

TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

**Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual Advisory Committee**  
**THECB Building, 1200 E. Anderson Lane**  
**Board Room**  
**Austin, Texas**

**May 2, 2016**  
**Minutes**

There were 14 members present. Members attending were:

Genevieve DeCesaro	Gary Don Harkey	Celia Williamson
Walle Engedayehu	G. G. Hunt	Clay White
Janice Epstein	John Jackson	Daniel Wright
Susan Gann	Shelby Stanfield	Tammy Wyatt
Edgar Garza	Deborah Vess	

Members absent were Nancy Curé, Michael Endy and William Fleming.

John Spencer attended as ex officio member representing the Texas Common Course Numbering System (TCCNS).

THECB Staff attending were Rebecca Leslie, James Goeman, Stacey Silverman, Rex Peebles, and Pam Rogers.

Recognized guests were Ann Bragdon and Tim Sullivan.

The meeting was called to order. Co-chair Edgar Garza made general announcements for the meeting. Co-chair Janice Epstein directed the committee to Agenda Item Two, Consideration of Minutes from the November 13, 2015 meeting. She called for a motion to accept the minutes. A motion was made and seconded to accept the minute as amended (Williamson and White). The minutes were approved.

Co-chair Garza called on Rebecca Leslie for an update on various issues and activities related to the ACGM, Agenda Item Three. Rebecca said that dance and music will be the focus of the Learning Outcomes Project this year. The Fine Arts and Education subcommittee recommended at the March 2015 meeting that a faculty group be convened to provide input about the lack of consistency and patterns for dance course offerings. Additionally, some institutional interest was expressed at the November meeting about the scheduled deletion of some dance courses. In response to the subcommittee's recommendation plans went forward to include dance in the project this year. Music is another discipline with many iterations of courses covering similar topics without differentiation of learning outcomes so music will also be part of the project. Nomination of workgroup members have been received and members for the groups chosen. Syllabi collection and review is one activity for the groups before the face to face meeting.

Rebecca noted that Rex Peebles was expected to join the committee meeting for discussion of the Field of Study Curricula but had been delayed. Rebecca introduced Pam Rogers as new staff at the Coordinating Board. Pam will be working with the Field of Study curriculum committees.

Moving to the final topic of Agenda Item Three, Rebecca referred the committee to their packet of information about rules for changes to the ACGM specifically course deletions. The rules provide guidance for the comprehensive review of courses that the committee has done for the last two years. The rules require the committee to review courses offered by three or fewer community colleges. For a course to be included in the ACGM it must be accepted and applied to the major required of bachelor's degrees at five universities. These are the parameter used to review courses. The review and appeals process are new to institutions. The rules were changed in 2011 and the comprehensive review process began in 2014 so institutions' adjustment to the scheduled deletion is evolving. James Goeman spoke to the review of courses prior to 2014. Review was by discipline and sporadic with only a few courses scheduled for deletion. The replacement of the discipline by discipline approach by the comprehensive review was made possible by the committee's hard work and the reported data analysis. The comprehensive approach has reveal some problematic areas with a proliferation of courses which dilute enrollments and make it difficult to identify transfer patterns. James expects that the number of courses which will meet the criteria in rules for consideration of deletion will decline as the majority of very obviously underutilized courses have been dealt within the last two review cycles. For a visual of the work the committee has done, Rebecca referred the committee to a spreadsheet of courses scheduled for deletion. There are approximately 300 courses which have been scheduled for deletion. Included among the courses are recommended deletions submitted by the Learning Outcomes faculty workgroups.

Without having any questions posed in regard to the update of activities Co-chair Epstein directed the committee to Agenda Item Four, Discussion and consideration of Houston Community College's appeal of the deletion of ANTH 2101 Physical Anthropology (Lab). Appeal documents were included in the committee's information packet. Co-chair Epstein introduced Ann Bragdon from Houston Community College and her colleague from Richland College Tim Sullivan who would be available to answer questions. Co-chair Garza asked Rebecca to explain the forms which were submitted for the appeal. The first form is the same as is used to request a new course. Subsequently a form specific to appeals has been developed. The form to request a new course included enrollment data at Houston Community College and a survey of practice at Texas universities. The additional forms are completed by universities and the appealing institution solicited these statements to substantiate the transferability and applicability to a bachelor's degree program. Appropriate signatures are affixed to the forms- chief academic officer and department head. The universities providing confirmation of transferability were Texas A&M University, Texas State University, Stephen F. Austin State University, Texas A&M University-Galveston, and Texas Tech. Additionally, included in the appeal documents are letters indicating that at least five community colleges would offer the course. Colleges sending letters indicating the course would be offered were the Dallas County College District Colleges (7), and Blinn College. The appeal documents included a syllabus and a lab manual. The lab manual was not required but provided additional information about content and rigor.

James mentioned that the specificity of information submitted with an appeal is very important to the process. Acceptance or acknowledgement of content as beneficial to students does not provide the clarity of knowing how a particular course is applied to a degree. Without a clear curricular and articulated transfer path, general endorsements do not provide information precisely useful to the appeals process. Rebecca made the distinct between what may happen

when faculty are advising students and have access to the student's complete academic record and what happens when faculty are developing a course and building a curriculum for a degree program.

Celia Williamson commented that the rules and the process uses the data but also leaves room for judgement through the appeals process.

James Goeman suggested that the HCC representative be called on to address the committee.

Dr. Bragdon spoke about the growth of the Anthropology program at Houston Community Colleges. She indicated that in some cases the limitation for community colleges wanting to teach the physical anthropology course was the lack of qualified faculty. Houston Community College has been able to hire more faculty and capacity for student enrollment has grown. The lab credit is essential for Anthropology majors transferring to universities. Without it students may have to take additional hours to have the lab experience. Resolving staffing deficiency and regional planning and collaboration will increase the growth of the study of physical/biological anthropology.

Dr. Sullivan from Richland College spoke to the importance of the lab with hands on experiences. He indicates that the course has demonstrated growth in student popularity.

Walle Engedayehu raise the issue of how the course would fit into core curriculum as a science course. Dr. Sullivan indicated that it may be a replacement as a non-major biology or may be used by those going into allied health or nursing type programs. Traditionally, Anthropology is thought as social science. Dr. Bragdon indicated that physical anthropology bridges humanities and life sciences and helps students makes connections. Dr. Sullivan said that physical anthropology is used as a natural science and that other anthropology courses are used as a social science.

Deborah Vess asked about the number of students transferring the course into the major. Dr. Sullivan did not have the numbers at hand but was aware of former students transferring the course into the anthropology major at universities. Dr. Bragdon concurred that students are being able transfer and apply the course. The convergence of opportunities for students transferring is relatively recent and growing.

G. G. Hunt acknowledged the fact that her own institution had not been able to offer the physical anthropology course because of the lack of faculty. She commended HCC for the success of the course.

Celia Williamson motioned that the scheduled deletion of the course be reversed and the course retained in the ACGM. G. G. Hunt seconded the motion.

Daniel Wright asked if the four hour course would supplant the three hour course. Co-chair Garza indicated that the adoption of the lab course would not preclude the use of the three hour course and that the three/one combination and four hour single course provided scheduling options and that Agenda Item 6 would address the issue.

With no other questions or discussion Co-chair Epstein called for the vote. The motion passed and ANTH 2101 will be retained in the ACGM.

Co-chair Garza directed the committee to Agenda Item 5 for the consideration of ANTH 2101 Physical Anthropology (Lab) Learning Outcomes as presented in the Houston Community College appeal proposal. Co-chair Garza asked Dr. Bragdon and Dr. Sullivan to speak to the Learning Outcomes as presented. Dr. Bragdon said that Houston Community College wanted the Learning Outcomes to be more specific and were more aligned with those in the ACGM for life sciences. Dr. Sullivan said that he served on the Learning Outcomes workgroup that wrote the very general outcomes that were included in the ACGM. At the time the intent was to be general and that would allow institution to add more as they wished but that he fully concurred with the HCC learning outcomes and covered the same topics and content in the course at Richland. Deborah Vess suggested that for a single hour credit course that this appeared to be a lot of outcomes. Rebecca pointed out that courses in the sciences revised by the Tuning group that the number is not unusual. Also, when Dr. Bragdon sent course information to the universities for their confirmation of transferability and applicability, those faculty were looking at the HCC course material-syllabus, learning outcomes and lab manual.

With no other discussion Co-chair Garza called for a motion. Celia Williamson made a motion to accept the learning outcomes. G. G. Hunt seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Co-chair Epstein directed the committee to Agenda Item 6 discussion and consideration of reversing the scheduled deletion of ANTH 2401 Physical Anthropology (Lecture +Lab), schedule for deletion spring 2017.

Celia Williamson asked about how enrollments would be viewed in the three courses-lecture, lab, and combination course as enrollments in one would diminish the enrollments in the other. Rebecca indicated that the courses should be considered together to get the full picture of enrollment. Generally universities have used the three plus one courses and community college have preferred the single four hour course but having the three plus one course option allows those enrollments to be reported. Co-chair Garza asked if the learning outcomes need to be revisited. Rebecca indicated that the ACGM display merely refers to the learning outcomes in the separate lecture and lab in the four hour version and does not reiterate all the learning outcomes of both courses. That wording would remain the same for ANTH 2401.

Co-chair Epstein called for the motion. Motion was made and seconded (Williamson and Wright). Motion passed.

Dr. Sullivan asked for clarification for planning purposes for spring 2017. The changes are effective immediately and institutions may go forward with plans to offer the courses without interruption.

Co-chair Garza directed the committee back to the update for Field of Study curricula. Rex Peebles said that a field of study establishes a block of lower division courses that when transferred apply to the requirement in a bachelor degree plan at a four year institutions. The Coordinating Board was given a legislative mandate during the last session to revise the current fields of study and to expand to other academic disciplines as well. Similarly the legislature mandate the development of "programs of study" for career and technical areas of

certificate and applied associate degrees. For the Fields of Study engineering and music groups are already at work and architecture and nursing will begin soon. Also analysis is being done to identify the top twenty to twenty-five associate degree fields that students declare when starting at a community college, what they choose to major in at the university when they transfer with 50 or more hours, and what bachelor's degree they ultimately obtain at graduation. The analysis shows that the lists of degrees for each point of transition is about the same. The top degree is interdisciplinary and this is understandable since this is the major for students wishing to become educators in grade K through eight. Nursing is high on the list. Business fields are subdivided but all are in the top twenty-five. Political science, history and English also continued to be popular choices. The Coordinating Board also hope to deal with degree paths which are problematic for students in transfer. Engineering has been the most challenging thus far. The field of study committees may recommend new courses or course deletions and modifications. The Engineer group has raise some questions or concerns with some of the courses which were revised as part of the Texas Tuning project. These course maybe revisited.

One question that follows from the events with the field of study groups is the question of learning outcomes for courses and when these should be added. Should this happen before or after the field of study group has made their recommendations? Rex Peebles indicated that perhaps the learning outcomes should be developed during the time the field of study committee is active. This may take more time but would hopefully ensure better acceptance and agreement with the choice of courses in a field of study.

Celia Williamson remarked that the AAT (Associate of Art Teaching) appears to be a field of study that is broken. It may mislead students. Another issue of concern is with some science fields where student completing an associate's degree that includes core may face a very challenging junior and senior year with all science courses. Students starting at the university may spread their core curriculum over the four years of their degree plan allowing some diversion from straight sciences in their final two years. Community colleges are significantly rewarded for the completion of the associate's degree with the core curriculum. This seems to put them at cross purposes with what maybe in the best interest of the student.

Rex said that in regard to the AAT, the AAT is dependent upon the educator certifications developed by SBEC (State Board Educator Certification). It may appropriate to wait until the changes in the certifications are settled before moving to update the AAT. Also, in those cases where degree programs are heavily weighted with sequenced courses in the major there is more flexibility for "inverted" programs where core curriculum could be spread over the four years of the program. A music associate's degree with the field of study is an example of a split core curriculum. This mechanism could be applied to work for the student's best interest in other disciplines such as biology.

Walle Engedayehu asked what the impact will be on course realignments and 2+2 agreements. Rex indicated that it is voluntary with community colleges to offer a field of study associate's degree but for the four year institutions the courses have to be used. Much of the success will depend upon how they are adopted at the two year schools and promoted to students. Then with universities having to use the courses this will create more conversations about student preparation. These conversations are already taking place among the Learning Outcomes faculty and the field of study committees.

Rebecca pointed out that in the process of reviewing courses and their enrollments, field of study courses are not of concern because rules require that discipline groups make recommendations for these courses. There were no other questions or comments about the progress and expectations of field of study curriculum committees.

John Spencer, Coordinator of the TCCNS database, spoke up to present the report from the Texas Common Course Numbering System. John commended The University of Texas at Austin for their work on the database and the presentation of the matrix of courses. The database has been updated with institutions also making their changes on the new platform. They hope to continue to enhance the website. The TCCNS Board will meet during the summer TACRAO meeting in Austin.

Co-chair Garza introduced the task of course review to be done by subcommittee. The committee will work to review enrollments and make recommendation to the whole committee. The information packet had the subcommittee assignments and the data chart with enrollments. Rebecca reminded the subcommittees to select a chair to report their recommendations with the reporting list to be provided to each group and to omit field of study courses indicated by FOS and voluntary transfer compact courses from their deliberations. Most should be marked on the chart and a copy of the ACGM is available to each subcommittee. Co-chair Garza adjourned the committee for subcommittee work and lunch until 1o'clock.

Co-chair Garza reconvened the meeting and asked that the subcommittee chairs provide a report. Edgar Garza served as subcommittee chair for Humanities and Liberal Arts. The subcommittee recommended that all languages be studied further and as a whole. There were no recommendations to schedule for deletion any courses in the Humanities and Liberal Arts group.

Gary Don Harkey was recognized to report on the STEM group. Many STEM courses are part of a field of study or voluntary transfer compact. The STEM subcommittee recommend two courses to be scheduled for deletion: HECO 1307 Personal Finance and MATH 1425 Calculus for Business and Social Sciences. Very few community colleges offer HECO 1307 and no universities indicate offering the course. MATH 1425 is offered at community colleges but a three semester credit hour course is available. The universities report offering MATH 1325.

Tammy Wyatt reported for the Fine Arts and Education group. With Architecture to be developed as a field of study, Dance to be included in the Learning Outcomes Project and Music as an existing field of study being revised, these courses were tabled. There were no recommendation for courses to be scheduled for deletion but several courses should be studied another year. There have been many recent courses deletions along with changes in core curriculum and implementation of the 60 semester credit hour rule for associate degrees. These developments may impact enrollments of remaining courses. Courses for recommended for continued study were:

ARTS 2314 Design Communications II  
ARTS 1325 Drawing and Painting (Non-majors)  
ARTS 2357 Photography II (Fine Arts emphasis)  
ARTS 2366 Watercolor I  
DRAM 1323 Basic Theater Practice (1 semester course)  
DRAM 2361 History of Theater I

DRAM 1120 Theater Practicum I  
DRAM 1121 Theater Practicum II  
DRAM 2120 Theater Practicum III  
DRAM 2121 Theater Practicum IV (The subcommittee questioned why the practicums were not just a repeatable course rather than separate courses.)  
PHED 1321 Coaching/Sports/Athletics I  
PHED 1238 Introduction to Physical Fitness & Sports

Rebecca asked for clarification. "Further study" as used in the report meant that courses were not recommended to be scheduled for deletion but that the ACGM Advisory Committee should review enrollments another year before any action would be taken. Tammy confirmed this meaning of "further study."

Celia Williamson reiterated Tammy's observations that there have been statewide initiatives such as the new core and reduction in hours of degrees which will cause changes in enrollments. Additionally, the recent scheduling of course deletions will impact the distribution of enrollments. As courses are deleted those enrollments will fall to other courses. It will take some time for this to be reflected in the enrollments the committee reviews. The flux in enrollments makes it prudent to wait and watch some courses.

Co-chair Garza said that similar discussion and observations made by the Humanities and Liberal Arts group. Also, there was interest in which courses were used in core. He asked if this information could be provided. Rebecca indicated that the core curriculum database does include ACGM/TCCNS designations and that efforts would be made to capture that information for the committee at the time of their next review.

Co-chair Garza asked for further questions or discussion.

James Goeman commented that the committee has formalized the processes for reviewing courses, scheduling courses for deletion, and now hearing appeals. As the processes continue to be refined the committee can expect to see more issues to arise. With today's appeal the issue of more specific learning outcomes was addressed. It occurred that in this case the input was limited to the institution making the appeal and the universities reviewing the course. A public comment period would be a good idea in these type of instances just as the case with the Learning Outcomes Project. There will be an exploration of how to facilitate and formalize comment/input and incorporating that into the appeals process. Another issue with appeals is the matter of timing. The two year period for teach-out for courses scheduled for deletion would ideally be enough time for institutions to initiate an appeal and also provide time for the committee's deliberations. However, if institutions do not come forward early, it condenses the time for the committee's work. The committee should have time to exercise due diligence in the process of reviewing appeals.

Rex Peebles said what happened with Dance was at the end of the two year period and the Coordinating Board received a lot of response from the field in regard to the deletions. The timing of the response put staff in the position of not having the necessary time to review information before the courses deletion were to go to the board. He made the decision to pull the dance courses deletions from the board agenda until Coordinating Board staff and the committee had the time to take a better look at the courses. In the past if there were any

deletions and appeals it involved a single course and time was not as much a factor in the review process as it is with multiple deletions. The Coordinating Board staff will continue to clarify and streamline the processes and will bring back more information to the committee. The committee is encouraged to think about the processes and how to improve them.

Genevieve DeCesaro remarked that she came to her administrative position with ten years of experience as the head of the dance program at Texas Tech and was therefore aware of the developments in the area of dance. However, before becoming an administrator she was not aware of the ACGM and believes that this would be case with most four year institution faculty. As the two year institution faculty begin their appeals, they are also having to educate the four year institution faculty about the ACGM. She suggested a template language be drafted to help two year institutions communicate with their four year counter-parts and incentivize the response.

Co-chair Garza called for a motion on the subcommittee reports. A motion was made and seconded. The motion to approve the subcommittee reports and accept the recommendations passed.

Co-chair Epstein directed the committee to Agenda Item 11 future agenda items and next meeting dates. She indicated that the committee will meet in the fall and review learning outcomes and then again in the spring in March or April. James said that due to limited availability of meeting rooms, scheduling of meetings has to be made well in advance and that both meetings for the upcoming year will be schedule at one time. A poll will be sent to the committee members to select the dates of the meetings.

Co-chair Garza reminded committee to return their travel form and the report document from the subcommittees to Rebecca. He also reminded the committee that at the fall meeting there would be the election of a new co-chair to represent community colleges as his term with the committee was coming to an end.

Co-chair Epstein adjourned the meeting at 1:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Rebecca Leslie