The discussion focused on the Draft documents previously circulated to the campus by the General Education Working Group (see link on HCC intranet) that outlined 1) the new General Education categories and the courses that could be used to fulfill those requirements, and 2) the hallmarks for each of those categories that had been created by modifying or streamlining UH-Manoa’s language. Issues and concerns that were raised and should inform subsequent discussions include the following:

1. With reference to the Writing category, the question was raised as to why this would not also include Reading as an aspect of general literacy. Jerry Saviano indicated that it was felt that once placement testing and the new Developmental English curriculum (which includes both reading and writing) was fully in place, students would have met the prerequisites for ENG 22, the first ENG course that would count as a means of meeting this GenEd requirement.

2. The category of Quantitative and Logical Reasoning was the subject of sustained discussion. Sam Rhoads noted the very disparate levels of MATH that were included as satisfying this requirement and also indicated that in several cases, those courses would not meet the hallmarks as currently written. In particular, such wording as “formal systems” has a particular significance in the context of higher-level mathematics, and courses below MATH 135 would not qualify. Sam recommended that this GenEd requirement focus more on numeracy and math skills, and agreed to draft new hallmarks for this category. (NOTE: Although the current draft refers to “Hallmarks (SLOs)”, it was decided to call them simply “hallmarks” since they would serve as guiding principles at a more general level; specific courses would need to have SLOs that would align with those hallmarks.) It was also pointed out disparities in language should be resolved: is it “Quantitative OR…” or “Quantitative AND…”; is it “Logical Reasoning” or “Symbolic Reasoning”? Each of these expressions carries different implications.

3. Sam also made a strong recommendation that the GenEd requirements include computing literacy. Jerry indicated that the General Education Working Group felt strongly about holding the number of GenEd credits required to 15, and that the CTE programs would be reluctant to increase that to 18. It was pointed out, however, that several programs also require ICS 100, separate from other General Education courses. At the end of the discussion, it was decided to add an additional category for this requirement, and that ICS 100 and ICS 101, currently in question in the Social Sciences category, would be included in this new category. It was noted that while students are increasingly comfortable and conversant with various forms of technology, they do not necessarily have the right kinds of skills and knowledge for college work.

4. With reference to the issue of computing literacy, other alternatives were also considered, including a) providing a means of placing or testing out of that requirement, and b) making ICS 100 a program prerequisite, rather than a course requirement. Sam mentioned that ICS faculty have for some time discussed the possibility of revising ICS 100 by creating topic-specific modules, so that students
might test out of some and focus on others. Sam stressed that ICS 100 is not simply a “skills” course but one that is more broadly based in understanding the appropriate uses of computing technology.

5. The General Education Working Group considers that it has met its charge in preparing the draft materials under discussion. The next step would be to develop a means by which courses could be formally reviewed and certified as meeting one of the GenEd category requirements. Marcia recommended that the CTE Gen Ed review board (or whatever it would be called) should be incorporated under the existing General Education Board, and should include both Liberal Arts and CTE faculty.

6. While it would be ideal to have new requirements in place by Fall 2011—something which the Chancellor strongly urges—it was felt that we need to ensure adequate time for discussion and that Fall 2012 might be the more realistic goal.

Since there was some confusion about the date of this first meeting, Jerry Saviano will remind the campus of the Town Hall meetings scheduled for Tuesday, 1/18, at 2:00 p.m. and Friday, 1/21, at 11:00 a.m. Both meetings will take place in 2-201.

Notes prepared by Marcia Roberts-Deutsch