GE 25 Council
October 17, 2005
MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Attendees: Wayne Artis (PPCC/CFAC), Jeff Reynolds (AIMS/sub for Donna Souther), John Lanning (UCDHSC), Gary Gianniny (FLC), Linda Curran (MSCD), Christina Martinez (MSCD), Frank Novotny (ASC), David Caldwell (UNC), John Cooney (CU System), Michel Dahlin (CU System), Linda Bowman (CCCS, by phone), Alan Lamborn (CSU), John Sowell (WSC), Duane Hrncir (MSC), Richard Nishikawa (CU-B), Roger Carver (CCD), for Lana Carter (Pueblo-CC).

The meeting began at 1pm with discussion of the agenda's action items. Linda Bowman phoned in. The first action item that was discussed was the finalization of revisions to all gtPathways forms so that they can be posted on the gtPathways website at the CCHE website. Collectively, with the exception of J. Sowell, the remaining Council members could not recall receiving my request, via email, that the forms be reviewed electronically and approved by the October 17th GE 25 Council meeting. Because there had been misunderstanding on the revision of the forms, it was decided that various people would work on specific content area forms and the nomination sheet, and have all forms ready for one final review prior to them being posted on the gtPathways section of the CCHE website. It was decided that J. Lanning would assist Vicki with the NPS forms, while A. Lamborn will assist with the SBS forms, and D. Caldwell will assist with the AHUM forms. The Communication forms have yet to be decided on as that content group has been given a deadline for content criteria revisions of November 11, 2005. Math minutes have yet to be received by Vicki and will therefore be addressed at our November 14th meeting. J. Reynolds will assist with the revising of the Nomination Form (and specifically the SBS category/sub-category listings). It was decided that the Council would review the revised forms at our next scheduled meeting, which was originally scheduled for November 7, 2005, but has since been rescheduled to the following: Monday @ 1:00pm/November 14, 2005, due to a conflict with the post-election CCHE Commissioners' meeting on November 7, 2005 @ AIMS Community College, Greeley.

The next action item on the agenda was discussion concerning the gtPathways Protocol and when the Council might approve the protocol so that reviews could proceed per the guidelines as established in the Protocol. As with the revisions mentioned above, the Council decided to formally approve the protocol at their next scheduled meeting on the 7th of November, (which again, has been officially re-scheduled to Monday November 14, 2005, so as not to conflict with the CCHE Commissioners' meeting scheduled for November 7, 2005).

The next action item discussed was the establishment and finalization of a gtPathways review calendar for 2005-2006. It was decided that there be a "rolling submission" of courses for review cycle IV, round I, beginning immediately after forms and the protocol had been formally approved by Council and until February 10, 2006 (2-10-06). The rolling submission period will be followed by a February 24, 2006 Course Review. Additionally, the Council agreed to another rolling submission period to take place post

cycle IV, round I reviews, with a deadline of March 31, 2006. A cycle IV, round II review would follow on April 14, 2006.

gtPathways Calendar for Course Nomination and Reviews
2005-2006

Rolling Submission Deadline	Course Review
Friday February 10, 2006	Friday February 24, 2006 (Cycle IV, Rnd I)
Friday March 31, 2006	Friday April 14, 2006 (Cycle IV, Rnd II)

The next action item discussed was the schedule for GE 25 Council meetings. It was agreed that the next meeting of the GE 25 Council would be on Monday November 7, 2005. This date has since been changed to Monday November 14, 2005, due to a scheduling conflict with the next CCHE Commissioners' meeting, scheduled for November 7, 2005. The Council unanimously agreed to schedule the remaining 2005-2006 meetings in conjunction with the already scheduled AC meetings. Therefore, our one remaining meeting for calendar year 2005 will be scheduled for Monday December 12, 2005 @ 1pm. **Please Note: We can vote at the November 14, 2005 meeting whether or not we would like to meet in December. I do not recall if AC will be meeting**.

The next item the Council discussed was whether or not we should establish two additional advisory committees to the GE 25, one consisting exclusively of faculty, the other of student support service individuals, i.e. Registrars, Admissions personnel and Advisors. The Council unanimously decided in favor of both committees. Specifics concerning the establishment, membership and meeting calendar for these two groups will be addressed at our November 14, 2005 meeting.

The next action item discussed/addressed was a recommendation from UNC's David Caldwell that a new and different category be created specifically for Foreign Language courses within the larger Content Category of Arts and Humanities. The new category would include 2nd year, 200-level foreign language courses and would appear on the Nomination Form as follows:

> Arts
> Literature and Humanities
> Ways of Thinking
> Foreign Languages

(with the appropriate designations). It was agreed that David would work on the official revising of this form and bring it to the next GE 25 Council Meeting on the 14th November for the Council's final review and official approval. On this same subject, it was collectively decided by the Council that at the next meeting on the 14th, an official gtPathways/GE 25 Council approved policy should be written that specifically states that 100 level Foreign Language courses not be nominated for placement into gtPathways curriculum.

The final action item on the day's agenda concerned an interim Fall 2005 review of the CCCS' Integrated Math and Science courses. Vicki informed the Council that she will be working with S. Schneider and other CCCS staff in order to ready the courses for an interim review. Vicki will convene the same groups who reviewed the courses this past July, and hold either an electronic review or in-person review. The review will be completed by the end of this semester, (fall 2005), in order to facilitate the successful implementation of Phase III of the Elementary Education Teacher Education Articulation Agreement. Vicki will give an update of the progress on this interim review at the Council's next meeting on the 14th.

The meeting then moved to discussion items. John Lanning presented the minutes from the work of the Natural and Physical Science Content Committee (NPS), and G. Gianniny also contributed to the presentation of the Content Group's discussion from the (Fac-to-Fac on the14[th]). The NPS responded to the question of the non-traditional lab being used for a gtPathways lab science course this way:

"It is the consensus of the NPS….that 'non-traditional' laboratories are acceptable for science laboratory courses when the laboratory course being reviewed does not apply to science major degree requirements at either a 2-yr or 4-yr college.

As part of the 'non-traditional' laboratory discussion, the NPS …recommends that if CCHE adopts a policy allowing for 'non-traditional' laboratories in science courses, CCHE must alter the NPS nomination form to require the institution to indicate whether the laboratory course submitted (1) has a 'traditional' or 'non-traditional' laboratory and (2) meets any science major requirements, not just in the science department submitting the laboratory course.

….The NPS Content Committee recognizes that 'non-traditional' lab courses may have already been approved for science major courses. The recommendation of the NPS Content Committee is that previous gtPathway approvals for lab science course not be reevaluated.

Further, the NPS decided, by consensus, that on-line courses be allowed for gtPathways core courses under the condition that the course be consistent with NPS content criteria for all lab science courses, whether traditional, non-traditional, or delivered through a distance learning format. It is the intent of the NPS Content Committee that an on-line course not just be a keyboard, simulation experience. It is the intent of the NPS Content Committee that an on-line laboratory course be a hands-on experience beyond simulation before gtPathways approval is granted.

As part of the on-line laboratory discussion, the NPS Content Committee recommends that any on-line lab course undergo the same evaluation criteria as 'non-traditional' lab courses addressed previously, and that the on-line lab course specifically demonstrate that a minimum of 50% of the lab experience be hands on, away from the computer keyboard."

Source: NPS meeting minutes, 18th Annual fac-to-fac, 10-14-05

Alan Lamborn, CSU, recommended that the GE 25 Council accept the NPS recommendations with referral to the new faculty sub-committee of the GE 25. Council further discussed obtaining an official legal opinion concerning the NPS recommendations, as the King Bill specifically states, "regardless of method of delivery…" (specifically concerning on-line labs, etc). Additionally, the Council agreed to review the NPS forms on the 14th of November in light of the Committee's above recommendations.

The Social Science Minutes are attached to these minutes. Please peruse and provide feedback at the November 14th meeting, (which in turn will be reflected in the minutes).

The following recommendations were made as the meeting was winding down:

1. List specific majors that exceed the 120 limit on our CCHE/gtPathways webpage;
2. List the inclusion of the generic/institutional syllabus as an **OPTION** on the nomination form;
3. List a Test Matrix on the website;
4. List the definition of General Education on the website (find it first!)
5. Include copies of "successful syllabi" on the website so that folks have an idea of what syllabi look like for those courses that have been approved for gtPathways.

The following items were tabled to the next meeting:

* The development of a core stamp (will we ever get to this?☹)
* A "Grandfather Policy" for gtPathways/students previously enrolled?
* An official written policy of what to do when institutions wish to change the designation of already approved gtPathways courses or withdraw courses already reviewed.

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY NOVEMBER 14, 2005 @1pm.
_____

Minutes of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Content Committee, Faculty-to-Faculty Conference, 14 October 2005

Members present: Alan Lamborn, Chair; Joan Clinefelter, UNC, secretary; Steve Mazurana, UNC, Earl Hasz, MSCD, Susan Moss, FLC, Irene Vernon, CSU, Scott Thompson, NJC, George Bagwell, CMC, Richard Nishikawa, UCB, Rod Eggert, CSM, Alex Bernasek, CSU, Misty Hull, PPCC, Alison Hagood, ACC, Roger Carver, CCD, Karen Thies-McWilliams, CCD, Susan Calhoun Stuber, CSU-P, Larry Steele, CCA, Wayne Artis, PPCC, Brenda Wilhelm, MSC, James Lindsay, CSU, Tracey Trenam, AIMS, Vicky Bollenbacher, AIMS.

The Committee meeting began at 12:20 pm.

Alan Lamborn, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Studies and Professor of Political Science, Colorado State University, served as Chair of the Committee.

Alan opened the Committee meeting by introducing himself. He then asked for a volunteer to serve as the "scribe" for the Committee. Joan Clinefelter agreed to serve as secretary for the meeting; the Committee agreed. Alan asked the members to introduce themselves. He then presented six questions that the CCHE gtPathways staff asked all of the Content Committees to address. The first was:

(1) Does the Committee have any questions/comments about the Transfer Articulation Agreements?

The members agreed that they were unaware of any formal articulation agreements involving the social/behavioral content area.

(2) Does the committee have any questions/concerns regarding the (60-60) Transfer Guides?

There were a number of questions regarding the 60-60 transfer guides and the relationship between the gtPathways core, the Associates degrees, and individual gtPathways courses. Members from the Community Colleges asked if a class is in the gtPathways core, does it have to transfer, and does it have to transfer to count towards the major. Alan and other members explained that a course in the gtPathways core always transferred into the new institution's core. However, it was noted that each area in the core had a maximum number of credits. Within the credit hour ceilings, gtPathways credits will transfer. If for example, student had six credits of Math gtPathways coursework, but the new institution's core only required 3 credits, then 3 credits would transfer into the core; the remaining credits would count as electives and so would still count towards graduation.

Regarding the question of gtPathways courses being transferred as credits that would count towards a major at the new institution, it was explained that that is for the institution to decide.

Members of the committee then asked if the gtPathways courses had to be at least a C- in order to transfer. Alan noted that it was not clear if CCHE or gtPathways had a policy regarding the minimum grade required for the transfer of an individual course. Committee members observed that some of their schools required the grade of C- for a general education course to be accepted into their core, if the class was taken at the home institution. Others explained that there were schools that accepted general education courses into their core with the grade of D.

The Committee asks for CCHE clarification: Is an institution required to accept the transfer an individual gtPathways course with a grade less than a C-?

Members also asked if there is a process to update the Transfer Guides automatically? Alan explained that the four-year schools have an explicit requirement to update the 60-60 Transfer Guides in a timely manner to alert the community colleges. He noted that the 2-year schools have been diligent in keeping track of the Guides and communicating their needs to the 4-year schools.

However, Alan noted there is no formal CCHE process for updating the Transfer Guides. However, because the CC system intends to keep its core aligned with the gtPathways core, this should not be a problem.

The Committee then asked for clarification regarding the 60-60 agreements. Alan explained that if a student had completed an Associates degree, then the new institution would have to accept the transfer of the degree. In such a case, the Associates degree would satisfy the new institution's core requirements completely. This is in keeping with common practice before the gtPathways was created.

The Committee then asked if a student received Ds for some of the classes taken as part of an AA or AS degree, would the institution be required to accept all of the AA/AS degree as satisfying the core requirements, even if that institution required all core classes to be passed with a grade of C- or better. Most of the Committee believed that the Associates degree would still transfer in its entirety.

The Committee would like clarification from the CCHE on this issue: If there are credits with the grade of D in the Associates degree, is the institution required to accept the degree in its entirety or only those credits that earned a grade of at least a C-?

This led to the question of the transfer of individual credits from the gtPathways with a grade less than C-.

The Committee would like clarification on this issue: Is there a grade requirement for gtPathways credits to transfer? Would an institution be allowed to deny the transfer of a gtPathways course if the student earned less than a C-?

The Committee then discussed the relationship between the gtPathways core and the core requirements of four-year schools. Alan and other Committee members explained that if a student had all of the gtPathways core completed, but did not have an Associates degree, then the student would still be obligated to complete the entire core at the new institution. As a result, a student who completed the 31 credits of the gtPathways core would still have to take as many as 9 credits to complete core requirements unique to that school's General Education program. Committee members noted that this often leads to confusion on the part of the students.

The Committee would like the CCHE to answer this question: Does the gtPathways website makes it clear that completion of the gtPathways core does not guarantee that the student will have completed all of the General Education requirements at a four-year school.

(3) Does your committee have questions or concerns regarding the gtPathways process, procedures, or current status of the curriculum?

Committee members asked if their schools should nominate as many classes as possible to be accepted as part of the gtPathways. Alan and others explained that the schools' contract agreements with the state have a timetable within which they are to have their core classes accepted into the gtPathways. Many members were not aware of this;

many noted that they had not seen their schools' contract agreements. Alan explained that the contract agreements are on the CCHE website. He urged members to find out when their deadlines were. All members were encouraged to nominate as many of their core classes as possible to the gtPathways for the evaluation process that will take place in the spring. Vicki Leal, in an earlier presentation, explained that this meeting will probably take place in February 2006. This would then make it possible for schools to resubmit any courses that are denied in the spring in the Fall 2006 evaluation process.

Alan then explained why there is no course evaluation process for Fall 2005. Due to a number of key, outstanding questions in a number of content areas, it was decided classes would not be reviewed this fall. One of the main reasons for this faculty-to-faculty conference is for the Content Area Committee to resolve these key questions. The CCHE wanted faculty feedback before continuing with the process. In particular, the CCHE staff wants faculty advice to improve the nomination forms so they better reflect the actual requirements of the content areas.

Alan then passed out copies of the new 31-credit gtPathways core. He noted that the Arts and Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences have been combined into one 15 credit category. The also noted that the original language that explained the content requirements with in these 15 credits were unclear and presented a potential nightmare for advisors. The CCEH staff has accepted alternative language which explain the credit requirement more clearly. This new core will go into effect in the fall of 2006.

The Committee then asked what will happen in terms of transferability when the "old" 35-credit gtPathways core is replaced by the new one. Alan expected that students who completed the 35-credit core will be grandfathered in so that their credits will transfer. Committee members noted that this represents a potential problem for advisors and registrars.

The Committee would like to know: Does the CCHE have a policy regarding the "grandfathering" of the 35-credit gtPathways core.

Alan then asked how the Committee felt about re-introducing the idea of a core stamp. The Community Colleges would like to avoid a core stamp because it devalues the Associates degree. The Committee recommends that there not be a core stamp because it would only introduce confusion. If a core stamp is to be revived, it should be done so only for the convenience of the school receiving the credits. If a student transfers with an Associates degree, that satisfies the new institution's entire core requirements. However, if the student does not have an Associates, but has completed the gtPathways core, that student will still have to complete any remaining core requirements at the new institution.

Committee members ask the CCHE the following: May one course be nominated to fulfill two different gtPathways requirements?

(4) The CCHE asked was about the possibility of creating two new advisory groups for the GE-25 Council.

The Committee unanimously agreed that there should be two new advisory groups, one comprised of faculty and the other of academic advising staff. The Committee also unanimously agreed that one representative from each of these new groups should then sit on the GE25 Council.

(5) The Committee was asked about the position of the Committee Chair.

Alan expressed his willingness to continue but also noted that having more faculty with such experience would be beneficial. He also noted that as a vice provost, there was some unease on his part regarding his continuation as chair. The Committee decided that it wanted a co-chair for this year to ease the transition from Alan's leadership and provide continuity. The co-chair would then serve as chair next year. Nominations for the co-chair were then taken. Joan Clinefelter was elected as co-chair of the Committee.

(6) The final CCHE question concerned whether all gtPathways content areas should require a reading competency.

The Committee unanimously agreed that such an idea should be rejected.

The Committee next turned to the key issue for the Content Area: How should the History requirement be explained and treated? Alan and other members noted that although it is described as a History requirement, courses that do not have an HIST prefix MAY be accepted as fulfilling the 3 credits for this area. Matt Gianneschi, CAO of the CCHE had joined the Committee at this point. Some members asked if the gtPathways language could be changed from History to Historical Frameworks. Matt explained that the term "History" was part of the policy and thus had to be used by law.

Alan then introduced for discussion suggested language to be added to the nomination form in order to provide evaluators with guidelines for deciding whether a course fulfilled the History requirement. It was again explained that courses other than History-prefixed courses could be accepted into this requirement. These might include courses in Ethnic Studies, Anthropology or Africana Studies. A motion was made and seconded to approve the following:

Motion to add language to the nomination form for Historical Framework Courses:

"The objective of the requirement that students take a course that provides content knowledge in history is to engage students in an analytical, chronological study of significant, multidimensional human experiences. Courses designed to achieve this objective should develop students':
      1. knowledge of a chronologically structured analysis of significant, multidimensional human experiences;
      2. understanding of the interpretive and analytical methods that are necessary to build chronological accounts of the past;
and
      3. understanding that alternative analytical perspectives can create different 'stories' of the past."

The motion was discussed at length. A motion was made and seconded to amend the language. The amendment was to strike the use of "multidimensional" in the opening paragraph and in #1, and to strike the use of "chronological" in #2.

      The motion passed by a voice vote.

A lengthy discussion then followed regarding the need to insert language regarding the use of primary and secondary sources or specific mention of historiographical methods and theories. Some members felt such language was necessary to preserve the historical nature of the requirement; others noted that such language was too specific to the discipline of History. A motion was made and seconded to amend the language by inserting "(including varied sources)" in #3 between "perspectives" and "can". After discussion, a vote was held to add this language. The amendment failed by a voice vote.

An amendment to replace "stories" in #3 to "narratives" was then made and seconded. After discussion, a vote was held. The amendment passed by a voice vote.

The Committee then voted on the amended motion. The new language follows:

"The objective of the requirement that students take a course that provides content knowledge in history is to engage students in an analytical, chronological study of significant human experiences. Courses designed to achieve this objective should develop students':

      1. knowledge of a chronologically structured analysis of significant human experiences;

      2. understanding of the interpretive and analytical methods that are necessary to build accounts of the past;

And

      3. understanding that alternative analytical perspectives can create different narratives of the past."

The motion passed by a voice vote.

The Committee then addressed the problem posed by the Content Area requirement for a significant writing component. It was noted that this requirement was the leading reason courses in the Content Area were rejected. Alan had consulted with long-time participants of the Content Area evaluation process to get a sense of what the practice has been in deciding if a nominated course had met the requirement for "a significant" writing component. Those he contacted explain that there were three general criteria that guided the evaluators' decisions:

      1. that the writing component had to be graded work.

      2. that short answer questions did not fulfill the requirement. In-class assignments needed to be of a scale at least as large as one has in an essay exam.

2. that the writing assignment(s) had to include writing done outside of the classroom. In-class essay exams were not enough; a piece of polished writing prepared by the students outside of class had to be included.

3. 20-25% of the final grade had to be based on these writing assignments.

It was noted that this requirement posed a burden on those schools who offer large surveys. CSU intends to meet the requirement by adding GTAs to help faculty. Other members noted the burden fell on their shoulders because their administrations did not appear to be willing to add extra staff to handle demand for new "History" classes or the extra writing assignments. The Committee noted, however, that it is not a question of whether the writing will be required but rather how the requirement will be dealt with by their particular institutions.

The Committee then discussed just how the History requirement and the assessment of writing competencies in all the categories of the Content Area should be handled in the next nomination course process. The Committee recommended the next group of faculty who evaluate courses in this content area be informed that past practice has been to define "significant writing" as described in the 3 points above. The Committee also recommended that the next Content Area evaluators consider having designated groups evaluate courses nominated to fulfill the History requirement.

The Committee meeting adjourned at approximately 3:20 pm.