



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: November 9, 2018 10:30 AM -12:00 PM
LOCATION: ITB 105
ATTENDANCE: [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS	
Garrett Apuzen-Ito	P	Shana Brown	P	Christine Beaule	P	Lisa Fujikawa	P
Halina Zaleski	P	Michael Cooney	P	Ronald Cambra	E	Vicky Keough	P
Shannon Johnson	P	Geoffrey LaFlair	P	Ryan Yamaguchi	A	Sheela Sharma	E
Kalikoaloha Martin	P	Garrett Clanin	P				
		Micah Leval (ASUH representative)	E	Stacey Roberts (SEC liaison)	P		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION / INFORMATION	ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON
CALL TO ORDER	Meeting was called to order by Shannon Johnson at 10:00 am.	
REVIEW OF MINUTES	Minutes from Oct. 19 were reviewed and approved 7-0-0.	
ACTION ITEMS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Motion to remove instructor-based designations for Focus courses so that all approvals are course-based. Approval follows course, irrespective of instructor. Drafted by CB, GAI. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale: Ensure greater stability and predictability for students, who can plan schedules knowing a course will continue to carry expected Focus designation(s). Ensure that Focus courses needed for graduation will be offered. Discussion: How does motion apply to courses where only one instructor typically teaches the course & applies for Focus? Can course-based approvals be granted even if there is only one instructor / syllabus? Response: if motion is approved, there will be further conversation to determine how single-instructor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No vote on motion. GC, GAI, and SB will revise motion. Further discussion planned for Nov. 30.



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

	<p>courses are awarded course-based designations. Concern: the “further conversation” will need to be directed so that the conclusion will be to recognize that single-instructor courses can still be awarded Focus designations.</p> <p>c. Discussion: how to ensure that faculty members are equipped to teach courses with these designations, if the designation follows the course and not the instructor? Response: responsibility of department with pedagogical support offered by GEO, GEC, and GenEd Boards.</p> <p>d. Discussion: does motion need to refer to external review? Response: not necessarily. GEC and boards have been moving in the direction of emphasizing learning objectives / consistency of SLO’s rather than instructor expertise per se. Referring to external review does answer question of “why now.”</p> <p>e. Discussion: need to specify timing to implement. Current board activities need to proceed apace, while not penalizing courses that are currently being reviewed or will be reviewed shortly. Also, need to accommodate work of Focus boards that are making changes to applications / questions for transition to online application system.</p>	
DISCUSSION ITEMS	<p>1. Question of release of internal / external Gen Ed reviews. Recent / current GEC motions and minutes refer to recommendations made in reviews. Do the reviews need to be released, and if so, to whom? Currently MFS can only see excerpted sentences referred to in GEC motions / minutes.</p> <p>2. GEC chair met with OVCAA staff to discuss making external & internal reviews public.</p> <p>a. In general, OVCAA recommends that reviews not be made public until responses have been forwarded to OVCAA and OVCAA also responds. This is how WASC reports are handled and is the procedure for all other program reviews at UHM.</p> <p>b. Rationales: there may be further refining of responses prior to wide release of reviews. Also, if reviews are released without response, faculty don’t get both sides,</p>	



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

	<p>i.e., review and response. If review is released without response, some faculty could mistakenly interpret recommendations as having been tacitly approved. If excerpts are released, these will be read out of context and may also create misunderstandings.</p> <p>c. Options discussed with OVCAA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Release reviews but password protected just for senators. Only release excerpts that are relevant to senate actions Don't release reviews at all Leave it up to MFSEC <p>3. iVCAA met with MFSEC. iVCAA recommends option iii above: reviews and responses not be released until the response process is complete.</p> <p>4. Discussion of next steps. Options considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cease sending motions to MFS. Wait until we finish writing response memo to external / internal reviews. Continue to send motions to MFS but ask them to wait to discuss and vote until reviews & response memos have been released. This reassures MFS that we are doing our job as a policy board. Avoids a bottleneck & burst of motions released all at once at end of year. Continue to send motions but don't excerpt / reference reviews. Concern: lack of context may confuse MFS / make motions less effective / lead to rejection. Do not release reviews, but continue to make motions that reference the reviews. Ask MFS to trust us that our motions accurately reflect overall reviews. Release reviews widely despite OVCAA concerns. Advantage of transparency. Release reviews but under strict control. For example, put a paper copy in John Kinder's office for senators. Make reviews available to senators via a password protected area of MFS website. Send motions to MFS and let them decide as to releasing reviews. <p>5. After motion, further discussion: Do senators vote on our response to the reviews? Response: No. Can we include</p>	<p>● Motion to make reports available to senators behind password-protected area of MFS website. Passed 6-2-0.</p>
--	---	--



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

- preambles on motions, to note that reviews have not yet been responded to, and explain our process / rationale for proposing motions before releasing reviews, add caveats, etc.? Yes.
6. CB: comments on nature of the reviews vis-à-vis faculty governance. Reviews give a plan for changes that can be made to Gen Ed. Response memos don't bypass the senate but rather, since GEC is a senate committee, represent the response of the senate. Response memos recognize that MFS is responding / has obligation to respond.
 7. External Review recommendations, continued. Blue sky recommendations. Challenging us to think differently about Gen Ed and how it can contribute to a 4-year undergraduate education more effectively. First part of Blue Sky: recommends we create thematic pathways to structure 15 credits of Gen Ed. Rather than taking Gen Ed courses willy-nilly, students will choose a pathway that links together Gen Ed courses.
 - a. Rationale: Could make Gen Ed more appealing. Structure and simplify process for students to choose Gen Ed courses. Aid in retention by allowing students to find like-minded peers and form supportive social groups (similar to ACE / first year clusters program).
 - b. Classes that currently have Gen Ed designations will retain those designations / no need to reapply. However they may be grouped into new thematic pathways.
 - c. Faculty / Departments can opt out of having courses included in the pathways. Courses can still be in Gen Ed even if they're not in thematic pathways.
 - d. GEC reviewed system at use at peer institution Oregon State—Corvallis. At OSU each pathway is referred to as a "playlist." OSU playlists each contained c. 75-100 courses under themes: Heal the World/Social Justice; Sustainability; Core Classics (literature, culture, geography, etc.); Go Global: Truly Global; Humanitarian Engineering, Science & Technology; Digital Communication Arts; Go Global: Pacific Rim; Go Global: Americas; four cores for teacher education; and Beavers Mean Business. OSU playlists may not satisfy all Gen Ed requirements, especially skills.



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

	<p>e. Discussion: Could a pathway constitute a minor (also 15 credits)? Response: Not necessarily, because thematic pathways can be implemented without needing to satisfy conditions of a minor. In addition, thematic pathways would likely be at the lower division, while minors are normally comprised of upper division courses. Follow-up: if we allow students to double-dip Gen Ed requirements with minor requirements (motion currently under discussion by GEC), can departments guide students to simultaneously complete Gen Ed and minor requirements via a thematic pathway? Response: thematic pathways will not officially steer students to complete requirements of any degree program. OSU playlists suggests minors for students who are interested in certain subjects.</p> <p>f. Discussion of how a thematic pathway would affect students transferring in from CC's, or using WICHE passport. Would these students be disadvantaged? No, because thematic pathways are optional, not required.</p> <p>g. How would themes be created? What mechanism(s) would allow as much faculty input as possible in creating themes? Response: GEC or other relevant committee can create a process for faculty to apply to create a theme and then that is approved by the GEC. Need to ensure reasonable parity of unit representation in thematic clusters.</p>	
INFORMATION ITEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Board reports. O-board will meet one more time. Other boards are also wrapping up work (F board, HAP board) ● GEO Director's report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Still have an E-Board vacancy! Any faculty member except an academic advisor (because that role is already filled) from any department may join. ○ "no late proposal" policy is being sorely tested. GEO is having to say "no" to late proposals. So just FYI some faculty may be frustrated that their proposals are not being reviewed because they missed deadlines. 	



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Powell, chair MFSEC, & Michael Bruno will attend our next meeting to discuss different areas of responsibility for MFS & GEC etc. Nov. 16 10:30 – 11:15. • No meeting on Nov. 23. 	
ADJOURNMENT	The next meeting of the General Education Committee will be on Nov. 16, 2018 at 10:30.	Meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Shana Brown, Secretary.

Approved on 11/30/2018 with 8 votes in favor of approval and 0 against.