Strategy for Campus discussion and roll out of changes

Jerry reported on a meeting with Cynthia, Mike Rota, Erika Lacro regarding how best to implement changes in a manner that ensures sufficient campus discussion. He stated that it was made clear that administration must take a leading role in explaining the need for changes, that messages from administration must reinforce the importance of this review and revision as well as the urgency. It needs to be made clear that the background for this is to implement recommendations related to the Underprepared Student Task Force findings and is directly needed to address Accreditation recommendations where the College ‘did not meet’ standard criteria related to CTE general education requirements. The announcement from the Chancellor and/or Vice Chancellor should emphasize the priority being given to this revision of General Education requirements – both the creation of the list of eligible classes *and* specific review and if necessary revision of program specific gen ed requirements.

The committee discussed important steps that needed to be taken to inform the campus of the work of the committee and to share drafts for comment and revision, and then what the next steps should be to enable discussion and dialogue and complete this task.

There needs to be a focus on this topic at the General College Meeting as well as targeted Divisional meetings during Duty Period to get a fast start on these discussions and review, with focused program meetings to follow.

Review of Gen Ed Philosophy Statement

Jerry shared a draft of a new catalog statement regarding the importance of general education; this draft had been reviewed and amended through email prior to the meeting. This statement will go into the catalog as part of the description of A.S./A.A.S. and A.A. degrees. This statement makes explicit the importance of general education learning objectives. There was one revision in wording discussed. The second paragraph telling students to check with their degree programs about specific changes will only be included if the campus cannot finalize the list of gen ed courses in time for the catalog printing. Cynthia motioned for the Committee to approve, seconded by Jess. The vote was unanimous in favor of accepting in its current form.

It was clarified that the catalog statement now should go through the established procedure of DCC review for changes to the catalog (for all Divisions’ DCCs), prior to being sent to the CPC. This is necessary to ensure the discussion and buy-in of all programs prior to its inclusion. Marcia will help to facilitate this process.

Review of Proposed Changes in Courses and Categories

The group then looked over the initial draft of general education categories and courses that would fall under newly designated categories. This was created based on the existing list of gen ed course options, with Marcia and Cynthia making the following changes: deleting courses that
have not been offered for years; deleting courses that are clearly not College level, and
determining new designation for courses that fell under now defunct category of ‘functioning in
society’. Also made sure that *all* CTE courses could only be counted as fulfilling general
education requirements for students not majoring in that program. The wording for this was
revised by the committee.

The following points were discussed;

Status of ICS. It does not really fit into any of the existing categories (categories that reflect the
groupings from Accreditation standard language, reflect the break down used at KCC, and which
mirror the groupings for Liberal Arts degree.) Rather than trying to include it in existing
categories, programs that require ICS capabilities from their students might have to consider a)
adding to their *program* requirements, or b) having an ICS class as a *prerequisite* to the
program (perhaps to be taken for those on waitlists) Another option is having students
demonstrate necessary capabilities through testing. The particulars of program needs related to
ICS will need to be dealt with on a program specific basis in dialogue with the ICS department.

It was clarified that in deciding what courses belong in the categories, Marcia and Cynthia
referred to the hallmarks for each category, hallmarks established in draft form by the committee
in earlier meetings. For those CTE programs that wish to include courses in the list of choices,
the SLOs for those desired courses will need to meet some or all of these gen ed category
hallmarks.

Prior activities related to mapping by programs should be used as a key resource to determine
what program requirements must be met by gen ed course choices. This will determine how
prescriptive a program will be in telling students what gen ed options they have. The Deans need
to find the records of past mapping activities.

The goal will be to start the discussion by program faculty on these drafts asap with the start of
Spring 2011 semester with the goal of finalizing not just the philosophy statement but also the list
of gen ed class choices in time for the catalog deadline (and pushing that deadline as late as
possible). If the list of classes cannot be finalized, might put a watermark indication in the catalog
telling students to look *online* where changes to gen ed course choices can be readily made
and information kept up to date more easily. The goal is to push to have this done in spring but
only if necessary dialogue can be carried out.