CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 12:35 p.m. by the chair.

Present: Helen Baroni, Richard Bigus, Patricia Fryer (chair), Jon Goss, Emily Hawkins, Jeannie Lum, Megumi Taniguchi.
Jan Heu (A&R), Tom Hilgers (GEO), Helene Sokugawa (OVCAA)

Guests: Monica Stitt-Bergh.

Absent: Jesse Jones (ASUH), James Marsh, Noel Kent (SEC), Kelly Aune (OVCAA).

MINUTES: The minutes and liaison reports of October 25, 2005, were approved as submitted.

OLD BUSINESS:
1. S06 Focus recommendations (Hawkins)
   The H Board recommended 5 courses for S06 (list attached).

   MOTION: It was moved and seconded that the GEC approve the recommended courses. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Listing Gen Ed attributes on MyUH (Baroni)
   A draft memo to VCAA Neal Smatresk re Showing General Education Attributes in MyUH Portal was distributed (attached). The request was expanded to include having the attributes visible on screens accessible by faculty. The GEC agreed that the memo should be sent. A copy will be emailed to GEC members.

3. Diversification renewal subcommittee (Stitt-Bergh)
   -The committee has been meeting every other week. Materials are being prepared and will include a memo to the chair, list of eligibility guidelines, hallmarks, and explanatory notes. The drafts will be discussed with the Council of Chairs and presented to the GEC in early spring. In F06, the packet will be distributed to the first group of 15 departments (and every semester thereafter for 2 years until all 4 groups have gone through the review process). If the committee needs help in reviewing the materials received, they will recruit more faculty. IAVCAA K. Aune’s suggestion that CCs have WI-type boards for Diversification would provide the subcommittee with a contact at the CCs when articulated Diversification courses are considered for renewal.

   -Revised DA hallmarks are being circulated to departments with DA courses. One response has been received. Deadline for responses is 11/16/05.

4. HSL-requirement waiver policy (Hilgers)
   A draft resolution was emailed to the GEC (attached). The GEC was asked to consider whether it should be forwarded to the Mānoa Faculty Senate.
Discussion:
-Forwarding the resolution may suggest problems with the requirement; the issue is really procedural.
-Waiver decisions are not subject to periodic review.
-Only 50% of students need to fulfill the HSL requirement because of existing waivers.
-Thus, the question has been raised as to whether HSL should continue to be a Gen Ed requirement.
-A list of HSL requirements by college/school is available at http://www.hawaii.edu/gened/hsl.htm.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to table the draft resolution.
The motion passed, 6 in favor, 1 abstained.

5. Should there be a uniform Gen Ed policy requiring Focus instructors to state hallmarks and learning outcomes in their syllabus? Discussion also considered how instructors would satisfy such a requirement.

Discussion:
-Hawkins: HAP would favor a uniform policy if that meant other boards would require a syllabus for new Focus requests.
-GEC requires that a syllabus show how hallmarks are being met.
-WASC requires learning outcomes in the syllabus of general education courses.
-Thus, the WASC learning outcomes requirement is administration’s responsibility.
-Stitt-Bergh reported that the Mānoa Assessment Council has been charged with the task of assessing student learning; faculty should monitor classes as it is now doing, for example, with the end-of-semester Focus surveys.

Suggestions for implementing such a policy:
-Instructors would be more likely to comply if boards developed learning outcomes which instructors could include with their syllabus.
-Faculty are not familiar with writing up learning outcomes.
-Additional requirements will discourage instructors from submitting Focus proposals.
-Other boards might develop a brochure like W’s Information for Students which describes writing-intensive courses and is distributed by instructors each semester.
-If university policy required syllabi from departments, the administration could stipulate what must be in the syllabi.
-Rather than ask for a revised syllabus, request a narrative of how the hallmarks will be met.
-A syllabus is to tell student what will be offered, not to satisfy a board and its hallmarks policy.
-If a syllabus is required with all new proposals, the instructor might have until the early weeks of the requested semester to submit it. Failure to do so would result in a one-semester-only approval.

It was agreed that the liaisons should discuss this issue with their boards. The GEO Advisory Board will also have it on its 11/15 agenda.

6. “Equivalency” and Foundations credit: Should a System course deemed equivalent to a UHM course meet the Foundations requirement that the UHM course satisfies? (It currently does not.) F Board liaison Goss will take this question to the F Board.
System committees have met to determine equivalency of courses; however, F credit is given only if the CC course has been reviewed by UHM’s F Board or the sending campus has a Common Foundations Program agreement with UHM (as HCC and KCC).

**Discussion:**
- Students assume that an “equivalent” course satisfies all the course attributes of the UHM course.
- Need system-facilitated coordinated review of all system courses.

**NEW BUSINESS**
1. Course-based designations (Hilgers)
   - GEC policy allows if a course itself inherently meets the hallmarks. Page 85-86 of the current Handbook describes the policy.

**WRAP UP**
1. Copy of VCAA memo re *Showing General Education Attributes in MyUH Portal* will be emailed to the GEC.
2. Liaisons should take the discussion re hallmarks and learning outcomes in syllabi to their boards.
3. Liaison Goss will take the question of equivalency and Foundations credit to the F Board.

Next meeting: Tuesday, 11/29/05, 12:30-2:00, Hawai‘i 208.
   - Send New Business items to Fryer.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Submitted by Barbara Mueller-Ali, Recorder