

TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
Academic Quality and Workforce

Academic Course Guide Manual Advisory Committee

December 4, 2018

Summary Notes (Approved)

Members present: Norma Perez (Co-Chair), Paul Bernazzani, Brent Colwell, Samuel Echevarria-Cruz, Ricky Dobbs, Elizabeth Erhart, Juan Garcia, Jonda Halcomb, Mark Hartlaub, Rahime-Malik Howard, Catherine Howard (phone-in), Amber Kelly, Lisa Lacher, and John Spencer, TCCNS Administrator, ex-officio.

Members absent: Joshua Villalobos, Needha Boutté-Queen, Ashley Purgason, and Tammy Wyatt.

Non-voting proxy: Cary D. Wintz (attending on behalf of Needha Boutté-Queen).

Coordinating Board staff: Rebecca Leslie, Program Director; James Goeman, Assistant Director; Suzanne Morales-Vale, Director of Adult and Developmental Education, and Rex Peebles, Assistant Commissioner.

1. Call to order and welcome

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Co-Chair Norma Perez. She introduced members and welcomed those new to the committee.

2. Election of Co-chair representing a public university

Co-chair Perez asked if there was a volunteer from the membership representing a university and explained briefly about the duties of the co-chairs. There was some discussion about the qualifications including experience on the committee. Paul Bernazzani expressed willingness to serve. Without other nominations, a vote was taken and Paul Bernazzani was elected co-chair.

3. Consideration of Minutes from the April 30, 2018 Meeting

Co-Chair Perez asked the committee to review the minutes. After a motion was made and seconded, the committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

4. Discussion of Coordinating Board rules and the committee responsibility for review of Field of Study and Voluntary Transfer Compact courses

Co-Chair Perez refer the committee to their information packet for rules and statutes related to field of study (FOS) and voluntary transfer compact (VTC). She read Rule 9.71 (c) (4) which states "Courses in a Board-approved field of study curriculum as outlined under §4.32 of this title (relating to Field of Study Curricula), or a statewide transfer compact shall automatically be added to the ACGM." Rebecca Leslie was recognized to give background information about the discussion item. There are differences in the two types of courses. Those in a field of study will be referred to a FOS committee if the ACGM committee recommends a review based on low enrollments and institutions infrequently offering the course. The VTC courses are not described in statute and the ACGM committee may schedule the VTC courses for deletion.

5. Discussion and Consideration of the recommendation to schedule ENGR 2334 Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics I for deletion

Co-chair Perez introduced the agenda item. At the April 30, 2018 meeting the workgroup for science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) recommended that ENGR 2334 Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics I be scheduled for deletion. Action on the recommendation was postponed pending clarification of rules regarding courses that are part of a VTC. With that clarification made, discussion was opened on the recommendation. Data was provided on the course and its frequency of offerings statewide. Jonda Halcomb spoke against the recommendation and indicated that two year schools are just starting the chemical engineering programs and that the VTC shows that the course was acceptable at universities. Jonda also said that the restriction of chemical engineering courses in the ACGM is limiting to two year schools. Rebecca was recognized to provide an explanation of the data provided. There are only nine universities with chemical engineering programs with two of those relatively new without graduate numbers. UT and TAMU are the largest programs. TAMU admits more transfer students than UT, however University of Houston while it does not produce as many graduates as UT and TAMU, is the largest transfer university in the state. Of the nine institutions with a chemical engineering degree, five offer the courses at the sophomore level. The other four institutions offer Thermodynamics as a junior level course. Jonda mentioned growth of industry in the south Texas area as an indication of demand for the degree. Brent Colwell commented that since the course is offered at the sophomore level at some institution, then the course should remain in the ACGM for transferability and to keep students from having to take the course at the junior level. Co-chair Perez reminded the committee that the course was not included in the FOS for engineering. James Goeman was recognized and provided the caution that a course not in the FOS does not have the guarantee of applicability to a bachelor's degree. John Spencer asked if the FOS was generic and clarification was made that the FOS has tracks for different degrees. Paul Bernazzani mentioned that thermodynamic is a degree requirement is in Chemical and Civil Engineering degree programs and asked if another thermodynamics course is in the FOS. Rebecca added university course inventories do have thermodynamic under different course rubrics in the different areas of engineering, but that enrollments and level at which the courses are taught was not researched. Samuel Echevarria-Cruz pointed out that online with the Tuning Project the compacts indicate that there are no universities that have agree to participate with the compact for Chemical Engineering. Samuel also asked what reason was given in the FOS committee for not including the course. Co-chair Perez asked if the committee wanted more information before a call for a vote. Further discussion and action what discontinued until the THECB staff involved with the Engineering FOS could be consulted.

Mindy Nobles joined the committee to provide information about the FOS for Engineering. Co-chair Perez asked Mindy to shed light on the reasons why ENGR 2334 Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics I was not included in the FOS. Mindy indicated that the subcommittee for Chemical Engineering did recommend the course to be included in the Chemical Engineering Track, however the full FOS committee did not approve the inclusion of the course. A faculty member from The University of Texas at Austin objected to ENGR 2334 because it is upper-division and the ACGM description and learning outcomes did not have sufficient content to match the upper-division course. Later a motion was made to accept the recommended chemical engineering track with the omission of ENGR 2334. The motion passed and there were no objections to the omission.

The discussion of ENGR 2334 resumed in the afternoon with information about the comment period provided by Mindy. James Goeman reported that Mindy found that five universities made comments about the Chemical Engineering program track and that none

were related to the absence of ENGR 2334. Jonda Halcomb related that in the discussions to leave the course out of the FOS it was generally understood among other institutions that they could continue to offer thermodynamics and it would be accepted by a number of institutions. Jonda asked why it was a bad thing to keep the course in the ACGM if it benefits the student and transfer agreements exist. Co-chair Perez pointed out that there was a concern because the course was deemed to be under-utilized at the last meeting. Vote was delayed to determine whether or not its inclusion in a VTC gave it special protections. The course would not be deactivated for two years if voted to be scheduled for deletion. Rebecca gave the criteria used to judge underutilization based on rules. A course must be considered for deletion if three or fewer community colleges offer the course. Additionally, for a course to be included in the ACGM five community colleges must offer the course and five universities have to indicate that the course is accepted and applied to a degree. The handout for the committee indicated the number of community colleges that offered the course and the statewide enrollments were:

FY 2014 two colleges offered it with combined enrollment of 61 students.

FY 2015 two colleges offered it with a combined enrollment of 61 students.

FY 2016 two colleges offered it with a combined enrollment of 65 students.

FY 2017 three colleges offered it with a combined enrollment of 71 students.

Jonda said that she thought the need for chemical engineering is growing. Rex Peebles joined the discussion and said that the FOS will be reviewed every five years if not sooner if needed. He also said that a recent proposal for a chemical engineering was not able to establish a workforce need for the program. Jonda clarified that she was speaking of the industrial growth in the Coastal Bend area and could review workforce need in that area. Co-chair Perez called for a motion to delete the course. There was a motion but not a second. Without a second the motion died. The course will not be scheduled for deletion. Rebecca said that the course along with all active courses will be reviewed in the spring. Jonda asked if Dr. Peebles would return with more information and he indicated he would.

6. Reports on research and discussion of a rubric change for SPCH courses

Co-chair Perez introduced the item for discussion reminding the committee of its responsibility for overseeing the courses in the ACGM, however unlike most individual course review, there is not a process in place to approve a rubric change. Dallas County Community College District made a request to change a rubric, but without a process defined, Co-chair Perez said no vote would be taken by the committee today. The agenda item was for discussion only. Co-chair noted that lacking in the submission from the institution was a statement from the Texas Speech Communication Association (TSCA), although the organization is mentioned in the request information. John Spencer was recognized to report on an informal survey done through the TACRAO (Texas Association of College Registrars and Admission Officers) list serve. John indicated that the responses were fewer than he wished. The twenty survey responses, along with other comments in discussions at TACRAO, indicated that the change from the SPCH rubric was perceived as unnecessary and would require operational changes to schedules, catalogs, and systems. Registrars also called John to express their concerns with any such change. Co-chair Perez asked John to send the survey to academic contacts for TCCNS as well as the student contacts for the system. Rebecca was asked to solicit information from the TSCA. Lisa Lacher asked if a cost benefit analysis was considered or possible. Co-chair Perez indicated that most likely cost would be associated with staff time. James Goeman pointed out that the benefits of a change are speculative and that there is no way to certify the benefits before the change is made. The cost of change is probably determinable, but

because the cost amount may vary by institution and so many institutions would have to be involved, asking institutions to determine the cost is an undue burden. Co-chair Perez pointed to data in the information packet for committee members showing the rubrics used at universities. Rebecca explained that among universities there is not a consensus rubric for speech courses. While many do use COMM, in the common numbering system a problem arises because there are overlaps in numbers between the areas of communication and speech if all speech courses were to be changed to the COMM rubric. Community colleges all use SPCH now but universities use different rubrics. James reiterated the challenge of cross-listing in the two areas: SPCH and COMM. Co-chair Perez asked if there were additional discussion or questions. There was a question about speech courses in core curriculum and how speech courses are used by institutions. Samuel Echevarria-Cruz noted that the most compelling argument for change included with the information from Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD) was the mention of a trend merging field, however they list only three examples (3 out of 38 universities). Samuel went on to state that there seems to be two distinct disciplines with their own nomenclature that are thriving separately. He questioned the benefit of a change when considering the cost. Rebecca said she did follow-up with Dallas County Community College about the merging departments but they were not able to respond within the time available. This could be researched and the question may be posed to them again. Rahime-Malik Howard asked if the request was about a prefix change or a title change. He noted that information submitted in the request referred to the "fear of public speaking." A change in the rubric would not change the class. John Spencer shared that courses may have college readiness designations used as prerequisites and that this may differ one institution to another. He said that DCCCD requires reading and writing readiness for enrollment in Speech courses in the core, however, Tarrant County College does not. Students transfer back and forth and after successfully completing the course at Tarrant return to DCCCD to be declared college ready in reading and writing. John thought that a title change may make the course less threatening, but there needs to be a discussion about what is required to take the course. Rahime remarked that the college readiness standards at DCCCD were understandable since students must be able to read speeches and to prepare in writing speech to be made. Co-chair Perez asked for any other discussion. James stated that the question to come before the committee will be to consider the cost versus whatever possible academic benefits. Rebecca summarized the items for further discussion on the possible rubric change: responses to a survey by TCCNS to academic and student contacts, speech in core curriculum, merged discipline departments at institutions, and a statement from TSCA.

7. Discussion and consideration of changes to ACCT 2301/2401 Principles of Financial Accounting in regard to the prerequisite of TSI standing

Co-chair Perez recognized Suzanne Morales-Vale to explain the agenda item. Suzanne received an inquiry/comment from the field about the only two references to TSI in course descriptions of the ACGM. In the context of the co-requisite model for developmental education generally any reference to TSI sends a message that the course can be employed in a co-requisite model to establish college readiness. In this case completion of ACCT 2301/2401 could be mistakenly interpreted to mean the student is college ready in mathematics. Given the context of the co-requisite model and the use of the term of TSI, she did not feel that it was necessary to mention TSI college readiness. Co-chair Perez asked the membership for any questions. Paul Bernazzani pointed out that if the prerequisite of meeting TSI in mathematics was removed, the course would in effect be subject to enrollment of students with little or no preparation in mathematics since MATH 1324 is only a recommended prerequisite. Rebecca Leslie said that the concern Paul

described was also a concern discussed among staff. The accounting course and the math course (MATH 1324) are both part of the Field of Study (FOS) for business and the prerequisites were placed on the course during the Tuning process. The idea of a "recommended" prerequisite is problematic and does not provide clarity to institutions. The staff thought that the FOS committee should be consulted and polled about the issue of placing a different prerequisite instead of keeping the "recommended" prerequisite. Co-chair Perez called for a motion to remove the prerequisite of TSI met in mathematics. A motion was made and seconded. The motion passed. The other issue of the recommended prerequisite of MATH 1324 would be taken up again after the FOS Advisory Committee provides feedback.

8. Discussion and consideration of changes to Math Mathematics for Business and Social Sciences in regard to the prerequisite of TSI standing

Co-chair Perez recognized, Suzanne Morales-Vale to explain the agenda item. Suzanne said that, for the sake of consistency, no other entry level course and particularly among mathematics courses has a TSI prerequisite since this requirement is a given. The course is listed in TSI rules among the first entry college level courses for mathematics. Co-chair Perez called for a motion to remove the prerequisite of TSI met in mathematics. A motion was made and seconded. The motion passed.

9. Report on Learning Outcomes Project

Co-chair Perez recognized Rebecca Leslie to report. The 2018 Learning Outcomes Project focused on courses that are part of new or revised FOS: Business, Psychology, and Social Work. The business and the social work workgroups have completed their work. The psychology workgroup continues to deliberate on changes based on comments received. New courses approved as part of a FOS and to be added to the ACGM in the spring edition were:

BUSI 2305 Business Statistics

PSYC 2320 Abnormal Psychology (still in process)

PSYC 2330 Biological Psychology (still in process)

Existing courses in the FOS that were revised are:

BCIS 1305/1405 Business Computer Applications

PSYC 2319 Social Psychology (still in process)

PSYC 2317 Statistical Methods in Psychology (still in process)

SOCW 2361 Introduction to Social Work

SOCW 2361 Introduction to Social Work

SOCW 2362 Social Welfare: Legislation, Programs, and Services

SOCW 2389 Academic Cooperative

10. Staff updates on Coordinating Board activities

Co-chair Perez recognized Rebecca Leslie to report. The handout provided to the committee listed the nineteen completed FOS and the fourteen FOS still in deliberation by advisory committees. Allen Michie is the contact for coordination of the FOS advisory committees and provided the information. Rebecca asked ACGM committee members to encourage their colleagues and institutions to participate in the processes for the FOS development. The process for FOS development is long and difficult with rules adoption, committee selection, meetings, and comment periods involved. Rex Peebles made remarks about the challenges of receiving enough nominations from public universities and stressed the importance of institutional participation. He said that the institutions are being asked to do something they never have, and they also should consider making adjustments to their own curriculum. The

FOS advisory committees will be asked to return after the comment period unless there is an overwhelming endorsement of FOS curriculum in the comments from the field. Co-chair Perez reiterate the importance of participation. John Spencer asked that a column be added to the chart in the handout provided to the committee to provide the date of review. Some discussion followed about transcribing the FOS courses. Rex indicated that there will be collaboration with TACRAO (Texas Association of College Registrars and Admission Officers). Co-chair Perez asked that the effective date be added to the handout chart for each FOS. Rex said that the implementation date will be a year to a year and a half after board approval to provide ample time for faculty and institutional preparation. Rebecca said this was particularly important for the Learning Outcomes Project if new or revised courses are needed for the FOS. Lisa Lacher asked if this information was available online. It is available under Institutional Resources selecting the link to Transfer Resources.

Co-chair Perez asked Rex to provide update of other activities of the THECB. He said the legislative session was approaching and the agency will be busy with bill analysis. The Academic, Workforce, and Quality Division analyzed over 400 bills last session. Issues of interest to the legislature that may impact the ACGM Advisory Committee are transfer, excess hours, core curriculum, and FOS. The legislature is also expected to consider dual credit and its funding, student debt, and performance funding for institutions.

Other activities mentioned were the release of several reports:
Dual-Credit Education Programs in Texas (American Institutes for Research)
Texas General Academic Institutions Increasing Successful Community College Transfer Report 2018
Study on Best Practices in Credit Transfer

Rebecca added that the Transfer Report provides information on the TCCNS is used by public universities with break-out by institutions including number of TCCNS courses in core and in majors as compared to non common courses.

11. Discussion of future work and meeting dates

Co-Chair Perez indicated that the spring meeting will May 7, 2019 and encouraged the members to be responsive to reminders. The spring meeting will include the review of courses and their enrollments. The committee will also return to the discussion of the speech rubric. There is also the possibility of a request for new courses. Members were instructed to return the travel expense form about to Rebecca before leaving.

12. Adjournment

With no other business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.