GENERAL EDUCATION FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL PROGRAMS

MINUTES
October 14, 2011, 1:30 PM

Members present: Jess Aki (Co-Chair), Erika Balbag-Gerard, Diane Caulfield, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Frank Fenlon, Kara Kam-Kalani (Co-Chair), Derek Oshiro, Jim Poole, Eric Shaffer, Bert Shimabukuro, Judy Sokei, Russell Uyeno.

A question was raised regarding the origin of the proposed seven General Education categories for CTE programs. In answer to the question, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch explained that the categories were derived from the General Education requirements for the A.A. degree and can be found in the college catalog. According to Chancellor Mike Rota, the categories for General Education should pertain to all Associate degrees, not just the A.A. degree. Marcia suggested that members of the committee go online and familiarize themselves with the ACCJC standards for general education. The seven general education categories being proposed are in alignment with the general education requirements outlined by ACCJC so that our college will be in full compliance with the expectations of the accrediting body.

Diane Caulfield expressed her concern that the CTE programs did not have a chance to comment on the latest 4-25-2011 version of the Gen Ed for CTE categories and hallmarks before the Chancellor’s policy on General Education was issued. Kara Kam-Kalani reported that the 4-25-2011 version was sent out to University College for input by faculty in April of Spring 2011. In the May 2011 meeting of the Committee for Programs and Curricula (CPC), Marcia distributed a copy of the latest draft to all Division Chairs, Deans, and members of the CPC (including those in the CTE programs) for their input.

Diane also commented that she has seen no more than five general education categories at other colleges. Jim Poole responded by explaining that the goal of the seven proposed categories is to be in alignment with the requirements of ACCJC.

Jim inquired as to whether hallmarks were necessary for each of the proposed categories. It was explained that hallmarks are needed so that course SLOs can be made to align with category hallmarks. Hallmarks are in place to meet the ACCJC requirements. Jim asserted his belief that we have gone beyond what is asked of us by ACCJC. Marcia directed Jim to go back to the ACCJC language in the Standard (i.e., Standard II.A.3.a-c). While general education may not seem entirely relevant for Tech I and II programs, there is a strong push for everyone to have a broad-based general education. The proposed set of seven categories addresses the first area (three bodies of knowledge) and the first four of the skills identified in the second area. The third area identifies qualities that are found in multiple courses and other categories (e.g., historical sensitivity, multicultural awareness) and those are not addressed with specific and separate categories.

Concern was also expressed over the number of hallmarks that need to be met in order for
a general education category to be satisfied. Jim stated that there is no CTE class that can fulfill all of the hallmarks under a single category. Therefore, he believes that we cannot expect all of the hallmarks under a particular category to be met. He stated that even Liberal Arts courses do not meet all of the hallmarks in a given category. Marcia commented that she would like to see at least three out of the four hallmarks met. Some of the CTE faculty commented that it would not be feasible to require a minimum number of the hallmarks in each category to be met. This led to subsequent discussion of who, or what body, will determine whether courses sufficiently meet the hallmarks for each category. Marcia responded that a subcommittee of the General Education Board will be assigned to determine whether new courses meet the General Education categories. The subcommittee will create policy on how courses will meet the requirements. Policies are already in place for certifying courses in the Liberal Arts program for Diversification, for example. The Gen Ed for CTE subcommittee can use that process as a starting point and mirror existing processes for certifying courses.

Marcia raised two questions for the committee to ponder: (1) Should we be moving towards transfer level classes? (2) Should these requirements be for non-program majors?

Eric moved to pass two recommendations on to the CPC:

(1) CTE programs do not have to meet all of the hallmarks in each category in order to satisfy a category requirement. At least one or more hallmark(s) must be met by means of the alignment of course SLOs. In terms of course certification, there does not have to be a total match. The motion was unanimously passed by the committee.

(2) The current Gen Ed Board be expanded to include a General Education for CTE Subcommittee that will include members of both CTE and Liberal Arts faculty and they will be charged with migrating the list of courses in the current categories to the newly proposed ones, and developing a process and criteria by which new course will be certified. The motion was unanimously passed by the committee.

Frank raised the question of whether a course can meet the hallmarks in different categories. The response was that a course can satisfy a single category only. Marcia moved for approval, and Diane seconded the motion.

Diane noted a few changes that need to be made to the draft of courses that fulfill general education requirements for CTE sent out by Marcia via e-mail in advance of the meeting. This draft was produced by the Gen Ed for CTE Working Group in Fall 2010. According to Diane, there are courses that need to be added to the list, and courses that are not just for non-majors. Marcia clarified that the list she distributed via e-mail was taken from last year's catalog based on last year's CPC actions. Diane offered to consult with Jim Poole regarding any possible changes that need to be made. She will then submit the changes to Marcia before the next CPC meeting on October 28.

Marcia emphasized the need to put to rest any ambiguity about the number of credits required of CTE students, given the new general education requirements. Specifically, an
increase in the number of general education categories does not invariably necessitate an increase in the number of credits that a student is required to take to graduate from a degree program. There are several means by which categories requirements can be satisfied. Particularly, general education requirements can be met through: (1) program pre-requisites, (2) program exit requirements, (3) testing out, (4) program courses that qualify for general education categories, and (5) combinations of courses through mapping of SLOs to hallmarks.

Diane expressed her concern that students will still have to pay for the 3 credits of a course in which they have “tested out.” Frank Fenlon, counselor, stated that if a student meets a requirement, counselors can just check it off and students need not pay for the credits.

Jim commented that there will be very few students who can actually test out. Bert added that there will be some students who have to take all seven categories, and that is what he is worried about.

Marcia commented that she wants to hear more from the CTE faculty about how Liberal Arts courses can better be tailored to meet the needs of CTE students.

Jim shared his desire to combine courses like English and Speech into one course for CTE students in order to avoid increasing the number of credits required by student in CTE programs. Ralph Kam commented that classes that consist of both CTE and non-CTE students provide for a richer and more diverse audience, rather than classes that consist of primarily CTE students.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM

Respectfully submitted by Kara Kam-Kalani