Members Present: Jess Aki (Co-Chair), Michael Barros, Diane Caulfield, Frank Fenlon, Ken Johnson, Kara Kam-Kalani (Co-Chair), Derek Oshiro, Sam Rhoads, Jerry Saviano, Eric Shaffer, Bert Shimabukuro

I. The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m. by Co-Chair, Jess Aki. The primary goal of the meeting was to work on cleaning up the CTE General Education hallmarks that were circulated in a preliminary draft via e-mail prior to the meeting. Jess opened the floor for discussion of any suggested changes to the existing draft.

II. Diane Caulfield suggested that the “lead in” wording for each of the seven categories be made parallel and consistent. Category 1: Writing, for example, states: “To satisfy the Writing requirement, a student should be able to demonstrate the following:” whereas Category 2: Numeracy and Logical Reasoning states: “A person who meets the hallmarks for this category:” There was general consensus that the lead in wording should be made parallel and consistent.

Additionally, Sam Rhoads stressed that the hallmarks should sound like hallmarks and not SLOs, and purported that some verbs lend themselves better to hallmarks and some lend themselves better to SLOs. Hence, the lead in wording should be phrased in a manner that is conducive to stating the hallmarks as hallmarks and not as SLOs. There was general support for this suggestion.

To that end, Ken Johnson suggested the following verbiage: “A person who meets the __________ hallmark displays the following attributes:” This verbiage was generally agreed upon by the committee. Changes to the working draft will be made to reflect the new verbiage.

III. A question was raised regarding the number of hallmarks within a particular Gen Ed category that must be met in order to satisfy the Gen Ed category. For example, is it sufficient for a program to meet just three out of the six total hallmarks for a particular category? Sam commented that all of the hallmarks should be met. In response, Jess commented that there are very few CTE courses that meet all of the hallmarks. Sam then responded that the hallmarks in one category can in fact be met through different CTE courses.

Relatedly, Diane inquired as to whether it was possible for one CTE course to address the hallmarks in several different categories. Sam’s response was “yes.”
Jerry then asked if it was possible for some CTE courses to meet the hallmarks through guest lectures. Sam’s response was “yes.”

IV. Ken suggested the addition of a hallmark addressing the issue of sustainability under the Social Sciences category. Others generally agreed that it was important to include sustainability as part of the Social Sciences category, and hence, a change was made to Social Sciences hallmark #1. The new hallmark will read: “An ability to think critically about one’s own behavior in society and the larger global community with an awareness of the principles of sustainability.”

V. The issue was raised as to whether someone who has tested out of the English requirement and thereby met the Writing category hallmarks is accurately reflected in the Writing category verbiage. Jerry asserted the importance of retaining the verbiage in hallmark #3 requiring “a production of 2,500 words or more of college level writing,...” However, it was argued that someone who tests out of the English requirement (thereby meeting the hallmark) will not need to produce the 2,500 words or more of college level writing and paradoxically, by testing out of the hallmarks, would not meet the hallmark. It was then suggested that hallmark #3 read: “An ability to produce a significant amount of college level writing.” There was subsequent discussion about whether the word “significant” was too general and could be interpreted in a multitude of different ways by different people.

Kara Kam-Kalani reintroduced Bert Shimabukuro’s earlier concern about the need for some type of quantification or specification of how much writing, for example, needs to be done for a hallmark to be satisfied. Sam contended that the issue of “how much” should be decided by CTE programs and hence the language, “An ability to produce a significant amount of college-level writing” should be sufficient. Bert’s concern, however, was that the Committee for Programs and Curricula (CPC) may possibly determine that a course does not in fact meet the hallmark if too little attention or emphasis is given to that hallmark in a CTE course. Quantification of exactly how much needs to be covered would help ensure that a course will meet the hallmark.

To address Bert’s concerns, Sam clarified that the specification of quantity or the exact number of words required could be specified in course SLOs rather than in the hallmarks. Jerry thereby agreed to the verbiage proposed by Sam and there were no further challenges proffered by members of the committee. Hence, the verbiage for hallmark #3 will be changed to: “An ability to produce a significant amount of college-level writing.”

V. Sam inquired as to why Category 1 has been titled, ‘Writing’ instead of ‘Literacy.’ His concern was that the title ‘Writing’ only covers writing, whereas ‘Literacy’ covers both reading and writing. Ken proposed the title of “Written Communication” which is consistent with the categories put forth by ACCJC, and there was general agreement on the category title change. Sam also expressed his concern that none of the Writing hallmarks addresses the ability to read, and therefore, a reading hallmark is needed under the Writing category. Eric argued that hallmark #4 (i.e., An appreciation of the features, history, and significance of excellent business,
technical, and contemporary writing) does address reading, and Jerry also agreed that the ability to read was adequately addressed. Specifically, it was noted that a person must be able to read in order to have an appreciation for various types of writing. It was then generally agreed that it was not necessary to add another hallmark to address reading, although Sam wanted his objections noted.

VI. Diane asked if PHIL 110 was included in the Numeracy hallmark. According to Sam, hallmark #8 (i.e., is sufficiently skeptical about reporting of news stories and advertising claims to know when they are logically and numerically inaccurate) addresses PHIL 110. There was some skepticism as to whether PHIL 110 was sufficiently represented by this hallmark. Sam reported, however, that he has sent his versions of the Numeracy and Logical Thinking hallmarks to Ron Pine for feedback, but he has not received any response. Kara was tasked with consulting Ron to see if he would like to add more Logic based hallmarks to the Numeracy and Logical Thinking category.

VII. In the category of Computing Literacy, Diane suggested that hallmark #3 (i.e., will appreciate the fact that anyone with a computer and access to the Internet has access to more information than was contained in all the libraries in the world just a few years ago) be omitted because of its superfluousness. Sam, however, asserted that “the youngsters these days don’t appreciate technology as much as probably you [Diane] and I [Sam] do.” In spite of his assertion, Sam made it clear that he was willing to omit it if everyone voted to omit it. Everyone voted to omit it. It was also suggested that hallmark #4 (i.e., will know a variety of ways to access that information) be removed due to its direct relation to hallmark #3 and because it is subsumed under the other Computing Literacy hallmarks.

Sam left because he was freezing.

VIII. For Category 2: Numeracy and Logical Reasoning, Kara suggested removing hallmark #2 (i.e., understands that some numbers are used for measuring; that something can be measured more and more accurately as necessary using decimals or fractions) and #3 (i.e., understands that some numbers are used for counting; that the numbers used for counting are "whole numbers" and not decimals or fractions) due to its “hyper-rudimentary” nature. Jess added that hallmark #2 and #3 could be merged. It was then suggested by Ken to merge them into: “An understanding of the uses and purposes of numbers including counting, measuring and calculating.” Kara still maintains that the new item is superfluous.

To address PHIL 110 as part of the Numeracy and Logical Reasoning category, it was suggested by Frank Fenlon that we adopt the verbiage currently used in the catalog to describe the Symbolic Reasoning Foundations requirement for the A.A. degree. Hence an additional hallmark was added that reads: “uses appropriate symbolic techniques to problem solve and evaluate critical information.”
Eric suggested that hallmark #8 (i.e., is sufficiently skeptical about reporting of news stories and advertising claims to know when they are logically and numerically inaccurate) should be simplified to read: “is sufficiently skeptical about media claims when they are logically and numerically inaccurate.” There was general consensus on this modification.

IX. For Category 4: Humanities and Fine Arts, Jerry expressed his concern about the wording of hallmark #3 (i.e., Demonstrate an understanding of how the arts and humanities are integrated with human values, constituting significant human activity in the creation and expression of those values). His primary contention was with the use of the word ‘integrated’ as part of the phrase: “arts and humanities are integrated with human values,...” Instead, it was suggested that the hallmark be reworded to: “Demonstrate an understanding of how the arts and humanities reinforce human values and constitute significant human activity in the creation and expression of those values.” There was general consensus on this modification.

X. For Category 5: Social Sciences, it was suggested that hallmark #2 (i.e., Interpret issues from multiple perspectives) be removed because of its redundancy with hallmark #3 (i.e., Demonstrate knowledge of multiple methodologies and theoretical approaches in understanding human behavior and societies). There was general consensus on the omission of this hallmark.

A minor change in wording was made to hallmark #5 (i.e., Demonstrate the ability to show how principles from social sciences can be used to make informed, reasoned, and ethical personal choices and inform public policy). The new verbiage will read: “Demonstrate the ability to show how principles from social sciences can be used to make informed, reasoned, and ethical personal choices to form public policy” (change in italics).

XI. There was general consensus that Category 6: Natural Sciences needed no modification.

XII. For Category 7: Oral Communication, Jerry commented that hallmark #2 (i.e., Use structural components and organizational patterns that enhance the clarity of a message and are appropriate to the topic, audience, context, and purpose) sounds more like an SLO than a hallmark. Kara and Ken both attested to the importance of general organizational abilities as an integral part of the public speaking process.

Jerry also commented that hallmark #1 (i.e., Gather research and select strong supporting material for various types of public presentations) was not specific to oral communication but more in line with information literacy. Kara explained that the ability to research and select strong supporting material were also an integral part of the speechmaking process.

Attempts were made to merge hallmark #2 and 3 into one hallmark, but in the end, it was generally agreed that it would be clearer and easier to keep them as separate hallmarks.
XIII. Jerry inquired about how the draft of hallmarks would be circulated to all of the CTE Programs. Jess replied that she would be going to the various CTE Programs and presenting them with the draft. Diane offered to help. Bert suggested that the draft be circulated to University College first for input. After it has been circulated for input from University College faculty, it can be circulated to the CTE Programs. This will ensure that everyone in University College is informed of the hallmarks being proffered and has an opportunity to comment before it goes out to the CTE Programs.

XIV. Jerry wishes to note the amiability of communication exhibited by those involved in the process of revising the draft of CTE Gen Ed hallmarks.

Meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kara Kam-Kalani