GENERAL EDUCATION FOR CTE: 
NOTES FROM THE 2ND “TOWN HALL” 
January 18, 2011

Present: Rob Edmondson, Frank Fenlon, Carol Hiraoka, Marilynn Ito-Won, Ralph Kam, Kara Kam-Kalani, Erika Lacro, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Mike Rota, Jerry Saviano, Shioko Yonezawa, Tim Wilson.

Jerry Saviano distributed copies of the initial draft of the proposed General Education categories and courses included in each as well as an updated draft that included a new category for computing literacy; the updated draft incorporates a number of the suggestions made at the 1st Town Hall on January 11.

As to why the title “Numeracy” was proposed to replace “Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning,” it was suggested that this went along with saying “Literacy” (in lieu of “Writing”) and “Computing Literacy” to create parallel categories of basic competencies essential for college-level work.

In reviewing the criteria developed by Sam Rhoads for Numeracy, it was felt that these seemed more like SLOs than hallmarks, given their level of specificity. (Sam, though not present at the meeting, wanted to remind everyone that this was just a draft.) Jerry will ask Sam to rework these items.

Chancellor Rota made the point that while we want to align the CTE Gen Ed categories with those in Liberal Arts, we need to acknowledge that General Education requirements for CTE are narrower in scope and purpose, accounting for fewer credits within the overall program. He did note, however, that if the consensus is that we need 18 credits (or more), then we need to have them.

Marcia Roberts-Deutsch reminded the group of the work previously done in mapping course-to-program SLOs in Tech I and Tech II, and suggested that something comparable be done in aligning program courses with Gen Ed hallmarks. This could provide some flexibility in how programs propose to meet those hallmarks.

Jerry Saviano asked Marilynn Ito-Won what concerns the counselors had. Marilynn indicated that implications for financial aid and Veterans’ Administration protocols were of concern, and that she other others were trying to anticipate problems that students might have. Marilynn also raised the question about program courses (e.g., CA 100) being included on the lists but being designated for non program majors only; this would require some significant changes in how programs meet their Gen Ed requirements. In this context, it was noted (again) that we are looking at a draft document, and that if programs want to make a case for other options, we need to create a mechanism by which that can be done. At issue is whether General Education should include only the more conventional liberal arts disciplines, in order to ensure a breadth of knowledge. This then returns us to the need to consider the option of aligning SLOs (regardless of course alpha) with Gen Ed hallmarks.
In this context, it was recommended that **the work of the General Education Working Group is not yet concluded**, and that it should meet at least one more time after the Town Hall meeting scheduled for Friday, January 21, when it is hope that more people, especially CTE faculty members, will be able to attend.

Kara Kam-Kalani raised the question as to why **Speech (oral communication) is not also included as a core requirement**. Although it is a graduation requirement for the A.A. degree, it is not clear where it fits within the CTE Gen Ed framework, though it is currently in the Arts and Humanities category. Ralph Kam noted that in the ACCJC standards, effective speaking is included with other forms of communication. It was felt that the prospect of having another category (effectively raising the required Gen Ed credits to 21) was not one that would be well-received.

This led to a more general discussion, prompted by a question from Chancellor Rota, of **what skills/competencies can be embedded in program courses**. It would seem that oral communication and computing might be good candidates for this approach. This would, however, also require a means of tracking students’ progress in completing those requirements / meeting those hallmarks. One conclusion that was reached was that, as a guiding principle, we need to **develop a plan that allows the CTE programs some flexibility** in meeting the Gen Ed requirements. Put another way, as the Chancellor suggested, we need to ask “how we can reconfigure what we need to deliver” in order to meet CTE needs.

The discussion also turned to the question of what constitutes appropriate “college level” work. (The **distinction between “college level” and “transfer level”** was noted but not defined.) In this context, Marilynn noted the progress made in modifying courses in Chemistry and Physics to put them at the 100 level (e.g., CHEM 55 became CHEM 105). It was suggested that MATH should do the same. The Chancellor noted that the program at PHNS is moving toward requiring all transfer-level courses.

Shioko Yonezawa asked whether a foreign/second language requirement might be instituted at HCC. It was thought that this would be more appropriate for the A.A. degree.

Rob Edmondson asked whether we know about “best practices” at other community colleges. Saddleback College (which Marcia visited in Fall 2010) is one such college, but that ultimately it depends on factors such as the mix of Liberal Arts/CTE programs, the demographics of the student body, and the nature of the work force for which students are being prepared.

**NEXT TOWN HALL MEETING: Friday, January 21, 11:00 am-12:30pm, 2-201**