

Minutes of the General Education Committee

Wednesday, November 4, 2015

Hawai'i Hall 208

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m.

Present: Hokulani Aikau, Kaitlyn Conner, Miguel Felipe, Nicole Iwasaki, Bonnyjean Manini, Dore Minatodani, Mike Nassir, Kiana Shiroma, Maria Stewart, Lisa Fujikawa, Vicky Keough

Excused: Ron Cambra, Kapa Oliveira, Nori Tarui, Ryan Yamaguchi

1. **Quantitative Reasoning (QR) Hallmarks** were discussed.

- **Summary of changes.** The Ad Hoc group met and looked at all the feedback received via email and from the workshop. They agreed on a number of changes and had a wordsmithing subcommittee hammer out the actual language. The changes were summarized as follows:
 - Hallmark #1 was moved to the Explanatory Notes.
 - An introduction/preamble was added, incorporating the old Hallmark #1 and providing a definition of QR.
 - A new Hallmark #1 was created to address the concern about college level rigor.
 - A “minimum 10%” clause was added to the Explanatory Notes of Hallmark #2. This was done to ensure that there is a practical element in “pure math” courses that meet QR.
 - The 30:1 student-to-teacher ratio in Hallmark #3 was preserved, and an Explanatory Note was added. The phrase “at least once a week” was also added to demonstrate that large lectures with weekly recitation sections of 30 students would meet this Hallmark.
 - One of the bullets under Hallmark #4 was merged with another; the order of the bullets follows the flow of solving a context rich problem.
- The GEC was reminded that FQ is similar to FW, in that FW courses teach writing through various themes, while FQ courses teach quantitative reasoning through content matter.
- **Training** of FQ faculty was discussed. The GEC felt that it was important for GAs and peer tutors to be provided with some form of training. However, they didn't want to be too prescriptive about how to handle this training. In the end, the GEC decided to provide examples in a second Explanatory Note for Hallmark #3, saying something like “Acceptable training for GAs and peer tutors can include but is not limited to University or Departmental TA training, weekly meetings, etc.” It was also pointed out that the QR proposal form should have a question that addresses training.
- It is unclear how **articulation** of FQ will be handled and whether other campuses will adopt Mānoa's QR requirement. Currently, the Hallmarks are for Mānoa only, though the original version was shared with other campuses in the UH System.
- **“A minimum of 10% of course content should include practical examples.”** The GEC discussed whether Hallmark #2 should make explicit the idea that practical examples should be spread throughout the course. After some discussion, it was decided to add this idea as a third Explanatory Note. Concerns were also raised about the “10% minimum” and whether that would be sufficient to allow instructors to do this. Some felt that the minimum should be higher. Ad Hoc group members explained that the original wording was 10-20%, but that the group ultimately settled on 10%, with the understanding that it would be much higher for most courses. There was some concern that the Math Department might choose not to propose some of their current FS courses for an FQ designation because of this requirement.

- It was decided that the final Explanatory Note under Hallmark #4 (“The primary goal of FQ”) would be moved to immediately after the bullet points in the introduction.

The GEC voted 7-0-0 to recommend the Hallmarks as amended. The next step is to send the amended Hallmarks to the Committee on Academic Policy & Planning (CAPP) and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). CAPP will be meeting this afternoon to discuss the Hallmarks. Hoku and Maria will go to present the Hallmarks and provide background on how the current version was drafted. The hope is that CAPP will be able to provide the GEC with its feedback by Friday, November 13 to give the GEC time to review, discuss and vote on the suggested revisions at their November 18 meeting. The approved version will then be sent to the SEC by Monday, November 23, ideally going before the full Faculty Senate at its next meeting on December 9 (moved from December 2).

2. The **course-based O Focus request for JPN 318** was approved by a vote of 6-0-1 after the Course Coordinator provided a rubric and more clarity about how students were receiving feedback.
3. The **E, O, and W Focus request for PACE 413** (J. Campos) was approved by a vote of 5-1-1 (including Laulima votes).
 - One member questioned whether there was enough class time for students to do all the oral activities described in the proposal. Another member agreed that the time was “tight” but that if students led class discussion for 40 minutes (versus the entire class period, as was initially thought), it was possible.
 - Some were concerned that the O and W Focus areas were getting “minimal treatment.” This concern has come up before with other multiple Focus designation requests. However, others pointed out that the course is still meeting the Hallmarks of both Focus areas, and that even courses requesting a single Focus may only minimally meet the Hallmarks. The issue of whether to continue to allow multiple designations may be put on a future GEC agenda.
4. The **O Focus Exemption request for Jacie** was approved by a vote of 7-0-0 (including Laulima votes). The experience centered around tutoring adults in reading/writing. While there was some question about whether or not the supervisor ever observed any of the tutoring sessions, the assumption was that the success of the students equated to positive feedback. Another member likened the experience to her students’ interviews, which are also evaluated indirectly (in her class, via the transcripts).
5. **Liaison Reports and discussion items** were deferred until the next meeting.
6. **Next meeting: Wednesday, November 18** (10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m., Hawaii Hall

208) Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Submitted by Lisa Fujikawa, Recorder