

**GE 25 Council**  
**September 12, 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), John Cooney (CU System), Michel Dahlin (CU System), Barbara Montgomery (CSU-P, by phone), Alan Lamborn (CSU), John Sowell (WSC), Carol Futhey (MSC), Richard Nishikawa (CU-B), Lana Carter (Pueblo-CC).

***Meeting started at 1:00pm; Barbara Montgomery phoned in from CSU-P.***

Meeting began with a very lengthy discussion of Agenda Discussion items I a., concerning changes to the Content course criteria for Math and Communication and facilitated by Gary Gianniny, FLC, who was bringing forward recommendations on behalf of FLC/S. Roderick. Although the recommendations were spurred by the changes taking place at FLC, (and including several upper division applied writing courses they have – in lieu of the intermediate “writing” course), the recommended revisions to the Communication Course Criteria encouraged additional discussion about the specific differentiation between the entry level writing (Communication) courses versus the intermediate courses. The Council agreed that the distinguishing elements were really quite ambiguous and questioned how the actual criteria for both were arrived at by the Communication Committee. There was brief discussion about the handful of applied writing classes that had been recommended for placement into the Pathways curriculum, specifically UNC’s Scientific Writing, 200 level course. The question was also posed concerning how many total applied writing courses have actually been reviewed. Barbara Montgomery cautioned the Council not to open a Pandora’s Box by reinventing the wheel or discouraging the unique qualities that serve to differentiate the various post-secondary institutions within the state of Colorado. Still others mentioned the “other” issue of applied mathematics courses, and that some of those courses (w/o the Math prefix), had also been reviewed and successfully approved for placement into the gtPathways curriculum. After some discussion, the final decisions were to defer further discussion on distinguishing criteria between the beginning and intermediate Communication (writing courses) to the Faculty-to-Faculty Conference and specifically to afternoon discussion in work groups (in this case the writing/Comm group). Additionally, Gary’s recommendation for revising the Content: Communication criteria accordingly: “Disciplines Included: Writing courses or courses from any discipline meeting the above criteria in which the primary focus is writing”, will be shared as an information item on 9-13-05 with the Academic Council. Gary also recommended changes to the Math Course Criteria, and a similar discussion took place about the applied courses that have been nominated, reviewed and recommended for placement into the gtPathways curriculum but that DO NOT carry the specific Math prefix. Discussion ensued concerning how the various committees review courses for placement into the Pathways curriculum and whether or not they actually respond to both the nomination form and the syllabus or just the syllabus. Several of the meeting attendees mentioned that the review committees should be given a specific

charge at the beginning of the review sessions so that editorializing and decisions that lie outside of the purview of the review committees' responsibilities could be minimized. Gary's recommended revising the Content: Mathematics criteria accordingly: "Criteria for Designating a Course as State Guaranteed in mathematics." (Mathematics was stricken from the criteria), and "Maximum number of credits in mathematics that will be guaranteed to transfer will be 1 course (or an integrated set of courses) ranging from 3-5 credits". Test is that the course must meet all stated criteria. Disciplines include: Mathematics (or courses from other disciplines meeting the above criteria)..." The revisions were shared as an information item on 9-13-05 with the Academic Council.

We next moved to a discussion concerning the clarification of the mission/role of the GE 25 Council, (with regard to the gtPathways process and curriculum, including consideration of the signed performance contracts and the actual legislation (Agenda Item I. b.)) There was discussion about the history of the Council and John Lanning and Lana Carter gave their perspectives. Additionally, Council members discussed the original composition of the Council and how it has changed over the course of the past few years. Council members also reiterated earlier questions they had concerning the role/function of the Council relative to the role/function of Academic Council, (especially, many pointed out), concerning the overlap in representation/membership that the GE 25 has with Academic Council. The GE 25 was also mentioned concerning its prominent inclusion in the Performance Contracts, as the primary body that establishes, maintains and facilitates all processes and procedures that govern the gtPathways process. GE 25 has statutory authority,. Processes, procedures, guidelines, etc. concerning the gtPathways are decided on by GE 25 and presented to Academic Council as Information Items and in a spirit of collaboration and discussion that fosters collaborative, mutually supportive agreement on decisions concerning the gtPathways program/curriculum. Please refer to the attached documentation on C.R.S. 21-1-108.5. Duties and powers of the commission with regard to common course number system – repeal. (specifically (3)(c)(II), concerning the GE 25 Council's role)

The Council agreed to table Agenda Discussion Items C and D to our next meeting on October 17, 2005.

Agenda Item I. Discussion Items e. Should the content course criteria concerning competencies be reconsidered in light of extra large enrollment numbers in some of the general education courses at the larger state institutions? Was tabled and instead deferred to the Faculty-to-Faculty conference to be held on Oct. 14, 2005. However, A. Lamborn did state that CSU was working to address this issue and was examining how the large classes could be accommodated so that a writing competency was included in the coursework/syllabus requirements.

Council members decided that Agenda Discussion Item I. f. Can a non-traditional lab be used for a gtPathways laboratory science course? Should be placed on the Faculty-to-Faculty Conference Agenda, but cautioned that the verbiage on the CCHE website, (that stipulates that the lab be a "classroom-based lab class") was not correct. They encouraged a more thorough review of the King Bill with regard to this specific issue and

also stated that articulation agreements don't stipulate the type of delivery for the instruction of the lab, nor are the on-line courses transcribed any differently.

Discussion Item I. g. concerning how changes to courses *after they've been formally reviewed and recommended for placement into the gtPathways curriculum* will be handled was discussed. Some Council members suggested that a sub-committee of GE 25ers could review the requests and make rulings/judgments. This item needs to be discussed further in GE 25 Council, (perhaps at the Oct 17<sup>th</sup> meeting), as no specific decision was made. Additionally, Council members must review and agree upon the new gtPathways Protocol and other logistical issues concerning the Pathways process prior to deciding on this agenda item.

In discussing Agenda Discussion Item I. h, "When Math and Science courses have been taken online should the credit still count toward completion of requirements per the Articulation Agreements? (Specifically Engineering and Math/Science @ CSM)? Council members decided, and the CCHE website appears to reinforce, that schools maintain the prerogative to require additional classes if the students are determined to have deficiencies in specific, major-related areas, such as Math/Science. We could also possibly pose this discussion question to the appropriate content group at the Fac-to-Fac, and of course, consult statute. (King Bill)

Agenda Discussion Items i. and j. were successfully tabled to our next or other future meetings.

The Information Items were shared with the Council members, including the upcoming date in October for the Faculty-to-Faculty conference, (OCT 14). A draft of the gtPathways Newsletter, The Transfer Times, was promised (for perhaps the Oct. 17<sup>th</sup> meeting). The MAA Committee on Articulation and Placement (Information Request) was tabled and will be referred to the Math Committee at the Fac-to-Fac on the 14<sup>th</sup>/Oct. Finally, under Information Items, the Council members reviewed the Internal Policy for the proper labeling of courses that have not been recommended/guaranteed for transfer or placement into the gtPathways curriculum. A brief discussion ensued concerning how it is that the courses previously not recommended were labeled "sub-standard", and a few words were shared concerning the media's handling of the whole gtPathways process and how the various administration/faculty have responded to the handling of the process. The booklets entitled "The Hollow Core: Failure of the General Education Curriculum", and "Becoming An Educated Person: Toward a Core Curriculum for College Students" were discussed and extra copies were given to all Council members. Council members agreed that it was best to consult their respective performance contracts but that ultimately a course should only be designated as "not guaranteed for transfer" AFTER IT HAS BEEN NOMINATED/RENOMINATED A TOTAL OF THREE TIMES. Still, some Council members indicated that three times didn't make sense and that it hadn't been agreed/decided upon by GE 25. The 3-Review/Re-review Policy is effective beginning with our next review, probably in Feb 2006.

Action Item a. was postponed pending the review of and agreement on the gtPathways Protocol, Nomination Forms, Content Course Criteria, Evaluation Forms and other issues that the GE 25 Council members continue to have concerning the gtPathways Process and Procedures. The GE 25 will continue electronic discussions concerning forms, while other issues of concern regarding the gtPathways process will be placed on the Content Committees' Discussion Agendas at the Oct. 14 Fac-toFac.

It was decided that both the gtPathways 05-06 Calendar and the GE 25 Council's schedule of meetings will be decided (hopefully for sure), at the Oct. 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Action Item d. was deferred to the working/Content Discussion Agenda for the Math Committee at the Faculty-to-Faculty conference on Oct 14<sup>th</sup>, but not before it was decided by the Council that courses that weren't formally reviewed should not be automatically placed into the Pathways curriculum, (in spite of what earlier content committees might have decided). Council members believed doing so would establish a dangerous precedent and potentially open a Pandora's Box that could not easily or quickly be contained/closed.

Action Items E and F, it was agreed, would be sent to Council members for electronic review/comments and will be emailed with these meeting minutes in an effort to collectively come to agreement on all gtPathways Forms, Processes and Procedures, so that reviews can be formally scheduled.

Action Items g. and h. were presented to Academic Council on September 13, 2005 as information items and are provided below. They will probably be placed on the Oct 14<sup>th</sup> Fac-to-Fac Agenda as information and possibly discussion items, (if there are no objections to doing so from members of GE 25).

September 13, 2005

### **New Structure of GT-Pathways Curriculum**

#### **Credits**

#### **Categories**

6                      Communication: 1 Intro. Writing course (3 semester credits)  
                             Communication: 1 Intermediate Composition (3 semester credits)

3                      Mathematics: 1 course (3 to 5 semester credits)

15                     Arts and Humanities & Social and Behavioral Sciences

*Arts and Humanities*

Fine Arts and Expression

Humanities

Ways of Thinking

*Select at least 2 courses with no more than 2 courses from any 1 category*

*Social and Behavioral Sciences*

History (Required)

Economic and Political Systems  
 Geography  
 Human Behavior and Social Systems

*Select at least 2 courses, 1 of which must be history, with no more than 2 courses from any 1 category.*

7

Physical and Life Sciences:

*Select 2 courses, 1 of which must have a laboratory component*

---

**Possible alternative approach to guarantee  
 15 credits in Arts and Humanities, History, & Social and Behavioral Sciences**

*Arts and Humanities* – Two courses (minimum 3 credits each)

Fine Arts and Expression (GT-AH1)  
 Literature and Humanities (GT-AH-2)  
 Ways of Thinking (GT-AH3)

*History* – One course (minimum 3 credits) (GT-HI1)

*Social and Behavioral Sciences* – One course (minimum 3 credits)

Economic and Political Systems (GT-SS1)  
 Geography (GT-SS2)  
 Human Behavior, Culture, and Social Frameworks (Gt-SS-2)

*If necessary to reach a minimum of 15 credits, select 1 additional course (minimum 3 credits) in Arts and Humanities, History, or Social and Behavioral Sciences.*

---

**CONTENT: SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**General Education**  
 “Guaranteed Transfer” Course Criteria

**State-level Goal:**

Collectively, the general education requirements in social sciences are designed to help students acquire a broad foundation in social science knowledge and ability to apply this understanding to contemporary problems and issues. Specifically the social science requirement helps students:

- Gain insight into the methods of social sciences,
- Understand historical and social frameworks,
- Understand how individuals relate to the social world, past and present.

**Criteria for Designating a Social Science Course as State Guaranteed:**

The content of a “state guaranteed” social science course shall be designed to:

1. Provide **content knowledge** in one of the following areas:

- a) Historical frameworks exploring important aspects of US culture, society, politics, economics or its position in the world; or historical frameworks that explore and compare achievements, issues, and characteristics of the world and its different cultures, **(HI-1)**

OR

- b) Understanding of contemporary economic or political issues, **(SS-1)**

OR

- c) Understanding how geography creates a sense of identity, shapes a culture and influences the economics of a region, **(SS-2)**

OR

- d) Knowledge of human behavior, including learning, cognition, and human development; or cultural or social frameworks that explore and compare achievements, issues, and characteristics of the world and its different cultures. **(SS-3)**

2. Ability to use the social sciences to analyze and interpret issues.

3. Understand diverse perspectives and groups.

AND

4. Competency in Critical Thinking

5. Competency in Written Communication or Technology.

Maximum number of credits in social sciences that will be guaranteed to transfer 9 credits, one History course plus 2 courses addressing a different knowledge area criterion (1 b –d).

**Suggested Disciplines Include:**

Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology

Revised 9-13-05

**NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: To take place the Monday after the October 14<sup>th</sup> Faculty-to-Faculty Conference, (AND NOT IN SEQUENCE WITH AC).**

**Monday October 17, 2005**

**CCHE Conference Room B**

**1:00pm**

**I. 23-1-108.5. Duties and powers of the commission with regard to common course numbering system - repeal.**

(1) The general assembly hereby finds that, for many students, the ability to transfer among all state-supported institutions of higher education is critical to their success in achieving a degree. The general assembly further finds that it is necessary for the state to have sound transfer policies that provide the broadest and simplest mechanisms feasible, while protecting the academic quality of the institutions of higher education and their undergraduate degree programs. The general assembly finds, therefore, that it is in the best interests of the state for the commission to oversee the adoption of a statewide articulation matrix system of course numbering for general education courses that includes all state-supported institutions of higher education and that will ensure that the quality of and requirements that pertain to general education courses are comparable and transferable systemwide.

(2) As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Council" means the council convened pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (3) of this section.

(b) "Course numbering system" means the statewide articulation matrix system of common course numbering for general education courses adopted by the commission pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection (3) of this section.

(c) "General education courses" means the group of courses offered by an institution of higher education that every student enrolled in the institution must successfully complete to attain an associate's or bachelor's degree.

(d) "Higher education institution" means a state-supported institution of higher education.

(3) (a) On or before July 1, 2001, the commission shall convene a council consisting of representatives from each of the higher education governing boards, each of the four-year higher education institutions, and a representative sample of the two-year higher education institutions; a representative of students enrolled in state-supported state colleges, a representative of students enrolled in state-supported community colleges, and a representative of students enrolled in state-supported universities; and a representative of the commission.

(b) The council shall recommend to the commission a statewide articulation matrix system of common course numbering to which the general education courses for each higher education institution may be mapped.

(c) (I) On or before October 1, 2002, the council shall recommend to the commission a list of general education courses to be included in the course numbering system. In identifying said general education courses, the council shall review the course descriptions, and may request summaries of course syllabi for review, focusing first on lower division general education courses. The commission shall review the council's recommendations and adopt a statewide articulation matrix system of common course

numbering for general education courses, including criteria for such courses, on or before January 1, 2003.

(II) The council shall annually review the list of general education courses and the course numbering system, including the criteria, adopted by the commission and recommend such changes as may be necessary to maintain the accuracy and integrity of the course numbering system. The council's annual review shall include consideration of the course descriptions, and the council may request summaries of course syllabi for further review.

(d) Repealed.

(e) This subsection (3) is repealed, effective July 1, 2011.

(4) (a) Following adoption of the course numbering system, each higher education institution shall review its course offerings and identify those general education courses offered by the institution that correspond with the courses included in the course numbering system. The higher education institution shall submit its list of identified courses, including course descriptions and, upon request of the commission, summaries of course syllabi, for review and approval by the commission on or before March 1, 2003, for inclusion in the higher education institution's fall 2003 course catalogue.

(b) Beginning with the fall semester of 2003, each higher education institution shall publish, and update as necessary, a list of course offerings that identifies those general education courses offered by the institution that correspond with the courses included in the course numbering system.

(5) All credits earned by a student in any general education course identified as corresponding with a course included in the course numbering system shall be automatically transferable among all higher education institutions upon transfer and enrollment of the student. All higher education institutions in Colorado shall participate in the course numbering system. The commission shall adopt such policies and guidelines as may be necessary for the implementation of this section. Each governing board shall modify its existing policies as may be necessary to accept the transfer of these credits.

(6) (a) The council shall devise and recommend to the commission procedures for exchanging information to document students' success in transferring among higher education institutions. The commission shall adopt and implement such procedures.

(b) The commission, in consultation with the governing boards and the higher education institutions, shall design and implement a statewide database to implement the provisions of this section.

(7) The commission may accept any public or private gifts, grants, or donations given for the purpose of implementing this section. Any such gifts, grants, or donations shall be credited to the course numbering fund, which fund is hereby created in the state treasury. Moneys credited to the fund are hereby continuously appropriated to the commission for use in offsetting the costs incurred by the commission in implementing this section and for allocation to the governing boards to offset the costs incurred by the governing boards in implementing this section. All interest derived from the deposit and investment of

moneys in the course numbering fund shall be credited to said fund. Any amount remaining in the course numbering fund at the end of any fiscal year shall remain in said fund and shall not be credited or transferred to the general fund or to any other fund.