

Minutes of the General Education Committee
Wednesday, September 30, 2009
Hawai'i Hall 208

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Chair Scott Rowland.

Present: Ernestine Enomoto, Lynne Higa, Mike Nassir, Scott Rowland, Galen Sasaki, Todd Sammons, Mamoru Sato, Carolyn Stephenson.

Ex officio: Ron Cambra (OVCAA), Jan Heu (A&R), Susan Hippensteele (SEC)

Support staff: Lisa Fujikawa (GEO), Tom Hilgers (GEO), Jo-Anne Nakamoto (GEO Recorder)

Guest: Stuart Lau (A&R)

MINUTES: Minutes of the September 16, 2009 meeting were approved with corrections in italics:

Guests: Graduate Students Valerie Aloiau and Melissa Jones to observe the GEC for "Politics in Education" course.

- Ross, MATH 100, did not like having juniors or seniors in this course. Advised Rowland to contact the department chair for further information.
- For some courses, large groups with assorted ages function fine in non-community courses, however may not be so with Foundations.
 - If we ever find the resources to fund these learning communities, incoming UHM students could have a "Math Freshman Experience."

ACTION AND INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. Stuart Lau, A & R Registrar, reviewed how Banner works. Banner is basically a "collection of data"; it's capable of many things if users know how to extract the right information in the right way.

Discussion:

- Can we restrict FG and FS registration of non-compliant students? Lau: You can set a prerequisite or restrict enrollment (e.g., require permission). You decide whether you want to a) try to keep student out of a course, or b) block registration entirely (done manually; time-consuming).
- Could we place automatic holds?
 - Could you easily identify students and attach holds on all of them?
 - How severely do you want to curtail activity? How often would you want the hold to run? Keep in mind manual intervention is needed.
- If we did a warning first, then could we possibly stop registration?
 - One option is to put in triggers, a multi-step process involving identification in the first pass, and then action in the second pass. Lau's opinion is that the warning model is easier.
 - Some FS courses already have prerequisites, but not all. That's a complication.
- Suggestion: automatic hold on non-complier registration for all 300-level courses.
 - Possible, but computer must run through all the rules to process prerequisites, which eats computer time. System slows down already when cashiers, students, Financial Aid, etc. are all utilizing the system at the same time.
 - Could the dates for registration be rescheduled?
 - Response: problems are not with "scheduled" activities but during end-of-registration free-for-all times when everyone is trying to wrap things up.
- With holds, you can state a duration period (i.e., "You cannot register with the seniors; you have to register with the juniors", etc.)
 - Seen as not as punitive.
 - However, AP credits on transcript can give new student non-freshman status, when in fact a student may be a first-time incoming freshman.

- What are some things that are tracked in Banner?
 - Degree audit side (STAR) handles all tracking.
 - Banner essentially stores raw data.
- Is it possible to find out the number of students graduating on time, etc?
 - Why does this actually matter? Answer: It would be nice to have some correlation to support the idea that taking Foundations at the start of a student's academic career makes a positive difference.
 - FG courses are all 100-level; why not remove that restriction and make FG a graduation requirement?
 - Perhaps FG isn't so much about "success" as it is about ensuring that all our students get a "liberal education."
- Would we want to show *causation* or *correlation*?
- Is it appropriate to ask Banner or Star for the information we seek?
 - Response: It should come to Banner (Roy).
 - Raw-data requests always come to Banner; Star will rearrange data so that students/advisors can make sense of it.
- Is there a correlation with the level of success?
- Rowland to circulate his list of questions on which we want data.
- Question: wasn't GenEd created in part to assist the undecided student in choosing a major, and in part to provide variety in students' educational experiences?

2. SEC Liaison report:

- Draft MOA on Transfer of General Education Core Requirements – Faculty Senate's executive committee requested a statement from GEC favoring or opposing the draft MOA to be brought to the full Senate.
 - Discussion: Re: courses on different campuses, students and advisors want a one-for-one course comparison. It's also necessary to check on receiving campus prerequisites so that transfer students see the whole picture.
 - Credits transfer but students don't always know what they count towards (i.e., college, major requirements, prerequisites, electives?)
 - At present, the draft MOA implies, UHM does not do a course-by-course evaluation of an AA degree when students transfer in. But in reality, UHM has to do full evaluation so that each transfer course is properly credited on the UHM side. The course numbering system between campuses is not always coordinated.
 - Problem also arises when a faculty member says "my course is XX" but doesn't do the paperwork for articulation, then teaches the class, and students mistakenly think it counts for what the instructor said.
 - In the case of A& S students, they can see on their Star page how/what requirements count. There are all sorts of things in Star to identify, but unknown how much system can handle.
 - Issue should go to CAPP for discussion.
 - Perhaps it's better to ask for funding for additional advisors to pre-vet students who intend to transfer to UHM than it is to have to track every transfer student transcript so meticulously.
- Proposed International Education Proposal (Interim Dir. J. Samaan).
 - May add 1 or 2 more courses to General Education requirements; do we want number of GenEd course "creep"?
 - Currently no funds available to fund any of the 65 or so action items in the proposal.
 - No GEC action necessary at this time.

- WRAP UP:
1. Read draft MOA carefully and come up with suggestions for reasonable response(s) for discussion at next GEC meeting.
 2. Rowland to assign course-based proposals requiring GEC's votes to Board members for review and discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Next meeting: October 14, 2009, 1:30 p.m., HH 208.

Submitted by Jo-Anne Nakamoto, Recorder