Honolulu Community College
General Education Board
Agenda
February 25, 2013
Room 7-603, 3:30pm – 4:50pm

Members present: Jennifer Higa-King (Diversification), Kara Kam-Kalani (Speech Focus), Alapaki Luke (HAP-Focus), Steve Mandraccia (Foundations), Chris Ann Moore (E-Focus), Eric Shaffer (WI-Focus), Sandy Sanpei (CTE Gen Ed)

Members absent/excused: None

Guests: Diane Caulfield, Carol Hasegawa, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch

Recorder: Jennifer Higa-King

I. Unfinished Business
None

II. New Business

A. Approval of minutes of last meeting (Jan. 25, 2013)
Minutes were unanimously approved pending corrections.

B. Updates for Banner and catalog due
Board chairs were reminded of the upcoming deadline (March 1st) for reporting, to the VCAA, updates and changes to certification lists of courses/instructors. Final reports summarizing the 2012-2013 academic year are due April 12th to Jennifer who will assemble the reports into one GEB report, and forward this report to CPC and the VCAA.

C. Planning: End of the semester reports
Last meeting of the semester and academic year will be April 15th (Monday), 3:30pm. Location: TBD

D. Accreditation: College-level general education course requirements
The board returned to the question about the General Education Board’s (GEB) role in the process of determining whether a course was deemed college-level. At the January 25, 2013, the GEB approved, by consensus, that the GEB and its sub-boards are not responsible for determining the level (college or transfer) of any proposed course, but is limited to deciding whether a course meets the hallmarks and aiding that course in doing so. Members expressed that there is some type of linkage between the GEB, DCCs, and
CPC in determining “college” level content, but the link is not yet clear. There was general agreement that the final decision resides with the CPC. As such, the GEB will suggest to the CPC that new course proposals be forwarded to the DCC first (for determination of transfer and/or college level) before being forwarded to the GEB. This will require a change in the Curriculum Proposal Flow Chart. Clarifying the role of the GEB in the process is crucial to preserving the integrity and function of the GEB sub-boards.

E. Follow-up questions about moving from instructor to course-based certifications.

A question was raised regarding the process of moving to course-based certification for HAP, Ethics, and WI courses. HCC’s HAP board supports moving HWST 107 to a course-based certification. Both LCC and UH-M already certify HWST 107 as a course. At HCC, the HAP board would ensure that faculty and lecturers teaching HWST 107 receive orientation on teaching HAP courses, including syllabus content, SLOs, assessment, and assessment-of-assessment.

The E-focus Board will now move forward to course based certification and grandfathering in any previously designated courses.

The feasibility of course-based certification for WI courses is not yet clear. Eric was also asked to check the UH system requirements for WI certification and to discuss the switch to course-based certification with the WI board.

F. Revising board and sub-board charters.

At the last CTE GEB meeting, members met again to discuss a proposal for membership, for inclusion in a charter. One proposal (“2-2-2”) was for two voting members from Tech 1, two from Tech 2, and two from the UC. The second proposal (“2-2-4”) was for two (Tech 1), two (Tech 2), and four (UC) faculty membership. The CTE GEB voted on whether to accept the second proposal, where there is a balance between CTE and UC votes. The vote was tied and there was a stalemate on further discussion. The next step was to have the GEB discuss the issue of membership.

Three central points of concern were: (1) equal representation (voting) from CTE and UC faculty; (2) separation of Tech 1 and Tech 2 as two different and distinct voting entities; and (3) how to incorporate the recommendations from the Accreditation report about finalizing discussion of general education. Regarding the latter, the board considered the idea of having a single general education board, rather than two (one for the CTE programs and another for articulation by the UC). However, in considering the urgency of the upcoming progress report (October) and work already put into re-structuring the GEB, the GEB decided to work with two separate boards for the time being.
The board revisited ideas for “2-2-2” and “2-2-4” membership. There was no consensus on how to proceed.

III. Next Meeting: April 15, 2013, 3:30pm. Location, TBA.