



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAII®  
MĀNOA

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**MEETING DATE:** October 19, 2017      11:30 AM - 12:30 PM  
**LOCATION:** Hawaii Hall 309  
**ATTENDANCE:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS		GUESTS	TIME
Aurelio Agcaoili	P			Debora Halbert	P	None	
Halina Zaleski	E	Garrett Clanin	P	Ronald Cambra	E		
Shannon Johnson	P	Nori Tarui	P	Ryan Yamaguchi	P		
Jennifer Griswold	P	Micah Leval, ASUH Rep	P	Lisa Fujikawa	P		
Michael Nassir	P	Stacey Roberts, Liaison	P	Vicky Keough	P		
Michael Cooney	P		P	Wendi Vincent	P		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION / INFORMATION	ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>		Meeting was called to order by Aurelio Agcaoili, SEC liaison at 11:33 AM.
<b>REVIEW OF MINUTES</b>	1. The minutes of October 12, 2017 had been circulated electronically for review and comments were made.	1. Adjustments to attendance, Comments/changes to Business action 6. Added text regarding department clarification, Business action 5, clarification. 2. Approved (6, 0, 0)
<b>CHAIRS REPORT</b>	1.	1. Introductions made.
<b>UNFINISHED BUSINESS</b>	1. None	
<b>BUSINESS</b>	1. Finalize GEC Norms - Wendi presented the norms and the GEC accepted them.	1. Voted on Accepting the norms, Moved - Micah, Seconded by - Jennifer, Approved (8, 0, 0).



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAII®  
MĀNOA

	<p>2. Liaison Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ethics - nothing to worry about</li> <li>b. O - very smooth (Mike)</li> <li>c. W - Halina not here</li> <li>d. HAP - Shannon, doing thoughtful work, what does the P mean</li> <li>e. Foundations - Mike, reviewed and approved several courses, FQ - confusion regarding what the class should be about, maybe need more clarity</li> </ul> <p>3. MFS Bylaws - Shannon and Mike</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Final edits to sections that impacts GEC (e.g. SEC liaison calling the first meeting), good discussion but language stayed the same, there are still mistakes in that section of the bylaws</li> <li>b. Perhaps put language in the MOU that deals with when and how we call our first meeting</li> </ul> <p>4. Program Review Survey - via email, encourage everyone to fill out the survey from Gen Ed.</p> <p>5. Update on the GEO Director search</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 3 names, interview periods identified, would like to meet with GEC schedules allowing, doodle for GEC to find times to meet with the candidates (for us to put forth comments and feedback), public talks will also occur, Oct 30-31st first visit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Christine Beale</li> <li>ii. Dharm Bawuk</li> <li>iii. Daniel Harris-McCoy</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Shannon will be chair for this type of gathering because Aurelio is on the search committee, it'll keep us from asking the same things <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Discussion - tabled until next week</li> <li>ii. Google Doc with what do you hope to learn and specific questions</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>6. Mike - 3 Related Motions - For Course Based Approval delegate down some of the approvals, suggestions because of expertise (those boards have 3 year terms, see lots of courses, know their hallmarks well and apply them consistently) unlike GEC members who don't necessarily know all the hallmarks, suggestion is that it's an unnecessary use of our time and workload (save times in</p>	<p>2. Review the motions for next week and make suggestions to Mike by Monday by 5 pm (by adding comments to a google doc created by Mike), finalize the language next week.</p>
--	--	--



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAI'I®  
MĀNOA

GEC meetings and speed up time for approval for the students), and that it is redundant. Suggest that the boards have the final approving authority when the decision is **unanimous** and does not take away our reviewing authority... *Argument Against* - Course based approvals impact many students, relatively few classes, so perhaps it is important to review twice, *Argument Against* - having GEC members who are unfamiliar with certain hallmarks, it familiarizes GEC members with hallmarks as a kind of “on the job training”

- a. For Course Based Approval - Full authority to the Foundations Board to approve instead of sending back to GEC
- b. Delegate the Focused Boards to grant full approval for course based focus designation
- c. Grant the Boards full and final approval of focus exemptions for extraordinary experiences (e.g. employment)
- d. **Discussion** - Michael, the second Argument Against suggests that the GEC should have to become experts in everything, this is unreasonable, we should just be mediators if there is an issue or grievance, Micah - question, the other boards don't have a student on them, if they bypass that the only committee with a student is then the student voice is lost, every level should have student consultation, Wendi - the GEC should also focus on policy which needs a student voice, Aurelio - there are no students on the other boards, in reality we don't necessarily consult students when we design a course, Shannon - spending so much time on proposals and not enough on policy and we need more time for assessment, Michael - perhaps include questions (influenced perhaps by ASUH) in the student evaluation that asked about Hallmarks and then the renewal process (should address these responses in the evaluations. Micah - How would students be able to engage with these types of course approvals if these motions are passed? Lisa -



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAI'I®  
MĀNOA

	<p>is it unanimous approval or denial or just <b>decision</b>, should we change the language?</p> <p>e. Discussion of Motion 2</p> <p>i. 2.f. - multiple course base focus designations - Option 1: any two or more?</p> <p>f. Revisit this next week - general sense that these motions are a good idea</p>	
ADJOURNMENT	<p>1. The next meeting of the General Education Committee will be on October 26, 2017 , in Hawaii Hall 309 from 11:30AM - 12:30PM.</p>	Meeting adjourned at 12:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Griswold, Secretary.

Approved on 10/26/2017 with 6 votes in favor of approval and 0 against and 2 abstentions.