

Key Staff

Rebecca Leslie

Program Director

Workforce, Academic

Affairs and Research

**Academic Course Guide Manual
Advisory Committee**

March 24, 2014

10:00 AM – 4:30 PM

Board Room

1. Welcome and call to order – Dr. Sharon Blackman and
Dr. Andrew Wallace, Co-Chairs
2. Consideration of minutes from the November 15, 2013 meeting
3. Discussion and Consideration of proposed revision to the ACGM to provide three semester credit lecture/lab options for non-major science courses
4. Subcommittee Work Sessions:
 - a. Humanities and Liberal Arts
 - b. STEM
 - c. Fine Arts and Education
5. Lunch
6. Discussion and Consideration of the deletion of under-utilized ACGM courses based on Subcommittee reports
7. Discussion of future agenda items and next meeting date
8. Announcements
9. Adjournment

This meeting will be web-cast through the Coordinating Board's website at:
<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us>.

TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

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

March 24, 2014
Minutes

There were 15 members present. Members attending were:

David Arreazola	Trudy Hanson	Shelby Stanfield
Sharon Blackman	Gary Don Harkey	Mary Trevino
Michael Endy	G. G. Hunt	Andrew Wallace
Edgar Garza	Hasan Jamil	Melissa Weinbrenner
Sandra Gregerson	Marcia Little	Tammy Wyatt

Members absent were, James Kracht, Jane Dennis, Amanda Vasquez and Vanessa Valdez, ex officio member representing the Texas Common Course Numbering System (TCCNS).

THECB Staff attending were Rebecca Leslie, James Goeman, and Rex Peebles.

Co-chair Wallace called the meeting to order. He directed the committee to Agenda Item 2, consideration and approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Minutes from November 15, 2013 were in the packet of handouts and a motion was entertained. Motion was made (Harkey) to accept the minute as read and the motion was seconded. The motion passed.

After providing reminders for using the microphones when speaking and about arrangements for lunch, Co-chair Wallace recognized Rex Peebles, Assistant Commissioner for Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research. Dr. Peebles spoke about the history of the committee and his own experience with the committee as a member and as co-chair while he was a Dean at Austin Community College and Vice President at Midland College. He quoted his former co-chair of the committee, Dr. Jean Schaake from the University of North Texas, who said, "Everything transfers but not everything applies." He stressed the progress made and yet to be made, and the important continuing contribution of the ACGM Advisory Committee, keeping in mind the good of students and education in Texas.

Co-chair Blackman thanked Dr. Peebles for his comments and encouragement to the committee. She also reiterated the idea of the collaborative nature of the work of the committee.

Since there were new members attending the committee for the first time, Co-chair Blackman asked that committee members and others around the table introduce themselves. New members attending for the first time were G. G. Hunt from Wharton County College and Tammy Wyatt from the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Co-chair Blackman opened discussion for Agenda Item 3, consideration of a three semester credit course options for a composite lecture and lab for non-sciences major science courses. The overwhelming majority of comments from committee member campuses were opposed to making the option available. A motion was entertained to clear the item from the agenda. Motion was made (Endy) and seconded (Harkey) for there to be no change in the ACGM in regard to the proposal. The option will not be made available. The motion passed.

Co-chair Blackman then directed the committee's attention to the main purpose for the meeting, Agenda Item 4, the Subcommittee Work Sessions. Co-chair Wallace introduced the process for the work session which could last for several hours and outlined parameters given in rules for review of the courses. Co-chair Wallace explain the color coding on the handout of ACGM course enrollments. The courses are to be reviewed and considered for deletion if three or fewer community colleges offered the course. For a course to be added to the ACGM not only do five community colleges have to be willing to offer the course but the course would have to be offered and applicable to degree programs at five universities. Co-chair Wallace also provided guidance for the organization of the subcommittees and the responsibility for reporting. Each group was to designate a group leader and a recorder and be prepared to come back to the committee as a whole with a list of courses prioritize for further review or for deletion. Co-chair Blackman pointed out that the courses highlighted in blue are not offered at any institution, either at community colleges or universities.

Co-chair Blackman spoke to the less obvious trends that would be identifiable on the spreadsheet handout of course enrollments including declines in enrollment and number of institution offering specific courses within the three year period. Co-chair Blackman explained the meaning of the asterisk by some courses and referred the committee to information at the back of the spreadsheet which clarified the data discrepancies created by misaligning ACGM/TCCNS equivalents with native university courses carrying a different level or semester credit hours (SCH). Rebecca Leslie, staff liaison, pointed out that in identifying patterns and preferred options of SCH, the subcommittees should refer the information at the back of the spreadsheet for a more complete understanding of issues involved. Rebecca indicated that courses with multiple SCH versions are an issue that may create problems in transfer with the extra/excess hours.

Melissa Wienbrenner asked about courses highlighted in blue in particular the Learning Framework courses. Upon looking at the courses in question Rebecca Leslie acknowledged an error in this instance and that the enrollments at the community colleges were healthy, although the course in some versions was not reported as taught at the university level. Melissa Wienbrenner was thanked for the correction.

Co-chair Blackman asked for other questions about the process and the handout. There being none she called on Rebecca to speak to the arrangements for the subcommittee work. Rebecca indicated that three table were set up by BJ Byrom, Administrative Assistant for the committee, with two in the back and one close to the front of the Boardroom. Rebecca recognized Dr. James Goeman as available during the subcommittees' work along with herself to answer questions and assists the groups. Co-chair Wallace directed the committee to the subcommittee group assignments in the packet of information. Co-Chair Blackman assigned each subcommittee to a table and the meeting adjourned to the work session.

On reconvening, the committee was called to order by Co-chair Wallace and he recognized James Goeman for any updates on the core curriculum process. Co-chair Blackman mentioned the change in the order of business to Agenda Item 8 and other announcements would be welcomed as well. James indicated that the initial approval of the new 2014 Core Curriculum was complete. The state web core center, which had been maintained by Texas State University, will now be on the THECB web site. An announcement will be sent to institutions to view the site and confirm their core submissions. James also indicated that the learning outcomes project has not yet chosen the courses to which learning outcomes will be developed and added.

Co-chair Wallace called for any other announcements. Michael Endy was recognized for a motion concerning the semester credit hour discrepancies in the courses reported by some universities as ACGM/TCCNS course equivalents. Mr. Endy made a motion that it be communicated to institutions misaligning their courses the need to review their reports to the Texas Higher Education Higher Coordinating Board to align credit hour values appropriately with the ACGM/TCCNS course.

Rebecca further explained the challenge created when the universities report courses not offered to indicate transferability. Actual practice is obscured.

BJ Byrom then provided the committee with printed copies of each of the subcommittees' reports. Co-chair Wallace directed the committee to Agenda Item 6, Discussion and Consideration of the deletion of under-utilized ACGM courses based on Subcommittee reports. Co-chair Blackman admonished the committee to take some time to review the reports and then the subcommittee spokesperson would be allowed to comment as needed. She also pointed out the reports had courses recommended for deletion and some recommended further study.

(The compiled reports of the subcommittees is attached as an addendum to the minutes.)

Co-chair Wallace recognized Melissa Weinbrenner, leader of the Humanities and Liberal Arts groups, for comment. Co-chair Blackman asked about notation on the report with a question mark. Dr. Weinbrenner said the subcommittee had questions as to the why there was a lab (ANTH 2101) for the Anthropology course (ANTH 2301) and if a four SCH version was necessary. Anthropology is not thought to be a general lab science. She referred to the use of multiple SCH versions of courses with the same learning outcomes. This needed further study. Dr. Wienbrenner said that the group felt that cross listing of courses was problematic and that this was another broader issue that also needed further study. In the languages the subcommittee recommended a consistent pattern for all languages following the most prevalent pattern of course offerings and eliminating the less frequently offered SCH versions of the same course.

Co-chair Wallace recognized Gary Don Harkey to report for the STEM Subcommittee. Dr. Harkey said the subcommittee looked at courses meeting criteria for deletion and in most cases decided to recommend deletion because time would allow for any comment in opposition if a real need for the course existed. Also, the group decided to leave unchanged the three and one option for lab sciences even if enrollments were low because the new core may push more institutions to use the split option for their lab sciences. The STEM Subcommittee also

philosophically approached the question of multiple SCH versions with the same learning outcomes leaving some lower SCH versions with low enrollments to allow the option as institutions move toward reducing hours in degrees prompted by the 60 credit hour mandate. BCIS and COSC were also problematic with antiquated programming languages and courses more appropriate for Workforce Education. Several chemistry courses were deleted but community colleges will still have a variety of options. There were some Engineering and Engineering Technology courses with very low enrollments and may be more appropriate for Workforce Education. The Home Economics area had several courses which could best be handled by unique need as only one or two institutions appeared to offer the courses. There were several Mathematics courses put on the list for recommended deletion because of low enrollments. Nursing courses often had very similar titles and what appeared to be a redundancy of content with the courses demonstrating low enrollments. The subcommittee wants the nursing faculty and professional organizations to look closely at any recommendation. Dr. Harkey concluded his comments and there were no question on the report.

Co-chair Wallace recognized Mr. Michael Endy for the report of the Fine Arts and Education Subcommittee. Mr. Endy said that most of the discussion within the group paralleled the discussion of the other subcommittees and also dealt with the large numbers of practicum courses offered in the fine arts. The subcommittee's intent was to be more efficient and more closely aligned with practice at the universities in regard to the practicums. Most of the courses recommended for deletion in the fine arts disciplines were of this types. The idea being that institutions would look closely at the practicums to be more efficient. Also, the group recommended an extensive list of courses for further review in the hopes that institutions could make recommendations for efficiency as part of the effort to reduce the number of hours in a degree programs.

There were no additional comments or questions on the Subcommittee reports.

Co-chair Blackman entertained a motion to accept the reports from the Subcommittees with recommendations for the deletion of courses and further study of others. Michael Endy made a motion to accept the reports as submitted by the Subcommittees. Melissa Weinbrenner seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Co-chair Wallace directed the committee to Agenda Item 7 for consideration of future agenda items and the next meeting date. Based on the subcommittee reports there was a possibility of a summer meeting. If not Co-chair Wallace indicated the next meeting would be in the fall most probably November. Co-chair Blackman suggested that the committee members review the reports again and see if any changes or corrections are needed. Then the question of need for a summer meeting would be more easily determine. Rebecca sought clarification from the committee and co-chairs as to how to provide the information back to them for review. It was determined that Rebecca would compile the reports into a single document and send that to the co-chair for review and then on to the committee as a whole. Institutions will be notified.

Returning to the mattering of dates for the fall meeting Rebecca was recognized and she gave a timeline for expected completion of the Learning Outcomes Project with courses coming to the committee in the fall between early and mid-November. Co-chair Blackman asked the committee what was a general timeframe for a summer meeting considering the activities on campuses. It was determined that August was off the table as this is a particularly busy time at

institutions. Mid-June to Mid-July was considered the best time to schedule a summer meeting if needed.

Without any other business before the committee, Co-chair Blackman thank the committee for their hard work and called for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made, seconded and passed. Co-chair Wallace echoed Co-chair Blackman in thanking the members for their contribution to the committee.

Respectfully submitted by Rebecca Leslie