

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
1200 E. Anderson Lane, Austin, TX**

**Board Room
Friday, February 25, 2011
10:00 a.m.**

Meeting Summary

Note: Presentations and full-committee discussion portions of this meeting were webcast. Breakout working groups convened during the meeting were not webcast. Webcast available at <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us> .

Present: Abraham, Agüero (proxy Fabianke), Arney, Billeaux, Carroll, Day, DeFranco, Eglsaer, Hardin, Hopper, King, O'Neal, Peebles, Redden, Ritchey, Schonberg, Smith, Solis, Walch, Walter, Williamson

Absent: Agüero

Guests: Loraine Phillips (TAMU), Danita McAnally (Amarillo College), Oscar Hernandez (STC), Neal Armstrong (UT), David Roach (TTU), Jennifer Morgan (UT), Kristin Harper (TAMU), Joe Pettibon (TAMU), Roberta Rincon (UT System)

THECB Staff: Catherine Parsonneault, Lucy Heston, MacGregor Stephenson, Anya Sebastien, Van Davis, Janet Beinke

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Rex Peebles. New members were welcomed and recognized. The Meeting Summary for the December 3, 2010 meeting was approved.

The Commissioner gave an update on the Legislative session and THECB budget recommendations.

Dr. Van Davis outlined the possible changes to Distance Education course notification procedures. He asked members for feedback to streamline approval process. He also outlined new Department of Education guidelines and that THECB is still determining Texas policy in relation to out-of-state requests.

The three workgroups outlined the additional recommendations for Core Curriculum changes in response to the six questions posed at the end of the February 25, 2011 meeting.

Work Group 1 (O'Neal, Schonberg, Hopper, Lowery-Hart, Swain, Phillips) presented their discussions regarding unique needs courses and their place in the core curriculum. MOTION: Unique needs courses should not be included of the core curriculum. The motion was approved.

Work Group 2 (Day, Williamson, Carroll, Eglsaer, DeFranco, Arney, McAnally) presented their discussions regarding the maximum number of hours for any institution's core curriculum. To align with current statute and policy, the workgroup recommended that core be a maximum of 42 SCH. The committee wanted to emphasize the importance of careful advising and other measures that facilitate transferability and applicability of courses for the major and core requirements. MOTION: The Core Curriculum should be limited to 42 SCH with Board approval for any institution requesting a core over 42 SCH from the Coordinating Board. The motion was approved.

Work Group 3 (Smith, Ritchey, Hardin, Peebles) presented their discussions regarding the practice of allowing institutions to award academic associate degrees with a field of study or transfer compact agreement without core completion. The work group reminded members that this policy does not relieve a transfer student of the requirements to complete the core for a bachelor's degree. MOTION: Retain the practice of allowing institutions to award academic associate degrees with a field of study or transfer compact agreement without core completion. The motion was approved.

Work Group 1 presented their discussions regarding a limit to the number of courses an institution may submit for approval for inclusion in the core curriculum. Work group members explained that institutions should self-limit based on available resources and faculty requirements determined by SACS guidelines. The work group proposed that institutions with large populations would need more courses to meet the needs of the students' core requirements. However, MacGregor Stephenson presented data from Texas Core Web Center showing a wide range in the number of courses in similar component areas at each institution. There is little correlation to the enrollment to the number of courses offered. Institutions do not seem to be limiting the number of courses currently. Members agreed that institutions should carefully regulate the approval of core courses. If the institutions do not regulate their core, then the process can be reviewed and strengthened. A substitute motion was presented to table the motion until the process procedures are considered. The motioned failed (7 yay, 12 nay). MOTION: Institutions should not be limited to a specific number of courses an institution may submit for approval. The original motion was approved.

Workgroup 2 presented their discussions regarding the process for selection and approval of core curriculum courses. The workgroup recommended that institutions should develop a faculty-based approval process for institution approval before sending to the THECB for final approval. The mechanism and guidelines for course approval should be the same for all institutions. Some UEAC members would like the option to offer courses not in the ACGM if the faculty have appropriate credentials and the authority to teach at that curriculum level. Institutions are responsible for maintaining the appropriate level of achievement for each core objective. Members also recommended faculty use AAC&U VALUE rubrics as guidelines for core objective assessment. Larry Abraham offered to share UT's information regarding their course selection process. Members agreed submissions to THECB should include mapping of core objectives, direct assessment measures and other strategies for assessment. MOTION: Once approved by the institution, the courses and supporting documentation, the criteria by which they were approved, and the process in which they are approved are forwarded to the THECB for final approval. The motion was approved.

A small group was charged with determining the necessary supporting documentation and criteria for approval. This group was asked to consider the possibility of including non-ACGM courses in Community College core curricula.

Workgroup 3 presented their discussions regarding recommended core curriculum courses in general disciplinary tracks. Members commended that there are too many variations, especially in STEM fields. An online statewide degree audit system would be preferable. In the meantime, specific core course requirements should be considered when developing transfer articulation agreements. MOTION: Instead of general area tracks, the direction should be toward statewide articulation agreements that all institutions will follow. The motion was approved.

The co-chairs noted the next meeting on April 8, 2011 with a tentative meeting planned for June 10, 2011. Based on the UEAC report and the Commissioner's recommendations, rule changes will be considered at the October Board meeting

The co-chairs assigned interim assignments for small workgroups regarding:

1. Develop recommendation to solve Government/Political Science sequence issues (Redden, Ritchey, Walter, Peebles)
2. Develop recommendations for selection and approval of core courses (Abraham, King, Walch, Rex, McAnally, O'Neal)
3. Finalize draft of report and include recommendations from February meeting (King, Schonberg, Billeaux, DeFranco, Phillips, McAnally)

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.