

## **Minutes of the General Education Committee**

Wednesday, April 4, 2012

Hawai'i Hall 208

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

Support staff: Lisa Fujikawa (GEO), Jo-Anne Nakamoto (GEO Recorder), Todd Sammons (GEO)

Absent: Fred Birkett, Richard Chadwick (SEC)

Excused: Dawne Bost (GEO), Garrett Inoue (Admissions), Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Joe Jarrett at 12:00 noon.

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

1. Approval of Minutes
  - Minutes of March 7<sup>th</sup> were unanimously approved.
  - Minutes of March 21<sup>st</sup> were unanimously approved with the following corrections:
    - Info Item #1, para immediately following bullet number 8 to read: "The GEC unanimously approved a motion to offer a two-year probationary period for SOCS 150 to the F Board. Joe will meet with the Board to present this compromise."
    - Info Item #2, second bullet. Replace "requirement" with "Hallmark".
2. Foundations Renewals for GEC Vote:
  - ELI 100 (FW) - The GEC voted (7 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstained) to renew this proposal.
  - GEOG 102 (FG-B) The GEC voted unanimously (8-0-0) to approve this renewal proposal.
  - GEOG 151 (FG-C) The GEC voted unanimously (8-0-0) to approve this renewal proposal.All of the above-mentioned proposals were renewed for 5 years (Fall 2012-Summer 2017).

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. Update on SOCS 150
  - Joe met with the Foundations Board on March 23<sup>rd</sup>. The Board revoted and reaffirmed that they recommended a one-year approval or none at all.
  - He reiterated that the GEC felt a 2-year conditional approval should be given to this course to give them enough time to improve it.
  - He mentioned the Foundations Board's concern about the lack of rigor for this course.
  - The GEC reaffirmed their stance of a 2-year approval by vote: 8-0-0. Joe will write memo to instructors/dean and incorporate Foundations Board's comments and concerns.
  - Proposal for future policy: in order for a course to be given a Foundations designation, it should have to been taught a minimum amount (to be determined) of times first (or, perhaps taught with a 2-yr probational/conditional approval). The Foundations Board felt that as long as the syllabus met the Hallmarks it should be okay to carry the designation.
2. Report: Foundations Multicampus Meeting – to be held on April 13<sup>th</sup>

- Discussion: Does the UHM Foundations Board require input regarding changes to the Hallmarks? There appears a conflict, due to the documents written prior to the articulation agreement.
  - Who votes first on any new changes?
  - Would each campus's GEC vote?
  - As mentioned in prior meetings, perhaps the UHM group could do the initial write-up.
  - Another thought is that quantitative skills might be tweaked into a Focus requirement vs. a Foundations requirement.
  - WASC currently hasn't made any decision regarding FS. We can't base policy on it, but what is best. If campus-wide consensus is that math is "good", then we would need a working group to hold community meetings to gather opinions. This goes back to the concept that admitted students should have had adequate math background in high school; also our expectation of what is a "foundational course"? Why the symbolic reasoning tangent, or is it essential to those seeking a liberal arts degree?
- Joe's review of peer and benchmark schools indicated that half of them have a combination of both logic and computational skills requirements. The others say either-or math or logic (which was included in our original statement of the requirement).

Meeting adjourned at 12:58 p.m.

Next meeting: April 18, 2012, 12:00-1:00 p.m.

Submitted by Jo-Anne Nakamoto, Recorder.