

Minutes of the General Education Committee

Wednesday, October 26, 2011

Hawai'i Hall 208

ATTENDEES: Fred Birkett, Ron Cambra (AVCUE), Richard Chadwick (SEC),
Sianha Gualano (ASUH), Joe Jarrett, Dore Minatodani, Scott Rowland, Mamoru Sato,
Wei Zhang

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

Excused: Jim Caron, Garrett Inoue (Admissions), Comfort Sumida, Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)

CALL TO ORDER:

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

ACTION AND INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. Minutes of October 12, 2011 were unanimously approved.
2. Update on Memo to Multicampus Foundations Board:
 - Jarrett made a few changes, requested a 3/31/12 response.
 - Things to keep in mind: departments have departmental requirements that the students must consider.
 - If the Foundations Hallmarks are changed, it will change the counting of courses, and technically would change “requirements”. If that is so, then it must go to the Multicampus Foundations Board for approval (even if you change a single word). It was noted that some areas of math are concept-based, and do not use numbers.
 - Jarrett received an email message from PHIL inquiring about FS renewal of PHIL 110.
 - If the Hallmarks change, then students would not be able to count PHIL 110 anymore. Rowland mentioned to the group that when we examined FS requirements/fulfillments two years ago, we tried to determine how a change would affect students, keeping in mind, “are we doing the best for students? Also, as an example, if you were an Art major and if you’re only going to take one FS course, what course would you take to fulfill it?”
 - Question: what was the WASC requirement when the UHM FS requirements were first written?
 - Response: WASC doesn’t always follow its own wording. Keep in mind that the Hallmarks were created 12 years ago. The question to ask is: are we now preparing students for real life?
 - Other universities have “College Algebra” or a statistics course that count towards their “*math requirement*”, not necessarily “FS-related”.
 - Motion to forward revised memo to the Multicampus Foundations Board was approved. Memo to be presented at the Friday, November 4th meeting.
3. Proposals for GEC Vote:
 - JPN 318 (Course-based O Focus)
 - Syllabus was rewritten re: how to get feedback.
 - Vote: unanimously approved.
 - HON 101 (Course-based W Focus)
 - Variation between page amounts and percentages noted between syllabi (however it was noted that no master syllabus is required). All will meet minimum qualifications.
 - Vote: unanimously approved.

- HON 380 (Course-based O and W Focus)
 - The O Focus was approved at the last meeting. The W Focus is being considered this time.
 - Discussion regarding discrepancy in number of pages in syllabus.
 - Vote: unanimously approved.
- HON 491 (Course-based W Focus)
 - The title was “Junior Seminar” although the course number was senior-level. It was noted that there is HON 492 (Senior Honors Colloquium).
 - Amount of writing seemed fine.
 - GEC voted to approve this proposal with the comment that feedback on final project should have critical feedback on writing drafts/outlines prior to the submission of the final paper.
- CEE 320 (Course-based W Focus)
 - Balance between group and individual assignments noted.
 - Vote: unanimously approved.
- CEE 355 (Course-based W Focus)
 - Discrepancy regarding writing requirements in second syllabus: lab report equaled 10% of grade, of which 60% technical content/accuracy, 20% for presentation, and 20% for answering a question to be provided separately; therefore, 20% of 10% would be 2%, which is not enough to meet requirements.
 - Also, just including a statement within the syllabus should not be enough to meet Writing Hallmarks interpretation of wording, “significantly”. Feedback in this course involved having students turn in a draft lab report before the final one (in addition to two individual and 4 group projects).
 - Vote: 7 approved, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.
 - In GEC memo to Department, what would you state as the main concern? It appears that they are more involved in “document assembly” vs. actual writing.
 - W Board to write a comment.
- IP 398 (Multiple Focus Designation – E,O, W)
 - Concern was raised regarding grading breakdown -- not really clear.
 - Syllabus vague regarding ethical reflection and oral communication. Course may look good but syllabus not clear.
 - Vote tabled to next meeting.

4. Distribution of FS/FG compliance data (Fujikawa).

Next meeting: November 9, 2011, 12 noon, HH 208.

Meeting adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

Submitted by Jo-Anne Nakamoto, Recorder