

## Minutes of the General Education Committee

Wednesday, October 29, 2014

Hawai'i Hall 208

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m.

Attendees: Kapa Oliveira (Vice Chair), Kaitlyn Conner (ASUH), Nicole Iwasaki, Bob Joseph, Joy Logan, Mike Nassir, Stacey Roberts (SEC), Todd Sammons, Amy Schiffner, Kiana Shiroma

GEO support staff: Dawne Bost, Lisa Fujikawa, Vicky Keough

Excused: Pete Garrod (Chair), Ron Cambra (OVCUE), Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)

1. **Minutes** from the September 17 and October 15 meetings were approved as written. Mike asked for clarification about how the GEC determines whether W Focus Exemptions are for an upper- or lower-division requirement. Lisa said that the GEC had previously decided that the curricular decision lay with the School/College that was granting the student's degree.

### 2. Course-Based Focus Requests

- The **E for THEA 411** was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0-0.
- The **W for GEOG/PLAN 310** was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0-0. It was noted that the course was not intrinsically W but was approved because of the department's commitment to having all sections meet the W Hallmarks.
- The **W for ENG 491** was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0-0.
  - It was noted that the Hallmarks weren't marked in the syllabi, though the information clearly appears in the W chart.
  - The W Board requests that syllabi be marked to facilitate their review and also to remind instructors that all of the Hallmarks need to be addressed. However, the Board doesn't follow up when the syllabi are submitted unmarked. The O Board, on the other hand, does.
  - Several members said that as instructors, they appreciated Board feedback when there were errors or inconsistencies in their syllabi.
  - Kapa also noted that Board feedback lends credibility to the review process, because instructors are made aware of how carefully their proposals are being reviewed.

3. The **multiple designation request (E, O, W) for Maya Soetoro-Ng's PACE 485** was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0-0 after it was clarified that the original and revised syllabi were reversed.

4. The GEC discussed the **QR Working Group draft of Quantitative Reasoning Hallmarks**.

- **Suggestions for modification**
  - Bob reiterated his suggestion to expand the definition of "calculate." He felt the proposal was very ambitious and hoped it would be possible to implement.
  - Amy questioned why #3 says "successful students will be able to..." and suggested that "successful" be deleted. Joy thought it came from the statement "Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to..." but agreed that it should be deleted.
- **Upper versus lower division.** There was a question of whether the Hallmarks would remain the same regardless of whether the designated course was upper- or lower-division. Joy explained that the QRWG is currently working on implementation models,

so it was unclear where in the curriculum the requirement would appear. Depending on what model is adopted, Hallmarks may need to be tweaked and rigor defined. There was general consensus that it would be easier to have one set of Hallmarks, and Dawne felt that the current Hallmarks were written in a manner that would allow them to be applied at any level.

- **Implementation models** include:
  - Replacing the FS requirement with a new FQ requirement
  - Having both FS and FQ. Some members felt this would be confusing.
  - Having an FQ requirement that would be reinforced later by a Q Focus course
- **Statistics courses.** It was noted that statistics courses meet the draft QR Hallmarks, which was the intention of the QRWG. There is also the hope that new courses will be created to meet the QR requirement.
- **Seat availability.** At least one member was concerned about the availability of seats when QR is implemented. Currently, availability of FS courses/seats is limited, which can result in graduation delays. When QR is implemented, attention should be paid to course/seat availability to ensure that it does not delay graduation.
- **Preparatory courses.** Some members were concerned about whether all students enter Mānoa prepared to take a QR course. There may need to be provisions for students who haven't had enough algebra or who otherwise enter underprepared. The difficulty is that Board of Regents policy prohibits Mānoa from offering "remedial" courses, although the Math Department is open to offering them for those students who need them.
- **Class size.** The proposal suggests that QR classes be limited to 25 students. However, the OVCAA has made it clear that such a small class size will not be possible. If the draft Hallmarks will only "work" with small classes, they may need to be changed. Large lectures with small breakout/discussion sections may be an option. The key is to be able to provide enough QR seats with existing resources. More seats may be available because there will be more courses eligible for a QR designation than are currently eligible for an FS.
- **Articulation.** If Mānoa does adopt a QR requirement, is there the possibility that courses from the community colleges can fulfill the new requirement? This is an area that still needs to be worked out.
- **AP credit.** It's likely that students will be able to fulfill the QR requirement with the appropriate AP credit.

The GEC members who serve on the QRWG (Mike, Joy, Todd, and Dawne) thanked the GEC for their input. In the next few weeks, an email will be sent to all UHM faculty asking for their feedback as well.

## 5. Liaison Reports

- F Board (Mike): The Board hasn't met since the last GEC meeting.
- O Board (Joy): The Board has decided to follow the W Board's lead and will begin requiring draft syllabi for new as well as renewal proposals.
- H Board (Bob/Dawne): The Board is reworking the HAP chart and revisiting the other sections of the Focus form.
- W Board (Amy): The Board created a checklist on their section of the Focus form to better support consistency between the W chart and the syllabus.
- E Board (Kiana): The Board has been having some "interesting conversations."
  - They agreed that embellishing the wording of the E Focus statement that is required on all E Focus syllabi is acceptable.

- The Board noted the fact that the required 8 hours of ethical content is not prorated (i.e., remains the same regardless of the number of credits).
- There are no requirements for E assignments in terms of grading or percentage of grade.
- There is an ongoing discussion about whether to tweak the E rubric that was created by an earlier E Board or to adopt the AAC&U VALUE rubric. The Board will compare the two rubrics and then make a decision.

## 6. Updates

- There is still a **vacancy on the 2014-15 O Board**. Todd will contact one person suggested by the O Board.
- The announcement for the **General Education Office (GEO) Director** position was recently sent out to the UHM community. Interested tenured faculty have until Friday, November 14 to express their interest by submitting a cover letter and CV.

## 7. Remaining Fall 2014 meetings (Wednesdays, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Hawai‘i Hall 208)

- November 5 (next week)
- November 19
- December 3

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Submitted by *Lisa Fujikawa, Recorder*