

Minutes of the General Education Committee

Wednesday, November 14, 2012

Hawai'i Hall 208

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

GEO support staff: Lisa Fujikawa, Todd Sammons

Excused: Dawne Bost (GEO), Amy Schiffner

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:05 p.m. Dore welcomed new ASUH representative, Dwane Tegman, and welcomed back Scott Rowland.

ACTION ITEMS

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

2. Several **requests for multiple Focus designations** were considered.

a. IP 364, Aurelio Agcaoili – E, O, W Focus

Discussion:

- All three Focus Boards recommended that the proposal be approved. It is up to the GEC to determine whether the instructor is sufficiently integrating all requested Focus areas into the course.
- One member questioned why the O and W Focus areas were not mentioned on the syllabus. She felt that the syllabus should indicate, for the students' sake, how the Hallmarks are being addressed.
- Several other members felt that it wasn't necessary for the information to be in the syllabus, especially when the instructor hasn't taught the course yet. They felt that it was more important that the instructor indicate (on the syllabus or otherwise) how the Hallmarks are being met.
- Dore said that the Hallmarks do not have to be repeated verbatim in the syllabus, but that they should be reflected and integrated into the course.
- Sarita said that the W Board tries to get Hallmark information on both the W Focus chart and the syllabus, and requires that the syllabus indicate how the W Hallmarks are being met.

Decision: 7-0-1 in favor of approving the E, O, and W Focus requests, with a request that the instructor integrate the O and W Focus areas into his syllabus.

b. IP 368B, Aurelio Agcaoili – E, O, W Focus

Discussion:

- Board members felt this proposal was much clearer than the previous one.
- No significant concerns were raised.

Decision: 7-0-1 in favor of approving the E O, and W Focus requests.

c. HON 301, Stephen Litschauer – E, O, W Focus

Discussion:

- There was reference to an updated syllabus, but it was not posted on Laulima for GEC review. Joy reported that the E Board did receive a revised syllabus which they were satisfied with.
- One member felt that the percentage didn't add up. It was pointed out that it might be because requirements were sometimes double counted for both the O and W Focus. The grade breakdown on the syllabus also adds up correctly.

Decision: 6-1-1 in favor of approving the E O, and W Focus requests.

A suggestion was made to identify sections that integrate 3 or 4 Focus areas well in order to post them on the General Education website to serve as examples to others. There was some concern that the sample(s) might become "cookie cutters" for future proposals. Another suggestion was to post examples from different courses that show how each Hallmark or Focus area is being met. The General Education Office will look for samples to share.

3. The GEC then considered several **Course-based Focus requests.**

a. APDM 460 – O and W Focus

Discussion:

- Some members felt the proposal was fine; others felt that the syllabi were inconsistent. It was pointed out that the syllabi are normally from sections that have already been taught with the requested foci, and that sections can differ in terms of how they meet the Hallmarks.
- Another concern raised was that the O and W Focus together constituted only 50% of the grade (versus 40%+40%). However, GEO representatives said that the two areas can "double dip," allowing both Focus areas to contribute significantly to the final grade but still be less than 40%+40%.

Decision: 7-0-1 in favor of approving the course-based O and W Focus requests, with a friendly reminder to the Course Coordinator to make sure that all syllabi meet the Focus Hallmarks.

b. GEOG 493 was not posted on Laulima, so the vote was tabled until the next meeting.

c. HON 495 – O and W Focus

Discussion:

- One member asked about the content of Honors courses. It was explained that the content varied widely depending on the majors of the students and the instructor's area(s) of expertise.
- No significant concerns were raised.

Decision: 7-0-1 in favor of approving the course-based O and W Focus requests.

d. SPAN 302 – W Focus

Discussion:

- Some members said that one of the syllabi gave the impression that students may not be doing enough writing (i.e., that they may be writing less than the required 16-page minimum).
- Sarita said that the W Board followed up with the Course Coordinator about this issue. The Coordinator submitted a revised syllabus, which addressed the concerns.

Decision: 7-0-1 in favor of approving the course-based O and W Focus requests, with praise for the revisions that were made by the department.

4. The GEC also considered two **Focus Exemption requests**.
- “Anthony’s” proposal was for a non-course experience. All members felt that the student made his case for the E Focus exemption. Decision: 7-0-1 in favor of approving the E Focus exemption request.
 - “Ashley’s” proposal was for the same non-course experience. The members felt that she made the case for an E Focus exemption as well. Decision: 7-0-1 in favor of approving the E Focus exemption request.

The GEC noted that the Hallmarks used to evaluate non-course experiences for Focus exemption were not currently in the General Education Handbook. The GEO will correct this oversight in the next version.

5. The GEC was asked to vote on three **Foundations (FS) renewals**, with seven more to follow at the next GEC meeting. After discussion of the FS Hallmarks (below), it was decided to table this vote until the next GEC meeting.

REVIEW: FS HALLMARKS

- One member’s interpretation of the FS requirement is that students should be learning how to look at situations in a symbolic manner, distilling the information from the specific instance to apply more generally to other situations. It is difficult to accomplish this unless it is a logic course. The FS requirement is essentially *not* math, but the ability to look at things in a logical manner, and to see arguments and realize that on a basic level they may be false.
- There has been a lot of discussion about changing the current FS Hallmarks, but until a change is made, FS courses need to be evaluated for how well they meet the current Hallmarks.
- Ron suggested tabling a decision on all FS renewals until the Hallmark issue is settled. He felt that approving the courses now may further confuse the issue. However, a decision needs to be made before the end of the semester in order for the FS designation on the courses to continue (if approved).
- It was also pointed out that the proposals that have been submitted address how the courses meet the current Hallmarks. To wait and then evaluate them on different Hallmarks would be problematic. At least one member was concerned that it was also problematic to approve a course for five years based on the current Hallmarks if there is a reasonable chance that the Hallmarks will be changed.

NEXT MEETING: November 28, 2012 from 12:00-1:00 p.m. in Hawaii Hall 208

On the agenda: FS renewals, HAP Board proposal for two-tiered renewal (3- and 5-year)

Meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Submitted by Lisa Fujikawa, Recorder