



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: October 19, 2018 10:30 AM -12:00 PM
LOCATION: ITC 105B
ATTENDANCE: [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS	
Garrett Apuzen-Ito	P	Shana Brown	P	Christine Beaulé	P	Lisa Fujikawa	P
Halina Zaleski	E	Michael Cooney	P	Ronald Cambra	P	Vicky Keough	P
Shannon Johnson	P	Geoffrey LaFlair	P	Ryan Yamaguchi	A		
Kalikoaloha Martin	P	Garrett Clanin	P	Sheela Sharma	P	GUESTS	
		Micah Leval (ASUH representative)	P	Stacey Roberts (SEC liaison)	P	Mike Nassir	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION / INFORMATION	ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON
CALL TO ORDER	Meeting was called to order by Shannon Johnson at 10:10 am.	
REVIEW OF MINUTES	Minutes from Oct. 12 were reviewed and approved 7-0-1.	
ACTION ITEMS	1. Revisions on E/O/W proposal for PACE 430 (Ranney).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion to approve PACE 430 passed 6-1-1



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

DISCUSSION
ITEMS

1. Presentation: Michael Nassir (GEC member, 2015-18) made two proposals regarding “double dipping” chart from the Diversification section of the UHM catalog (see “Double Dip Proposal 10-19-2018”), which explains when students can double count Gen Ed courses towards other Gen Ed and/or major & minor requirements. Gen Ed courses typically count toward major, but not minors & certificates. Background: 2017-18 GEC agreed on changes to allow double dipping of Diversification and Foundations requirements with minor reqs and was ready to bring to MFSEC, but waited to discuss double dipping of HSL with majors and minors. MN recommends decision be made at future GEC meeting.
 - a. Goal of proposals: simplify requirements, make advising and course-planning easier.
 - b. Proposal part 1: remove double dipping chart from the catalog. Make it a set of internal policies to GEC / GEO.
 - i. Question: when GEC approves courses for a Gen Ed designation, does that change the status of a course for double-dip purposes? Response: yes, it can, because course is now part of Gen Ed and might not count towards minors / certificates
 - ii. Question: from advising perspective, how important is this chart? Response: in practice some students & advisors do use the catalog chart. Chart is integrated into STAR. Also, in MN’s proposal, would still be public information (available on web), just not published in catalog.
 - iii. Question: why can’t Foundations courses have focus designations? Response: rationale is that foundations classes set the “foundation,” and skills represented by Focus hallmarks are best developed in upper-division classes after establishing that foundation. Div classes can be any level. Also, they can double dip with focus, and this helps transfer students from UHCC.



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>c. Proposal part 2: remove restrictions that prevent students from applying Gen Ed courses towards both major, minor, and / or certificate requirements. Potentially unlimited application of Gen Ed courses towards multiple programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Rationale: simpler, more student-friendly. ii. RC: proposal could encourage students to look to minors and certificates, and would make it easier for STAR to incorporate certificate requirements. Caveat: need to give enough notice to be sure that STAR can comply. iii. Version of proposal was presented to Council of Academic Advisors last academic year. CAA subcommittee looked at Gen Ed requirements at peer & benchmark institutions to see if they allowed double-dipping. Survey of PBI not definitive; some allowed double-dipping; some did not, but had multiple exceptions, e.g., you could double-dip, but only up to a certain number of credits, or only for certain courses, etc. Hard to see a clear pattern of best practice. iv. Comment in support of proposal: Rules should be simple and based on requirements of major or minor, without regard for double-dipping. Gen Ed should not prevent students from completing programs. v. Question: Would this change undermine GEC's ability to determine the educational outcomes created by certain classes? Response: Gen Ed courses are meant to ensure that students learn certain skills / topic areas. Even if they count toward majors and minors and certificates, skills and benefits should be the same. vi. Question: What were arguments against proposal, in CAA review? Response: some advisors concerned that students could do all Gen Ed requirements inside major. Within any | |
|--|---|--|



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

	<p>given department, classes typically use same epistemological framework. Their students may not be exposed to range of disciplinary perspectives, hence education not truly “general.” Comment: students still need 120 credits to graduate; credits beyond major will naturally lead to more diversification.</p> <p>d. General discussion in regards to both proposals: language equivalent courses. Some schools allow students to satisfy language requirement from culture classes or study abroad. Many culture substitution courses carry DH’s, etc. so this proposed change would really impact how those students build their degree programs. What becomes of an HSL requirement if a student is allowed to sub in a culture class under the new requirements? Note: GEC does not oversee list of courses that are culture alternatives to HSL for some schools. GEO Director: resolution was put before the MFS that colleges could waive the HSL requirements as their faculty decided, and approved. More than half of units have waived the HSL requirements or swapped out culture requirements. This will be discussed under the blue-sky recommendations in the external report.</p> <p>2. MFSEC liaison: Proposals do imply curricular changes. Would have to go to MFS for approval. Need time to build groundwork.</p> <p>3. Suggested next steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Look for more specific examples from departments to calculate likely impact Ask for CAA to respond to updated proposal Solicit input from stakeholders. Some colleges have fought against changing these requirements, and it would be good to seek input to make sure that there is reflection of their concerns. Much of the current system is based on concerns from arts & sciences, so there should be time to consider their concerns. Add to our upcoming agendas a brief discussion period on this issue so we can incrementally increase our understanding on this issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEC chair will ask to get on CAA agenda to discuss revised proposal; will ask them to provide examples of how the proposed changes would affect majors / minors in practice.
--	--	--



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

<p>e. RC: putting this option on the table might motivate departments to try and address these concerns over burden to students, and see if they want to consider internal changes to allow them to reduce burden on students. Real value to students to reconsider options.</p> <p>4. Picking up on governance Recommendation 1.a, to move GEO back under the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) from OVCAA. Asking Ron Cambra (Office of Undergraduate Education) for his views</p> <p>a. RC: moving GEO to OVCAA was meant to allow for closer cooperation with OVCAA. Not sure how much cooperation is happening in practice given large numbers of commitments in OVCAA. Moving GEO back into OUE might make conversations about undergraduate education more fruitful. In the end, OUE also reports back to OVCAA.</p> <p>b. Discussion of status quo: GEO reports to OVCAA, which is not overseen by the MFS. Faculty should have control over curriculum and academics. OVCAA oversight of GEO lessens understanding of Gen Ed as responsibility of MFS. Move might help faculty retain more direct control over curriculum. Example of OVCAA initiatives compromising faculty control over the curriculum: SUST designation. Conflict with departments that are creating their own sustainability certificates.</p> <p>c. Discussion of proposed change: If both GEO and OUE report to OVCAA, how would there be a difference in terms of faculty control over the curriculum? Response: OUE comes to GEC meetings, OVCAA doesn't. OUE has more to do with student success issues on campus, including liaising with CAA. OVCAA has more to do with policy.</p> <p>d. Discussion of impact of possible Manoa reorg. In reorg, there is supposed to be a new office of student success, and definition of student success depends on what services are put there. No info yet regarding how GEO defined in most recent proposal. New model to be</p>	<p>● Vote in regards to Recommendation 1.a. strongly agree – 4; somewhat agree – 3; somewhat disagree – 0; strongly disagree – 0.</p> <p>● No vote taken on Recommendation 1.b.</p>
---	---



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

	<p>released on Nov. 2, with requests for input by Nov. 9, and town hall meeting on Nov. 2.</p> <p>5. Recommendation 1.b – director of GEO shall become ex officio chair of GEC.</p> <p>a. Discussion: This proposal may lessen independence of GEC, because administration currently selects director of GEO. Question: What if GEC selects its own chair who then becomes director of the GEO? Response: GEC can recommend a GEO director, but offer has to be made by OVCAA. Also, workload concerns if the two positions were combined.</p> <p>b. MFS turnover & rotation – can be both strength and weakness.</p>	
INFORMATION ITEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MFSEC report -- SEC confirmed GEC should be a permanent committee and this should be affirmed in MFS documents. Logical point to ensure this is articulated would be during reconciliation of GEC MOU with the MFSEC. 	
ADJOURNMENT	The next meeting of the General Education Committee will be on Oct. 26, 2018 at 10:30.	Meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Shana Brown, Secretary.

Approved on 10/26//2018 with 5 votes in favor of approval and 0 against.