Members Present: Mike Barros, Dean, Tech I, Michael Cress, Tech II Faculty Rep., Keala Chock, Dean, Tech II, John Delay, University College DCC Rep., Ross Egloria, Distance Education Coordinator, Kaleo Gagne, President, ASUH-HCC, Carol Hasegawa, Academic Support Rep., Jennefer Higa-King, Chair, General Education Board, Kara Kam-Kalani, UC Division Co-Chair Hum/SocSci, Chair CPC, Femar Lee, UC Chair, Math/Natural Sciences, Doug Madden, Tech I Faculty Rep., Steven Mandraccia, UC Faculty Rep., Shanon Miho, Student Services Rep., Scot Parry, Articulation/Matriculation Officer, Ron Pine, UC Division Co-Chair, Hum/SocSci, recorder, Jim Poole, Tech II Division Chair, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Dean University College, Sandra Sanpei, Tech II DCC Rep., Bert Shimabukuro, Tech I Division Chair, Jeff Stearns, UC Division Chair, Language Arts, Pat Yahata, MIR.

Guests: Sally Dunan, CENT, Erika Lakro, Chancelor, Kaiulani Murphy, HWST, , Joy Nagaue, FT, Lara Sugimoto, Counselor Coordinator.

Absent: Alapaki Luke, UC Division Chair, Hawaiian Studies, Guy Shibayama, Tech I DCC Rep., Steven Shigemoto, MIR.

Minutes of the CPC meeting of January 18, 2013 were reviewed, corrected, and approved.

Kara announced that it was her intention to try to finish the meeting by 10:30am as several CPC members had to attend an important meeting on hybrid classes at that time.

Prior to finishing the curriculum actions, Chancellor Erika Lacro followed up on her announcement to the campus and briefed the committee on the serious nature of the conclusions of the Accreditation Commission. HCC has been placed on warning and the campus has only six months to fix the problems addressed. We will be visited again in October. Pertinent for CPC action is item 4 on general education. The general education components of some CTE Associate degree programs are not transfer level. Transfer level courses would either transfer to a baccalaureate program as general education courses or be acceptable as an elective. For instance, English 22, Math 50, and some technical math courses used by some HCC CTE programs do not qualify. This is a serious matter as the college level general education standard is an eligibility requirement. The previous ENG/MATH prerequisite policy needs to be revised to reflect what is expected by accreditation. We need immediate action and a quick fix for the catalog.
Erika noted that she has plans to work with students. Depending when students entered HCC, some will be grandfathered under our existing graduation requirements. Beginning Fall 2013, new students will need to take 100 level general education course content. She recommended a blanket approach to addressing the minimum general education component of all CTE programs.

ASUH-Honolulu Community College President Kaleo Gagne announced that he will also be working with students and will be conducting a town-hall information session on what the warning means. Marcia Roberts-Deutsch and Steve Mandraccia urged that it should be clear to students that no degrees are impacted at this time and that the Commission decision is part of an assessment process for identifying and addressing problems. Corrective action will take place to address the recommendations.

Sandy Sanpei asked about the distinction between “transfer” and “college level.” Because the emphasis is on college level, the focus should be on content not number. Steve Mandraccia noted that is true, but that having a below 100 number on any general education course raises the suspicion of the course not being college level. He also noted that the current "technical math" is not college level math. The technical math needs to be made more rigorous to be at college level. Students have to take MATH 100, 103, or 115 to satisfy the "college level" requirement. Erika then mentioned that Keala received Perkins funding to create a new technical math curriculum that is college level. Steve commented that he and the math faculty are aiming to have the new technical math course ready by Fall 2013.

Jim Poole asked whether the system policy for A.A.S. degrees should change since the policy currently emphasizes that these degrees are non-baccalaureate programs. The catalog states that "this degree [A.A.S.] is not intended nor designed for transfer directly into a baccalaureate program." Others noted that the catalog also states: "AAS programs may, however, include some baccalaureate course offerings," and therefore, the wording is still accurate. Several CPC members argued that the policy does not need to change, but that only the general education components addressed to be college level. Jim urged that the policy be made clearer in light of the changes needed.

Doug Madden asked about the implications for Philosophy 110. Ron Pine noted that it would probably mean students in CTE programs would not take this course for the general education math or logic category in place of any math course for any CTE Associate degree, as currently students have to place at transfer level math to use 110 for a CTE Associate Degree. If they now have to take a transfer level math course, there would be no need for Philosophy 110. The category will no longer be Math or Logic.

Ron Pine motioned that a general blanket approach to program modification be endorsed by the CPC. Steve Mandraccia seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Erica said she would draft a policy and that the wording for the blanket general education adjustment would be presented for CPC feedback at the next CPC meeting. She also stated that
the new policy will be in effect immediately after the CPC has had a chance to look at the Memo of Policy at the next meeting on March 15.

Jennifer Higa-King asked Erika to comment on item 2, Program Review and SLO Assessment. Erika summarized that although there are pockets of excellent work on SLOs at HCC, there were too many problem areas, and in general SLOs are not integrated well with program review. Currently, the assessment of course SLOs is only being done by some programs/disciplines. All disciplines and programs need to be doing assessment and making adjustments based on assessment. At the time of the accreditation visit, the ILOs were also not firmly in place. For another example, there are no SLOs for the business office.

Erika also commented on the recommendation pertaining to Distance Education. SLOs for DE need to be assessed and compared to face-to-face instruction to determine the efficacy of DE instruction, according to the Commission’s report. Also, a strategic and capacity plan needs to be in place, along with support services. Given the support services that we currently have, we need to determine how many DE students we have resources to support. Additionally, given the impending move from Bldg. 7 and the possibility of using hybrid online/in-class instruction, a strategic plan for such instruction also needs to be in place. Ross is working on a strategic plan. Knowledge surveys are heavily used but they should only be part of overall assessment. Ross gave as an example of an assessment problem that we have in some instances: an instructor teaching a section of a course DE and another instructor teaching a section of the same course on-campus and there is little or no communication or coordination on assessment. In general, our institutional research capability is not being fully utilized and there are lots of research questions that can be addressed. For instance, how do students do moving on after taking a DE class? Same or different from students taking on-campus courses?

CURRICULUM ACTIONS

Tech I

IEDB 20 (Modify SLOs -- previously tabled)

Bert Shimabukuro provided an update, and Mike Barrios provided needed clarification. The SLOs were approved on other campuses. Ron motioned to accept, Marcia, seconded, approved unanimously.

2. AEC 80 (Deletion -- previously tabled)

Bert noted that the needed construction management piece was remedied. Motion made by Marcia to approve along with the changes noted below. Second by Femar Lee. Approved unanimously.
AEC Program (Modification)
AEC 81 (Modify description due to deletion of AEC 80)
AEC 110 (Modify description due to deletion of AEC 80)
AEC 114 (Modify description due to deletion of AEC 80)

Tech II

FT 160, 217, 237 (Previously tabled; concern of no prerequisite.)

Joy Nagaue noted that Math 50 is a program requirement. Sally Dunan pointed out that we have a mandatory placement policy and there should be a prerequisite or co-requisite for each course. Joy agreed to add “C” or higher in ENG 22/60 or ESL 23, OR placement in English 100. CPC approved pending the addition of the pre-requisites.

CENT -- Certificate of Completion in Basic Information Assurance

Sally summarized that the purpose was to establish a certificate that would recognize the campus as a center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education. Recognition is granted by the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security. Concern was raised at the DCC level that the certificate contained some non-technical courses. However, the government agencies involved in the designation of Centers of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education allow for some non-technical courses. There needs to be a minimum of ten technical courses. The Tech II DCC approved the certificate contingent on external certification.

Doug motioned to accept the Certificate program, Marcia seconded. Motion approved with one abstention by Sandy Sanpei.

FT 170 (New course).

It was noted that there was the same pre-req/co-req problem as with the previously tabled FT courses. Joy agreed to add “C” or higher in ENG 22/60 or ESL 23, OR placement in English 100.

Erika noted that eventually the math and English prerequisites would be added automatically.

Bert motioned to approve the FT courses as amended, Sandy seconded. Approved unanimously pending the addition of the pre-requisites.

University College

HWST 284 (New course -- previously tabled due to prerequisite concerns)
Kaiulani Murphy agreed that prerequisite of “C” or higher in ENG 22/60 or ESL 23, OR placement in English 100 is appropriate. Marcia motioned to approve, contingent on changes being made, Kaleo seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

**EALL 271/272** (Modify prerequisites and course description)

Bookkeeping to match with other courses. Jeff motioned to approve, Ron seconded. Approved unanimously.

**ENG 257C** (New course)

Some formatting and typographical errors were noted. Will be corrected.

Motion to approve: Jeff Stearns. Second: Steve Mandracia
Approved unanimously

**SP 253** (Modify grading option to allow for pass/fail)

Approved.

**ECON 231** (Modify recommended prep)

Should be 131. Clerical, no objections. Approved.

**HIST 241** (Uncoupling) Motion to approve, Jeff, Second, Steve. Approved.

**JOUR 150** (previously tabled to examine whether SLOs were appropriate)

Approved.

**Update on CTE Gen Ed Board**

Sandy Sanpei reported that the CTE Gen Ed committee had met subsequently to a full Gen Ed Board meeting to work on its charter. The section in question was Membership. The committee said that a differentiation should be made between Tech I and Tech II rather than combining everything under CTE, so the proposal was made to have two representatives from Tech I, two from Tech II, and two from UC. It was pointed out that this was not in keeping with prior discussion and the Chancellor's mandate that representation had to be balanced (i.e., equal numbers from CTE and Liberal Arts) and that UC was also not a single entity but was comprised of four separate divisions. A member of the CTE Gen Ed committee also proposed that the CTE Counselor (initially involved for the primary purpose of reporting back to the other counselors) should be made a voting member. No decision was made by the CTE Gen Ed committee
because of the balance/equity issue previously cited. Jennifer Higa-King also pointed out that while having a CTE counselor on the board is helpful, the committee's responsibility is only to consider courses for Gen Ed certification, not to determine program applicability, so voting should be the responsibility of instructional faculty. Further discussion will take place.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00am

Next Meeting: March 15, 2013, 9am, 2-614