

Minutes of the General Education Committee

Wednesday, December 12, 2012

Hawai'i Hall 208

Attendees: Ron Cambra (AVCUE), Dore Minatodani, Sarita Rai, Stacey Roberts, Scott Rowland, Carolyn Stephenson (SEC), Comfort Sumida, Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)

GEO support staff: Lisa Fujikawa

Excused: Dawne Bost (GEO), Joy Logan, Amy Schiffner, Dwane Tegman (ASUH), Todd Sammons (GEO), Wei Zhang

CALL TO ORDER

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

ACTION ITEMS

1. The **minutes of November 14, 2012** were approved with one change.

2. Request for **Foundations Renewal: AMST 150** for FGB

Discussion:

- The Foundations (F) Board, by a 4-2 vote, recommended that the AMST 150 renewal request be approved. However, they had some concerns:
 - The course seems to have drifted from its original state.
 - The readings, while multicultural, are not that global in nature. There are many ethnic perspectives, but almost all are American.
 - Most readings are not primary sources, and the majority are recent, from the last ten years.
- If the GEC approves the proposal, the F Board wants to make sure its concerns are clearly expressed in the approval letter. The F Board also wanted to make sure that the department would attend to these concerns over the next five years. The GEO has tried to implement better tracking of “conditional” approvals to address this concern.
- If the proposal is approved, the F Board would like to review a draft of the approval letter to make sure all their concerns/conditions are expressed.
- One of the difficulties with the AMST proposal was that it was received well after the deadline. This did not allow sufficient time for the F Board to work with the department before having to make a recommendation to the GEC.
- The GEC agreed that the course seems to be more about U.S. multiculturalism rather than about world multiculturalism, with most perspectives coming from different ethnic voices in the U.S. Many felt that there are other resources about the U.S. that originate in other countries, and that there should be a better balance of Western and non-Western sources.
- If the FGB designation were to be removed from Fall 2013, a UHM-2 form must be submitted to the OVCAA by December 15, 2012. Some members were concerned that removing the designation for a semester (and from the 2013-14 Catalog) and then adding it back in Spring 2014 (if subsequently approved) is confusing. AMST also needs to be notified prior to removal.

Decision: The GEC unanimously decided not to approve AMST 150's FGB renewal request with a vote of 0-5-0. The committee felt that the main concerns were about how the course was meeting Hallmarks 1, 2, and 6. Dore and the GEO will discuss next steps.

3. Foundations (F) Board proposal to have GEC review/approval waived with a unanimous F Board decision

Discussion:

- The F Board would like the GEC to consider delegating approving authority to the Board when the decision is unanimous.
- The F Board feels that the GEC is simply a “rubber stamp,” and that when a recommendation isn’t approved, that the Board’s work and expertise aren’t being valued.
- GEC members felt that it was valuable to have a second set of eyes review proposals, and that the GEC reviews the proposals carefully, as opposed to simply “rubber stamping” decisions. Still, they felt it was important to recognize that the F Board does have greater expertise in reviewing Foundations proposals, and that the General Education process at Mānoa should be based on valuing all Boards’ expertise and trusting that the Boards are doing careful reviews.
- There is also the issue of time. With a second layer of GEC review, it takes longer for proposals to be approved, and valuable negotiating time can get cut short.
- It was pointed out that course-based Focus requests still go to the GEC for final approval. However, if this proposal is passed, the Focus Boards may also ask that approving authority for course-based proposals be delegated to them.
- Most Focus decisions, unanimous or otherwise, are not reviewed/approved by the GEC. However, there are many more Focus than Foundations requests received each year.

Decision: The vote was 5-0-0 in favor of waiving GEC review/approval when a Foundations Board decision is unanimous. However, the Foundations Board will still notify the GEC of all decisions, unanimous or not.

INFORMATION ITEM: Course Coordinators for Foundations Courses

The Foundations Board recently decided to require that each approved Foundations course have a Course Coordinator. This mirrors the requirement that Focus Boards have for course-based Focus approvals. Each Course Coordinator is a designated faculty member who is responsible for ensuring that all sections of the course are taught in accordance with the Hallmarks each semester.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Improving the System and Mānoa Relationship

All Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate were asked to discuss a Senate Executive Committee (SEC) document outlining issues between Mānoa and the UH System. Committees were to give feedback and highlight any issues they felt were pressing and/or missing from the list. The GEC had questions, many of which were answered by Carolyn.

- The “APT level” refers to the tremendous increase in the number of APTs, particularly at the System level. In particular, there has been a disproportionate increase in the amount of APT support as compared to the number of executive positions.
- “Low-lying fruit” refers to things that are easy to do which would make the Mānoa/System relationship better.
- Suggestions included:
 - moving the System offices off of the Mānoa campus
 - working to eliminating duplication of services (e.g., online transfer databases)
 - not having “one-size-fits-all” System initiatives that may not be applicable/feasible on some campuses (For example, “15 to finish” was a Mānoa initiative that the System adopted. However, it is not necessarily feasible for the community colleges to adopt.)
 - not lumping data together when the individual campuses vary so greatly (e.g., providing “Cost of education across the System” when the cost of parking, tuition, fees, etc. differs from campus to campus)

- One member commented on how many students complete their Core requirements at a CC before transferring to Mānoa. What is the cost to the System when students do this? Does it make sense to encourage more students to begin their studies at Mānoa? Some of the benefits:
 - Research: UHM professors are often publishing while teaching their 100- and 200-level courses.
 - Rigor: Courses may be more challenging because instructors teach to the student population (all of who had to meet admissions criteria).
 - Financial aid: There is a time limit on financial aid, so the more time that is spent at the CCs, the less time students will have financial aid at Mānoa.
 - Transfer credits: There is the possibility that not all credits will transfer, although the Ka‘ie‘ie Program provides KapCC students with advising in this area (as well as on financial aid). It was pointed out that this kind of assistance is being provided by the four-year campuses, not by the System or by the CCs.

Dore will send out another reminder about reviewing the System/Mānoa relationship document and providing feedback. She will also ask the Mānoa Committee on Articulation (MCA) for their input.

4. A **Spring 2013 meeting time** was discussed but not settled upon. Lisa will send out a “when is good” survey to find a day/time. It was noted that Joy will be on sabbatical in Spring 2013.

Meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Submitted by Lisa Fujikawa, Recorder