



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: Monday, January 31, 2022 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM
LOCATION: Zoom
ATTENDANCE: [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS	
Matt Eng	P	Scott Rowland	P	Jose Perez Jaramillo (ASUH rep)	A	Christine Beaulé	P
Betsy Gilliland	P	Jaymian Urashima	P	Laura Lyons (OVPAE rep)	P	Vicky Keough	P
Dan Harris-McCoy	P	Mandy Westfall-Senda	E	April Quinn (OVPAE rep)	P	Cari Gochenouer	P
Mike Nassir	P	Jonathan Pettit	P	Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions rep)	A	Lisa Fujikawa	P
				Shana Brown (SEC liaison)	P		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION / INFORMATION	ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON
CALL TO ORDER		Meeting was called to order by Chair Gilliland at 12:32 PM
REVIEW OF MINUTES		Minutes from 01/10 meeting approved with 7 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
INFORMATION ITEMS	<p><u>Gen Ed Response Timeline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEC members need to add on their individual feedback about the redesign if didn't already <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members can add to the feedback document whether voting members or not, but voting members definitely need to fill out the document Fill out by Friday, Feb 4 Reports by other boards needed by the beginning of next week <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed document of the report will be in our final master report at the end of the semester 	<p>Members will need to add individual feedback for the Gen Ed Redesign Proposal by Friday, 2/4, if they have not done so already</p> <p>Board liaisons will need to collect and report on feedback from their respective boards or inform board chairs to send</p>

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA FACULTY SENATE
 2500 Campus Road • Hawai'i Hall 208 • Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822
 Phone: (808) 956-7725 • Fax/Polycom: (808) 956-9813
 E-Mail: uhmfs@hawaii.edu • Website: <http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/>
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

- We need boards to send bullet points of the top things they are concerned with for now
- Send to GEC by Monday, Feb 7
- Redesign working groups can pull information on the sections they're working on by Feb 14
 - Example of distributing work: Scott's WG
 - Split up the assigned parts among members in the WG
 - Each member responsible for summarizing the feedback in their assigned area
- The GEC will send summary to CAPP by Feb 15 and will be sending out more fleshed out reports later
 - CAPP can then combine feedback from the senate perspective
- Can also encourage colleagues in departments to send their own departmental or individual feedback separately

SEC

CAPP looks forward to the response(s) and comments of the GEC and its boards to the systemwide Gen Ed proposal by Feb. 15. From the CAPP chair: "To facilitate easy and accessible data capture, CAPP has crafted a Google Form reflecting the main Design Proposal categories plus space for any additional comments or feedback. This will be a transparent process, so please note that responses transmitted from committees to CAPP will become part of the public record, very likely via CAPP minutes or as attachments (supporting materials) to any senate action proposed by CAPP." Google form is at

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScmKDTmExE_Myxe-9JZMxowPEIz-KYDaN_8mymxiRTYGDkmGPQ/viewform

GEC

GEC chair sent a lot of emails with GEO, boards, and other groups that have been requested to submit feedback on the systemwide GenEd redesign proposal.

feedback directly to GEC by Monday, 2/7

Working groups will need to summarize feedback for their assigned sections of the Redesign Proposal by Monday, 2/14



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

E Board

E Board met to review proposals, discuss plans for spring 2022 workshops, and continue working on response to the Gen Ed Redesign proposal.

HAP Board

Jan 21, 2022 HAP Board Meeting: Discussion of new Gen Ed curriculum proposal; updating of ongoing feedback document (which was put into a more formal format after the meeting by Konia Freitas and Patricia Halagao); final comments to be received by Monday, Jan. 24; talked through proposal review process for the sake of newest member of the board.

O Board

The O Board reviewed and agreed on the summary that was written regarding their feedback for the Gen Ed Redesign Proposal. Across two meetings, the O Board worked out the final details of their workshop about alternate tasks for developing oral competencies. They held the workshop (in partnership with CTE) on Jan 28.

Assessment WG

AWG met Tuesday 2/25 to discuss revisions to the GenEd assessment process. We also drafted a statement of the goals and purposes for the Faculty Learning Communities and roles of members of the learning communities.

Curriculum/Guiding Principles WG

We discussed the foundations courses in the draft Gen Ed proposal, and agreed on a series of suggested revisions. Next week we will tackle the reinforcement and capstone portions of the proposed curriculum.

Governance/Impact/Articulation Working Group

We discussed the GenED redesign proposals and talked through how to revise the last sections of the GEC's responses to the SEC request for comments.



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

	<p><u>Div Board</u></p> <p>We discussed transfer credit evaluations, pending applications and the GenED redesign proposal. Started to discuss the Diversification workshop. (paste reports)</p> <p>Addition to Assessment WG Report: Provided clarification on the earlier notes about the revisions to the assessment process. It was decided that they will work on the rubric first and then instructors can use that to create assignments with the rubric in mind (rather than creating a rubric later in the process)</p>	
ACTION ITEMS		



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

DISCUSSION ITEMS	<u>FG Assessment Report</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Wanted GEC to focus on section starting on p. 8 of the report - section on how results can be used ● Gave GEC the report to get feedback in December. Questions, comments, and suggestion have already been received on the document ● FG assessment WG will bring this back to foundations board to discuss how to implement these ideas ● Last chance for feedback (discussion) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This document is more of a broad assessment about the courses (generalization of the FG courses) ○ Will foundations do something with presenting the information from this? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ O board does this - they have incorporated assessment information into the reasoning for workshops ■ Could work on a teaching resources webpage for topics like Africa to help with gaps found in the assessment ■ When faculty apply/reapply, there will be resources for them to help them make it better ○ Would it hurt to tell people that we're low in Africa right now so they can adjust their courses? (more direct approach) ○ HAP board as an example - page with resources that we can point faculty to ○ Rubric that's developed - good to share with faculty teaching FG courses? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubric will be shared ■ When Foundations post the rubric, it needs to be clear that it's a rubric related to only a specific learning objective (not overall for FG) ○ We could bring together faculty that do specialize in Africa to get advice/suggestions ○ Could work on advice for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ People starting a new FG course 	



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

- Those who are already teaching and want to improve their courses to fill gaps
- Recommendations will be brought back to the Foundations board for now to review

Course-Based Considerations

- Need clear information that GEO can put on the website to help faculty
- Accountability
 - Course coordinator clarification
 - If only one main instructor, then it's likely they are also the coordinator
 - If multiple instructors teaching same course, then course coordinators are needed
 - We want course coordinators to be responsible for keeping all instructors teaching the course the way it needs to be done
 - What is the extent of proof we are demanding at the focus board level?
 - Thorough collection of syllabi and assessment is collected at renewal
 - Suggestion: semesterly check-in with course coordinators would need to be quick/easy as a reminder to check courses (since renewal process is more thorough)
 - The more frequent the check-in, the easier it should be
 - Should just serve as a reminder to the course coordinator to check in with the instructor/course
 - Punishment clause? What happens if they aren't filling it out regularly?
 - Other suggestion: make renewal more rigorous (e.g., send all syllabi instead of a master syllabus)
 - Might become an issue in departments where the instructor doesn't share syllabi with the department/chair



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

- Would also be a lot of syllabi to look over (e.g., 5 years worth)
- If we use a Google Form for check-ins:
 - We could flag if a course coordinator changed so it can be updated in the records
 - Or can have the dept chair update us if course coordinator changes
 - Or send the Form to the course coordinator and cc the chair
 - Initial request for check-in and reminder send directly to the course coordinator
 - Follow-up with the chair if not receiving a response after a few attempts to reach the course coordinator
 - Could have the boards follow up on unresponsive courses
- Is there any evidence of problems with courses being taught not according to the hallmarks (anecdotal or otherwise)?
 - There is ignorance among some of the faculty members with regard to hallmarks
 - Some have seen course drift
 - Not complete ignorance but shifting components of a course each semester and then slowly moving away from the focus
 - Hallmarks end up being less emphasized than the original proposal's syllabus
- Will create Form that will be sent to all course coordinators
 - If the form comes back with problems, the follow-up is the responsibility of the board for that focus area
- How will check-ins work for courses with multiple foci?
 - Suggestion: one form for each board



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Could just keep it one form per course - check all the focus areas that the course has applied for ■ Which board would follow-up if check-in is not completed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Can give to boards that have the least amount of follow-ups? ○ Is a Google Form the best? Or are there other ways of collecting the check-in? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Formatting of Google Forms to organize data may be an issue - other platforms could work better ■ Should we create a working group to work on check-in Form? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Figure out logistics of how the form would work ■ Does the GEO have other database tools that can be used? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Forms: would need to separate each foci into separate questions so they show up in diff cells ● Doable in Google Forms if we don't have other software ○ Accountability Process: Lisa will summarize/write-up the process for accountability so we can review it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Process will include semesterly check-ins ■ GEO will work on implementation on the process - will bring questions back to GEC if questions/issues arise ● Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was decided that there is no need for additional faculty training ○ Ideally, we want some kind of training for course coordinators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Could do an annual coordinator info session ○ Other ideas to help course coordinators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Brown bag, best practices guides 	<p>Lisa will work on creating a write-up of the accountability process for GEC to review</p>
--	--	--



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

- Could collect input from coordinators that successfully facilitated different instructors/GAs
- Could create video for coordinators to watch that provides information
- Could create things that can be put on the website (asynchronous) rather than just having workshops (synchronous) so that they have access to information no matter when they look for it
- Could reach out to coordinators to create a list of best practices
- Should review be mandatory?
 - No, it shouldn't be mandatory
 - There are people that already know what to do
 - Resources meant for those we identify (or self-identify) as needing more help
- Focus forms
 - How do we define "master syllabus"?
 - What do we expect to be consistent across all sections?
 - Course learning objectives
 - Needs to be approved at the creation of course
 - Don't need to review course SLOs - should already be there
 - Pieces like the E statement - E board checks for this across all syllabi
 - Master syllabus - used in other areas currently? Completely new process?
 - Master syllabi are used now for course-based applications, so it's not new



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

- We have also looked at different syllabi in proposals and had to compare them
 - Didn't go specifically point by point to check everything in syllabi
 - Looked at whether they both satisfy the hallmarks
 - This process makes us think that we weren't such sticklers for consistency across syllabi
- Clarification: we are not dictating that they need to have a master syllabus, they just need to make sure they're meeting hallmarks
- Master syllabus question comes from faculty that are wondering what we mean by a master syllabus in the instructions
 - Right now, we tell them that departments have the option of having a master syllabus or multiple representatives
 - Master syllabus is something that every instructor would need to follow
 - If only one instructor teaches it, then there's only one version and we could consider it the master
 - If they only have one instructor but don't want to call it the master, is that okay?
 - We can just tell them that it's okay to have one representative syllabus (instead of a master) if there really is only one person teaching the course



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

- We can keep this option open for faculty (to submit “master” or “representative” syllabi)
- The thing that needs to remain consistent is meeting the hallmarks
- If there is no master, they should send us two syllabi.
 - If only one person teaching, then they can submit one representative syllabus
 - Coordinator will be responsible for checking that hallmarks are met if they add on new instructors
- Ultimately, we will be requiring either a master syllabus or representative(s) syllabi
- Cross-listing
 - Focus designation should be on both sides of the cross-listing
 - One course coordinator for cross-listed courses or one coordinator from each department?
 - Usually, there’s a “main” department, so they could just have one coordinator from that department
 - Are there courses that are equally divided and do not have a “main” department?
 - Ex: in COE, programs had offered the same course but the course was taught differently in each department
 - In this case, we made a recommendation to not crosslist the



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Keeps it at one coordinator ■ Need to have place on the applications for both departments' signatures so that we know both departments are okay with having the focus designation on a course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Helps to make sure that both sides are on the same page with focus designations ■ So, we will adjust the form so that one course coordinator and both department chairs will sign the proposal 	
NEW BUSINESS		
UPCOMING MEETINGS	SPRING 2022 MEETING SCHEDULE: Mondays from 11:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. via Zoom <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● February 14 ● February 28 ● March 7 ● March 28 ● April 11 ● April 25 ● May 9 (finals week) 	
ADJOURNMENT		Meeting adjourned at 1:00 PM

Respectfully submitted by Jaymian Urashima, Secretary (Spring 2022).

Approved on 02/14/2022 with 6 votes in favor of approval, 0 against, and 1 abstentions.