

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

**Board Room
Friday, April 8, 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.theccb.state.tx.us>.

Present: Abraham, Agüero, Arney, Billeaux, Carroll, Day, DeFranco, Eglsaer, Hardin, Hopper, King (proxy Williams), McMillen, O'Neal, Peebles, Redden, Ritchey, Rodriguez, Schonberg, Spencer, Walch, Walter, Williamson

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: Dominique Chavez, Van Davis, Lucy Heston, Allen Michie, Anya Sebastien, MacGregor Stephenson

The meeting was called to order by co-chair Rex Peebles, and new members Ana Maria Rodriguez and Jeremy McMillen were recognized.

I. Approval of Meeting Summary for February 25, 2011 Meeting

The meeting summary was approved.

II. Discussion item: Legislative Update

Dominic Chavez gave an update on the status of higher education bills in the Legislature, including SB 28, HB 1244, HB 9, HB 1, and HB 3025.

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

III. Consideration of Recommendation to Endorse the Preferred Course Offerings for US Government/Political Science

After some discussion about the merits of taking GOVT 2305 and 2306 as the single government sequence and its possible effect on community college and transfer students, it was moved that UEAC make the recommendation as written:

To reduce the number of excess hours taken by students confounded by the different sequences of Government, the Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee recommends the single sequence of GOVT 2301 and GOVT 2302 be deleted.

This recommendation will be sent to the ACGM Committee for consideration.

IV. Consideration of Recommendations Regarding Guidelines for the Selection and Approval of Texas Core Curriculum Courses

The subcommittee charged with finding guidelines submitted their recommendations. The subcommittee discussed, among other questions, how institutions would submit new courses to the Coordinating Board for consideration in the core curriculum, and how the Coordinating Board would approve new courses to the core. These were the recommendations:

- (1) The formal approval structure for the Core Curriculum. A flowchart detailing the steps in the approval process must be provided. Initiating and approving individuals and groups must be identified by function and where appropriate, by office. Evidence of faculty involvement in the process must be presented.
- (2) Criteria used by the institution to determine each of the Core Objectives and Component Area Definitions must be included for all core courses. Course specific evidence of meeting criteria must be made available for Coordinating Board review. (This evidence includes syllabi, student learning outcomes, and other relevant material.)
- (3) A table of courses included in each Foundational Component Area of the Core Curriculum must be provided.
- (4) The institution's plan for the assessment of the Core Objectives must be provided.

Discussion followed on issues of mapping the courses to component areas, the role of common learning outcomes, and the alignment of standards and timelines with those of SACS.

A motion was made, and passed, to consider recommendations. The subcommittee was asked to work on rewording the recommendations over the lunch break, and the following text was moved and approved:

To ensure courses submitted to the CB for inclusion in any institution's Core meet the Core Objectives, institutions must document the following:

- (1) The formal approval structure for the Core. A flowchart detailing the steps in the approval process must be provided. Initiating and approving individuals and groups

must be identified by function and where appropriate, by office. Evidence of faculty involvement in the process must be presented.

(2) Criteria used by the institution to determine that each of the Core Objectives and Component Area Definitions must be included for all core courses. Course specific evidence of meeting criteria must be made available for CB review. (This evidence includes syllabi, student learning outcomes, and other relevant material.)

(3) A table of courses included in each Foundational Component Area of the Core must be provided.

(4) The institution's plan for the assessment of the Core Objectives must be provided.

V. Consideration of Recommendations Regarding the Report on Revising the Texas Core Curriculum

There was discussion of the role of core curriculum courses in major programs. Students transferring from community colleges to universities would therefore need to take additional courses, some students would be "double dipping" in their degree requirements, and there are issues with the 120-hour limit. MacGregor Stephenson pointed out that highly specialized courses in the core curriculum exacerbate the problem of having too many courses, increase discontinuity in the core, and are unfair to community colleges which are limited to offering core courses that are in the Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM).

It was moved and seconded that UEAC make this recommendation to the ACGM committee: "All lower-division courses in an institution's core curriculum would automatically be in the academic course guide manual."

Discussion followed about how new core course approvals would be made, whether they would be automatically funded, and whether institutions or the Coordinating Board would be setting the standards to meet SACS requirements. MacGregor Stephenson clarified that the role of the Coordinating Board is to check for unnecessary duplication, overlap, and gaps in core courses.

The motion failed.

A second motion was made for this recommendation from UEAC to the Coordinating Board: "All lower-division courses included in an institution's core are to be funded by the Coordinating Board."

It was clarified that this motion refers to both unique need courses and those included in the ACGM, and that this would involve a change in Coordinating Board rules. Discussion followed about how, and if, unique courses that vary in content would be transferrable across institutions by virtue of being in the ACGM.

The motion failed by not reaching a majority. There were nine approvals, nine oppositions, and three abstentions.

A motion was made to approve the Report on Revising the Texas Core Curriculum, with the change of "desirable" to "possible" on pg. 20. The motion carried.

MacGregor thanked the committee for their two years of difficult work on the report. The report, along with staff recommendations, will be sent to the Commissioner outlining recommendations for changing Chapter 4 Subchapter B rules. If approved by the Commissioner, the rule changes will be posted for public comment for thirty days. They will then be voted on by the Strategic Planning and Policy committee on September 20, 2011, and then by the full Coordinating Board on October 27, 2011.

VI. Interim Assignments and Next Meeting Date

Members stated that issues to be addressed in future meetings could include advising, degree audits, discipline areas with problems for transfer, transfer compacts and recommendations based upon new provisions in HB 2035, course eligibility for the core curriculum, the review of existing programs, and increasing awareness of the purpose and philosophy of the core.

A subcommittee was established to recommend benchmarks of evaluation to the Coordinating Board for the review of existing programs. Members of the subcommittee are Larry Abraham, Dick Eglsaer, Joyce Ritchie, Mark Smith, Terry Walch, and Celia Williamson.

No date was set for the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 PM.