

Minutes of the General Education Committee
Wednesday, February 22, 2012
Hawai'i Hall 208

Attendees: Jim Caron, Sianha Gualano (ASUH), Joe Jarrett, Dore Minatodani, Scott Rowland, Mamoru Sato, Comfort Sumida, Ryan Yamaguchi, Wei Zhang

Support Staff: Dawne Bost (GEO), Lisa Fujikawa (GEO), Jo-Anne Nakamoto (GEO), Todd Sammons (GEO)

Excused: Fred Birkett, Ron Cambra (AVCUE), Richard Chadwick (SEC)

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Joe Jarrett at 12:01 p.m. He stated the GEC meeting was going to be completely informational, but that the next meeting would have at least one multiple designation Focus course and very likely SOCS 150 requiring review and votes.

ACTION ITEM:

Minutes of the January 25, 2012 meeting were approved with the following correction:

Information Item #4, 5th bullet ("Benchmark schools tended to have a math or a logic requirement, not both.") should be moved to become the 4th bullet item in Information Item #3.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. SOCS 150 - SOCS 150 will be under review by the Foundations Board at their Friday, February 24, 2012 meeting. The Board's recommendation will come to the GEC for voting thereafter. GEO will post the revised proposal on Laulima for all GEC members to read. It was noted that the proposal is approximately 50 pages. The previous proposal is also available for review.
2. ATTENDANCE POLICY (not on the agenda) - Jarrett provided clarifications of the Faculty Senate Attendance Policy obtained at the SEC retreat. He stated the policy seemed to be in response to committees with attendance problems. He said GEC does not currently have a problem with attendance.
 - The Senate representatives said all committees should take attendance as any committee member could be removed.
 - 3 unapproved absences per semester = removal from the assigned committee.
 - An absence is considered "unapproved" if there is no notification prior to the meeting. A committee member needs only to give advance notice that he or she will not attend a meeting in order for the absence to be approved.
 - Senate appointees can be treated as Senate members.
 - Committee members appointed by entities other than the Faculty Senate are subject to the same attendance rules as Faculty Senate members and Senate appointees. The only GEC committee member that is in this category is the student representative from ASUH.
 - These individuals, if removed, will be replaced by the appropriate committee.
 - The Senate representatives advised that administrative personnel (generally ex officio members) not meeting attendance requirements should be reported to the appropriate supervisor.
 - Attendance sheets do not need to be turned in as long as attendance appears in the committee meeting minutes.
 - It was suggested that the actual attendance sheets be saved in the GEO and the Faculty Senate be notified of GEC attendance via submission of the minutes to Kristin.

- It was also pointed out that anyone who does not want to serve on a committee needs only to ask to be removed; it is not necessary to be indirect about the desire not to serve by failing to show up.

3. FS WORKING GROUP – Sammons reported on the FS Working Group Meeting held February 17, 2012:

- The group made “a breakthrough” though the proposal was not accepted as originally written.
- There was apparently consensus among group members that the proposal, as written, would not be accepted.
- The group suggested a provisional change to the wording of the proposal. Along with the change is a suggested move of the Explanatory Note to Hallmark #5 and for Hallmark #5 to become an Explanatory Note.
- They suggested changing the wording of Hallmark #5 (“not focus solely on computation skills”) to “include computational and/or quantitative skills”, and add an Explanatory Note that says, “The course will not focus solely on computational skills.”

Bost stated it was also proposed that the Explanatory Notes include a new section illustrating examples of computational and quantitative skills as they are actually taught in the classroom of existing or possible FS classes. Amy Schafer, a Manoa representative on the FS Working Group, created a Google Documents file for group members to post suggested examples.

GEC discussion of the information provided about the working group had general agreement that the proposed changes were potentially an improvement over the current situation. It was also noted that the working group did not seem to be addressing the math requirement issue. However, it does assure that PHIL 110 will continue to be included as an FS class. Sammons stated that only approximately 8%-10% of all students take PHIL 110 rather than a more quantitative class, thus the issue may not be as serious as it seems.

It was mentioned that there are FS Working Group members who propose a change in admission requirements prior to expanding the quantitative requirements for all UH four-year degrees. A brief discussion of high school mathematics requirements and community college and UHM entrance requirements followed.

The discussion then focused on the next steps in the process. Jarrett stated that GEC can change the wording of Hallmarks if requirements are not changed. When asked to clarify this procedure, he stated that a change that added or subtracted requirements would have to go to the Faculty Senate. There was speculation that if the proposed change was required to go to the Faculty Senate, there should be little trouble getting it passed, although some Senate members may want to see “more.”

Jarrett and Minatodani would like to see the FS Working Group Minutes when they are prepared.

4. ILO Presentation - Minatodani reported:

- “WASC is asking UHM to adopt Institutional Learning Outcomes, by which UHM will assess undergraduate achievement. “
- The assessment will happen at the institutional level, not departmental or individual. The ILOs must have desirable, measurable outcomes. There are questions about how to measure things that occur outside of the classroom.
- The ILO Working Group did not attempt to make a “map of what is happening. “ The results of their efforts are instead a vision of what Manoa wants in the future.
- The draft ILOs, the Working Group's draft report, and draft FAQs were summarized for the GEC.
- Minatodani asked for group members to provide comments about the documents which will be emailed to the committee members. She requested “technical and fundamental” feedback.

- GEC's comments will go back to the working group, who will adjust the documents as necessary.
- Barring significant changes or problems, the finalized documents will be sent to the SEC, who will then bring them to the full Senate.
- The Working Group is suggesting the SEC develop a process whereby the drafts will be circulated widely for review, as these documents need to be reviewed and approved by all stakeholders.

Discussion of the ILO information departed from #3 on the ILO draft grid "VALUE – Personal and Social Responsibility."

It was agreed that most Manoa classes do not formally teach things such as community service and that "lifelong learning" and "joy of learning" were virtually impossible to measure and assess. Minatodani stated the working group attempted to include only what is "already down on paper" including things mentioned in the UHM strategic plan. Sammons suggested that the many of these ILOs may be co-curricular, which is acceptable since these are institutional learning objectives.

Rowland stated that as the documents go forward to the broader university for review, they must be presented as a statement of "what Manoa wants to be, not what we are already." Minatodani stated it is possible that when departments look at the documents, we will find they are doing a majority of the ILOs even though "they are not specifically articulating these things in their SLOs."

Minatodani stressed that the ILOs are not meant to exist side by side the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) put forth by the Lumina Project. She stated if the university commits to the Lumina Project, then the ILOs may be rendered unnecessary, but the Working Group went ahead with their task since DQP is not yet in place.

5. DFWI Working Group – Jarrett reported that the group (made up of representatives from MAC, CAPP, and GEC) met and had a long discussion about the issues affecting the DFWI concern; however, a plan is still needed to have the group progress. He asked that GEC members who found the DFWI issue to be important to "weigh in" with their opinions and ideas. As an example, Jarrett used the idea that Manoa should provide a more extensive new student orientation for incoming freshman and transfer students to ensure early academic success and retention. Sammons stated the GEO would like to look further into this suggestion.

There was a discussion of how MATH 100 and other high enrollment classes with high failure rates might be helped. The possibility of more adjuncts and TAs being added to teach MATH 100 was explored, especially since there is precedence with other "service courses" like ENG 100 receiving external funding from the OVCAA. Breakout sessions were also suggested. A few attendees pointed out that MATH 100 was not on the DFWI list and the perception of it being a high failure rate class may be related to one well known unusual semester.

The "D" or better criteria to successfully pass MATH 100 for the purpose of meeting a General Education requirement was then discussed. Rowland asked if a "D" "helps a student." Jarrett stated that MATH 100 is not a prerequisite to any course but simply fulfills a General Education requirement. He stated it is possible that the "D" for class credit is allowed because students can fulfill their GenEd requirements and then move into their major.

The discussion then focused on the multiple committee efforts to study retention rates. The logic and validity of committees studying strategies for senior retention was explored. It was generally agreed that seniors are already committed to graduation barring unusual circumstances thus calling the placement

of time and resources into question. It was pointed out that many committees are looking at retention rates in the first two years; it may be feasible for other committees to review senior retention.

Jarrett then asked if the issues being examined by the DFWI Working Group and other similar committees “have anything to do with the GEC.” The resulting conversation included references to admission criteria, initiatives by the School of Hawaiian Knowledge, and Foundations requirements. There were questions of how DQP may impact the discussion of DFWI and retention. Jarrett again asked committee members to consider if these are General Education issues and something the GEC should be exploring in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 1pm.

Next Meeting: 12:00 noon, March 7, 2012

Submitted by Dawne Bost