

**GE 25 Council**  
**March 2008 meeting**  
**March 10, 2008**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Meeting Attendees:**

R. "Nish" Nishikawa, CU-B; John Sowell, WSC, Cathy Barkley, MSC (phoned in); Wayne Artis, PPCC; Alan Lamborn, CSU-FC; Richard Wagner, MSCD, Cristina Martinez, MSCD; Geri Anderson, CCCS; Kathleen Bollard, CU system; Tom Smith, UNC; John Lanning, UCDHSC; Roger Carver, CCD, Russ Meyer, CSU-P, Jeff Reynolds, AIMS; Tom Christensen, UCCS; Michael Mumper, ASC.

**INFORMATION ITEMS:**

**Website Update** - gtPathways web page updates and information: Vicki shared that the website is up-to-date, with the exception of the Feb 29<sup>th</sup> courses, which will go to the Commission for formal approval at their April 4, 2008 meeting, (after which time they will be posted at the DHE/gtPathways website). Cristina extended a very nice compliment to the gtPathways staff and their efforts to bring the webpage up-to-date, in terms of corrections.

**CO3 Update** - Vicki also pointed out that CO3 content/competency criteria were posted at the site, as was a revised Nomination Form (including the CO3 content/competency criteria). PLEASE NOTE that the CO3 courses approved on Feb 29<sup>th</sup> will not be posted until after the April 4, 2008 Commission meeting.

**gtPathways Review Cycle VI, Round II Update** - Vicki provided a summary of the gtPathways Review Cycle VI, Round II:

AHUM – 7 courses recommended; 2 deferred;  
COMMUNICATION – 1 recommended; 8 deferred;  
Natural/Physical Science – 5 recommended; 0 deferred;  
Social/Behavioral Science – 7 recommended; 6 deferred;  
NO MATH DURING THIS REVIEW

Individual institutions' course listings/status were email on Friday March 14, 2008.

**SCI and SC2 Update** - It was decided that Vicki would send out John's work on the SC1 and SC2 listings for review to all institutions. They will respond electronically so that Vicki and staff can proceed with any corrections that need to be made to the Natural/Physical Science listings.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

CAP4K (competency-based curriculum spanning K-12/post-secondary) – Comments about draft legislation:

We had a very candid conversation about CAP4K in GE 25 Council on Monday, (3/10/08). In a nutshell, here is a summary of the comments:

- The Assessment aspect of the legislation appears piecemeal; the reporting is prescriptive and convoluted and has no conductor, (specific person/organization/aspect) that gives the legislation order/oversight in its attempts at making seamless the transitions between K-12/Post-secondary;
- The members of GE 25 wondered aloud if the legislation would actually result in measureable improvement, (and mentioned that in other states, i.e. Oregon, Ohio and Indiana the attempts had had a negligible impact on access/success/increased participation and graduation at the post-secondary level).
- Many GE 25 members believed that most aspects of the legislation lacked the SMART model (as it applies to goal-setting within the context of strategic planning), but that could also be applied to legislation. They did not believe that the goals of the legislation were Specific, Measureable, Achievable;
- They all believed the timeline for implementation (included within the legislation) was unrealistic;
- They question the use of the terminology of the legislation, (content standards vs. skills);
- They were concerned with the responsibilities assigned to both the DHE and the CDE and wondered about the fiscal implications;
- They also wondered about the ease with which post-secondary faculty would be able/willing to convene with K-12 faculty, (and noted the difficulty we've had at times recruiting faculty for the gtPathways course reviews);
- They found the assessment as mentioned in the legislation inadequate, (and wondered aloud how you could concurrently develop/revise content standards and assessments);
- They also were perplexed by the idea of assessing pre-schoolers and wondered how or if it had ever been done;
- They found a few aspects of the legislation to be agreeable; however, they believe it would be best to start with a conversation between various stakeholders and others involved in P-20 efforts to come up with ideas on assessment and alignment of the state's model content standards, (as a preliminary first step of incremental legislation).

Finally, I understand that this legislation has been spoken of simultaneously with the work, to date, of the GE 25 Council and the gtPathways program, (a program of course selection for the state's set of general education courses guaranteed to transfer). It should be noted that this program selects courses based on a set of content and competency criteria that is specific to one of five discipline/content areas and includes various competencies, i.e. critical thinking, reading, writing, technology and mathematical reasoning. The work of the Council has spanned 7 years, (including 2 years of preliminary planning and 5 of ongoing course reviews). We have not, to date, been able to coalesce around test-out options, (though the King Bill/legislation requires "we" do). Also, it is not high stakes, in terms of graduation requirements, etc.

***Please note that these comments were shared with Dr. Julie Carnahan, CAO, DHE, so that she could add them to a memo that went to David Skaggs, concerning the CAP4K legislation.***

Advising Issues: The Council discussed various advising issues, including transferability versus applicability and within the context of this discussion talked about the Statewide Articulation Agreements (and possible re-calibration of such), and also the Transfer Guides, (currently linked to the gtPathways website but in most cases, out-of-date).

Prior to sending out a memo to members for GE 25 that respectfully requests that their respective Transfer Guide be updated, Wayne and John (with the assistance of GE 25 members), agreed to first figure out what needs to be in the Transfer Guides and how they should be conceptualized and re-posted, (updated), at the gtPathways website. Thus, we will take this up at April's meeting (with assistance from Wayne/John). All agreed upon this course of action.

Also, Vicki agreed to meet with Geri and CCCS advisors in order to discuss various advising issues.

It was also agreed that an overall review of the Statewide Articulation Agreements would begin, first with the Engineering agreement, (as there have been questions about transfer and applicability of courses as listed in the agreement). It was further agreed that the meetings would include associate deans (and others) who have the authority to work on possibly changing policy within the agreements. Vicki suggested that a change be made immediately, suggesting that students successfully complete courses contained within the agreements at the level of at least a B or better, (in order for the completed coursework to actually transfer and be APPLIED to the major delivered at the receiving institution).

Vicki shared information regarding advising presentations she's recently given. She also mentioned that sometime in April she would be visiting Pueblo and Greeley in order to conduct at least 2 statewide gtPathways information sessions. She said she would notify members of GE 25 when she settles on an exact date.

Vicki also recommended that perhaps we could re-fashion the purpose and goal of the 2008 faculty to faculty conference so that it is more accommodating of advising issues within the state. She suggested that we invite ½ advisors and ½ faculty and frame the discussion more around advising and transfer/articulation, (with strategically invited faculty members who are either heavily involved in the advising of their respective institution or who may be familiar with articulation agreements, etc.) GE 25 was supportive of this idea for the 2008 conference and told

Vicki to proceed. **The date for next year's conference is Friday October 10, 2008.**

**ACTION ITEM:**

1. Proposed changes to AHUM content criteria (see hand-out)-DEFERRED TO APRIL MTG.
2. Advising Meeting Reports (W. Artis and J. Lanning)-DEFERRED TO APRIL MTG.
3. gtPathways Spring Reviews ([late] April 2008 gtPathways Review Cycle VI, Round III (Should we schedule this or wait until Fall, 2008?)) STATUS – It was decided that WE WOULD NOT HAVE AN APRIL 2008 REVIEW. Instead, the Council decided to post

a deadline for submissions for a fall 2008 review: October 3, 2008, with logistics of the actual review TBD, (i.e. electronic, etc.). Various formats for the Fall 2008 gtPathways review will be discussed over the next several months.

4. AHUM co-chair resignation/4 year (we need a replacement from the 4 year sector)-  
DEFERRED TO APRIL MTG.
5. NOTE: Geri's IB question will be deferred to the April meeting, in the interim, Vicki will review statute.

Meeting adjourned.

**Next meeting will be April 7, 2008.**