

## Minutes of the General Education Committee

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

12:00-1:00p.m., Hawai'i Hall 208

Attendees: Pete Garrod, Bob Joseph, Joy Logan, Stacey Roberts, Scott Rowland, Todd Sammons (GEO), Elisabeth Seamon (ASUH), Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)

GEO support staff: Dawne Bost, Lisa Fujikawa

Excused: Ron Cambra (OUE), Sarita Rai, Amy Schiffner, Kiana Shiroma, Carolyn Stephenson (SEC)

The meeting was called to order at 12:05 p.m.

### 1. ACTION ITEMS

- a. **Minutes** from the October 16 meeting were tabled until the next meeting to give the GEC and guest Amy Schafer more time to review.
- b. **Course-based Focus proposals**
  - The **HAP request for POLS 301** was approved by a vote of 4-0-1 (7-0-1 with online votes).
  - The **W request for CEE 330** was approved by a vote of 4-0-1 (7-0-1 with online votes).
  - The **W request for THEA 311** was approved by a vote of 4-0-1 (7-0-1 with online votes).

### 2. INFORMATION ITEMS

#### a. Report on “dual option” W courses

*Background:* Honolulu Community College (HonCC) has been offering some of its courses with a “dual option”: Students in one section of a course can decide whether or not they want to take the course with a W Focus. When this practice was brought to the attention of the System Committee on Written Communication, the group felt it was in violation of the spirit of the W Hallmarks and asked that the practice be discontinued. It took several years, but from Spring 2014, dual option courses will no longer be offered.

#### *Discussion:*

- One member asked if the instructor gets credit for teaching two courses. He felt that it would be difficult to have two sets of standards and said that similar issues had been raised in the past when a course was listed at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Several other members agreed that having two sets of standards was problematic, saying that activities such as peer editing and brainstorming would be difficult in a “dual option” course.
- Class size was another issue. At one point, “dual option” courses had as many as 30 students, with the argument that the 20:1 student-to-teacher ratio for W courses was being maintained because only 20 of the 30 students opted for the W option.

#### b. Report on the System HAP meeting

*Background:* The group is composed of representatives from each of the eight participating UH campuses (all but Hawai'i CC and UH Hilo). Most of the representatives have been on the committee for many years. In contrast, Mānoa's representative usually changes annually, because the Chair of Mānoa's HAP Board generally serves for only one year. For continuity purposes, the Gen Ed Faculty Administrator and the two Gen Ed APTs have been attending for the past several years.

*Report:* The current issue is whether to replace the term “Native” with “aboriginal.” The majority of the System group feels that “aboriginal” is a clearer term with less cultural baggage. Some group members also want to see more Hawaiian terms, such as “maoli,” used in the HAP Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes. However, there are often different interpretations and connotations of terms, which make their use more difficult.

The discussion began in Spring 2013, at the group's annual meeting. The issues arose in response to the proposed modifications of the existing Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes. Mānoa, represented by GEC Chair Dore Minatodani and incoming and outgoing HAP Board Chairs Ernestine Enomoto and Yuko Otsuka, expressed concerns about making such changes without broader campus consultation. Mānoa was also opposed to the proposal to remove Hallmark #4. The ensuing discussion was productive and resulted in plans for a Fall 2013 "summit" to widen the discussion beyond the HAP System group. There were also plans to try to have a panel presentation on the issues at the 2014 World indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education (WiPC:E), which will be held at Kapi'olani Community College. However, by Fall 2013, many participating campuses no longer felt the need to consult beyond the HAP System group, so a summit inviting broader campus input was not held. Plans to present at WiPC:E were also put on hold. At this point, Mānoa's primary concern is making sure that there is sufficient consultation to ensure that System decisions are made with Mānoa campus support.

A third proposed change was to modify Mānoa's current HAP student learning outcomes (SLOs) for System use. Mānoa's concern is that the proposal focuses on addressing the WASC Junior Commission's concerns rather than the Senior Commission's.

*Discussion:*

- One member felt that a summit to garner wider campus input would be beneficial, while another felt that the proposed changes were acceptable as long as there was disciplinary consensus.
- Similar issues have arisen in Latin American Studies; what is the best way to refer to indigenous people?
- Several members felt that it was unimportant what language or "labels" were being used as long as the intent and meaning of the Hallmarks remained intact.
- There was some concern that the proposal to delete Hallmark #4 was the first step toward HAP becoming a "Hawaiian only" requirement. Would this type of change be acceptable?
- The GEC also discussed the "decision-making chain." Recommendations from the HAP System group go back to the individual campuses for discussion and approval. In Mānoa's case, the recommendation goes first to the UHM HAP Board, then to the GEC. It was unclear whether a Faculty Senate vote would be required.
- Todd explained that the original Hallmarks were created by UHM. They were adopted by other UH campuses, which allowed those campuses to participate in the HAP Multicampus Group and to designate their own HAP courses, simplifying the articulation process.
- While the original intent of the group was to facilitate articulation, the group's recent focus has turned to reworking the Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes. Mānoa's concern is that the group will move forward with the proposed modifications to the Hallmarks without getting sufficient Mānoa support/"buy-in," which in turn could endanger the current HAP articulation agreement. There is also concern about the implications the changes may have for accreditation.
- The original articulation agreement did not include procedures for how to make and implement modifications to existing Hallmarks. Unlike the Foundations Multicampus group, which works by consensus, the HAP Multicampus group has decided to go with a majority vote.
- Because there are no longer any plans to have a wider campus summit, the suggestion was made to create a HAP working group to discuss the issues of terminology and assessment. The group could also revisit the requirement itself.
- The GEC Chair and the Gen Ed Office will sit down with the HAP Board Chair and Vice-Chair to figure out next steps.

**3. NEXT MEETING** will be held on Wednesday, November 20 at 12:00 p.m. in HH 208.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

*Submitted by Lisa Fujikawa, Recorder*