## Minutes of the General Education Committee Wednesday, February 20, 2013 Hawaii Hall 208

Attendees: Dore Minatodani, Stacey Roberts, Sarita Rai, Scott Rowland, Carolyn Stephenson (SEC), Amy Schiffner,

Comfort Sumida, Dwane Tegman

GEO Support Staff: Dawne Bost, Lisa Fujikawa

Excused: Ron Cambra, Joy Logan, Todd Sammons, Ryan Yamaguchi, Wei Zhang

Guest: Amy Schafer

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Chair Dore Minatodani at 1:40pm.

Minutes: The minutes of the 12/12/12 meeting were tabled until the March 6, 2013 meeting.

Guest Presentation and discussion: Amy Schafer, Foundations Board (F Board) Chair, presented the F Board proposal that the initial approval period for Foundations courses be changed to three years rather than the five currently in place. The primary reason for this request is to "avoid entrenchment of a course that does not really work out." Under the current proposal system, applicants for an initial F designation submit less information about the course than what is required for a renewal proposal. This makes it difficult for the F Board to assess how well the course meets the Hallmarks. A three year initial designation of a course would still allow the opportunity to "teach, revise, teach, then renew." Knowing that fewer students will be effected by a marginal course during a 3 year approval period will make "a borderline application easier to approve."

There are few new courses that come before the F Board seeking an F designation. There has been an increase in the number of new F designation proposals in the last year, but in the past, few new courses have requested the designation. It was estimated that under a 3 year initial approval period a new course could be taught as few as two times and as many as six times before coming up for renewal. The discussion then centered on the adequate amount of time needed to develop a course. SOCS 150 was offered as a course that the last academic year's GEC determined needed more than two semesters to "work into being more the course it promises to be." It was suggested that two semesters of instruction for a course may not result in enough evidence to support the course at renewal.

Some GEC members wanted to know what would happen if a marginal course, approved for a 3 year period, did not show adequate development at renewal. The course would be treated like any other renewal at that point. One member suggested that an additional three year period, rather than the current five year period, could be issued in such circumstances. It was suggested that are mechanisms in place for assuring "course integrity" and that the course is meeting the Hallmarks during the three year approval periods. Both statements were countered by expressions of concern about administrative impact of staggered renewal periods and confirmations that there are no active monitoring mechanisms in place for any General Education courses.

The vote on this proposal was delayed until the March 6, 2013 meeting of the GEC. Any further discussion of the proposal could be conducted by email.

## Course-based proposal reviews:

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{EE}}$  495: The E designation was approved unanimously.

ITE 343: The O designation was approved unanimously.

## **Information Items:**

Staffing: The E Board and DFWI committee do not have GEC staffing due to Joy Logan being on a one semester sabbatical. Amy Schiffner will attend the E Board meetings beginning in March, 2013. The DFWI committee will be staffed at a later date.

AMST 150: A brief re-telling of the circumstances leading to meeting of the GEC Chair, and F Board representative, the Chair of American Studies, the author of the AMST 150 proposal and GEO representatives were provided. The meeting, held on 02/07/13 at the American Studies Department's request, primarily focused on the AMST 150 renewal proposal.

The meeting resulted in greater understanding on the part of American Studies about the renewal process and what was needed for AMST 150 to continue with the FGB designation. The AMST 150 proposal will be resubmitted by 03/11/13.

<u>Advisory Group update</u>: The Advisory Board addressed the HAP Board proposal explained at the 11/28/12 GEC meeting. The proposal asked for a three year approval period rather than the current five years for marginal renewal approvals. After discussion, the proposal was dismissed.

It was announced that Board professional development efforts should be coordinated with Dawne Bost, in the GEO since she manages the GEO professional development component. The F Board proposal cited above was also discussed. The full Advisory Board unanimously supported the proposal. There was also discussion of potential improvements to the General Education website.

<u>Multi-campus HAP Board update</u>: The board met for five hours on 02/08/13 to discuss topics including protocols for multi-campus HAP Board meetings and native voice. They adjourned after establishing concrete protocols and after proposing changes to the HAP Hallmarks and explanatory notes. The representatives from each campus will discuss the changes with the appropriate entities on their individual campuses then report back the results of those discussions at the 04/26/13 multi-campus HAP Board meeting. At that time they will also explore possible changes to the articulation agreement.

The GEC inquired about the process for changing the Hallmarks. GEO staff explained that if a formal proposal is drafted by the multi-campus HAP Board, each campus will review the proposal and report back to the multi-campus Board. If it is unanimously approved by the multi-campus HAP Board based on decisions made at all campuses, then the proposal will go before the GEC. If the GEC approves the proposal, then it will also determine if the changes warrant Faculty Senate approval. The GEO thinks that changes that clarify the intent of the Hallmarks, but do not change the intent or requirements do not go to the Faculty Senate. If the proposal is rejected by the GEC and approved by all the other campuses, there is some uncertainty about what options Manoa may exercise.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35pm.