~1 course
 - GEOL: ~14 courses
 - ASTRONOMY: ~12 courses
 - ENV: ~10 courses
 - Other (meteorology, oceanography, etc.): ~6 courses

Other Notes:

- Current GTP courses will retain their "approved" status until the completion of the review cycle for their GT Pathways category.
- CDHE was under the impression that the syllabus submitted for peer review was the "institutional" syllabus that all instructors of every section of the course were required to use. What we learned today was,

for many (all?) institutions, the syllabus submitted has been one faculty member's syllabus and probably was not used by other faculty in any other section. Raises the question: "What's the point of the syllabus review if only one faculty member will use the approved syllabus?"

- Positives of GT Pathways:
 - With a completed DwD or general AA/AS, a student's Gen Ed requirements are transferred and applied as a block.
 - GT Pathways has raised the level of rigor and skill in courses because of the peer-to-peer discussions of the courses.
 - Potential to do more in way of quality control, like randomly auditing syllabi for drift and PD around the competencies.
 - Per data from CU System & CDHE:
 - 4-year graduates - 86-88% attended only one IHE.
 - 2-year graduates - 85% attended only one IHE.
1. CDHE working out an MOU with online platform folks.
 2. A training process needs to be developed and the faculty who attended the F2F conferences need to be involved in the training process (could be done webinar style and recorded and made part of the online platform).
 3. New submissions (regardless of content area) need to be integrated in the re-review process. Will not be possible this first cycle. We need to go through this fall to see how the process will work first. Wait until spring 2017 for new course submissions or, if possible, wait until the review cycle for that content area.
 4. IHEs may choose not to re-submit all courses currently in the GT Pathways curriculum. Criteria for prioritizing/limiting might include:
 - Course must be part of the institution's general education core; (Agreement that this will be required of every institution)
 - Course must be offered at least once every two years; (Agreement that this will be required of every institution) and
 - Course must be part of a STAA/DwD or institutional transfer guide (There was discussion about requiring 4-years to submit only the transfer equivalent of courses in DwDs for GTP approval. One question/problem is that many of the requirements simply state "any GT-MA1 course" so what's the equivalent if there's no course title? Also, there is fear that if a community college course is not GT Pathways approved then a 4-year institution may not accept it and apply credit.) *CDHE will propose at the next GEC meeting that this 3rd bullet NOT be implemented. CDHE does not want to risk students/advisors/faculty thinking that if a course is not GT Pathways approved, or loses its approved status, that it will not transfer. Also, in the rare case that a faculty member or advisor does not want to transfer in and apply a course because of the institution at which the student took it, CDHE does not want to give up the authority to make the institution accept and apply the credit.

- Do these criteria only apply to community colleges because of the Community College Common Course Numbering System (CCCCNS)? **This discussion can wait.**
- D. Items on GT Pathways syllabi that should be standard? (feedback from Fac2Fac and last GEC meeting)
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. Last time, GEC voted 70% yes and 30% no. **Margarett Doell, Wayne Artis, and John Lanning will develop this language for syllabi and submit to GEC for approval.**
 2. Syllabi need to demonstrate how the SLOs for that content area will be measured.
 3. 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.
 4. It was noted that standard syllabi language might include any federal requirements.
- E. Draft Revised GT Pathways Nomination and Review Forms
[See handouts: 1) NOMINATION FORM - CO1 - working draft, V.1 - 2016-07-06.docx; 2) CHAIRS FINAL EVALUATION FORM - CO1 - working draft, V.1 - 2016-07-06.docx.]
These edits were made to Section C of the Nomination Form:

SECTION C: COURSE SUBMISSION INFORMATION.

In addition to this Nomination Form, be sure to submit a **course syllabus** that contains:

- 1) a course description;
- 2) a course outline/schedule;
- 3) student learning outcomes (SLOs) from the required GT Pathways content criteria and competencies (identify how the SLOs will be met);
- 4) a description of how the assignments meet the SLOs, and the value/weight of the assignments; and
- 5) the state-approved statement that this course is a GT Pathways course.

You may also include content or curriculum guides or other supporting documents.

Items 1-4 above must be evident in your syllabus and your syllabus must demonstrate to reviewers how this course meets the content criteria and competency requirements listed below.

V. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

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

VII. FOR FUTURE PLANNING (PARKING LOT)

A. For fall 2016: Change math requirement in AHUM agreements from “One GT Pathways Mathematics course (GT-MA1)” to “One GT Pathways Mathematics course (GT-MA1), prefer MAT 120: Mathematics for the Liberal Arts” for Art History, Communication, English, French, History, Music, Philosophy, Spanish, Studio Art & Theatre.

B. 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.

C. Update Current STAAs

1. 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?

D. 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?

E. GPA Calculation for Transfer Students

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

F. 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?