Minutes of the General Education Committee  
Wednesday, April 4, 2012  
Hawai`i Hall 208

Attendees:  Ron Cambra (AVCUE), Jim Caron, Sianha Gualano (ASUH), Joe Jarrett,  
Dore Minatodani, Scott Rowland, Mamoru Sato, Comfort Sumida, Wei Zhang  

Support staff:  Lisa Fujikawa (GEO), Jo-Anne Nakamoto (GEO Recorder),  
Todd Sammons (GEO)  

Absent:  Fred Birkett, Richard Chadwick (SEC)  
Excused:  Dawne Bost (GEO), Garett Inoue (Admissions), Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)  

CALL TO ORDER:  
The meeting was called to order by Chair Joe Jarrett at 12:00 noon.  

ACTION ITEMS:  
1. Approval of Minutes  
   • Minutes of March 7th were unanimously approved.  
   • Minutes of March 21st were unanimously approved with the following corrections:  
     o Info Item #1, para immediately following bullet number 8 to read: “The GEC  
       unanimously approved a motion to offer a two-year probationary period for SOCS  
       150 to the F Board. Joe will meet with the Board to present this compromise.”  
     o Info Item #2, second bullet. Replace “requirement” with “Hallmark”.  
2. Foundations Renewals for GEC Vote:  
   • ELI 100 (FW) - The GEC voted (7 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstained) to renew this  
     proposal.  
   • GEOG 102 (FG-B) The GEC voted unanimously (8-0-0) to approve this renewal proposal.  
   • GEOG 151 (FG-C) The GEC voted unanimously (8-0-0) to approve this renewal proposal.  
All of the above-mentioned proposals were renewed for 5 years (Fall 2012-Summer 2017).  

INFORMATION ITEMS  
1. Update on SOCS 150  
   • Joe met with the Foundations Board on March 23rd. The Board revoted and reaffirmed that  
     they recommended a one-year approval or none at all.  
   • He reiterated that the GEC felt a 2-year conditional approval should be given to this course  
     to give them enough time to improve it.  
   • He mentioned the Foundations Board’s concern about the lack of rigor for this course.  
   • The GEC reaffirmed their stance of a 2-year approval by vote: 8-0-0. Joe will write memo  
     to instructors/dean and incorporate Foundations Board’s comments and concerns.  
   • Proposal for future policy: in order for a course to be given a Foundations designation, it  
     should have to been taught a minimum amount (to be determined) of times first (or, perhaps  
     taught with a 2-yr probational/conditional approval). The Foundations Board felt that as  
     long as the syllabus met the Hallmarks it should be okay to carry the designation.  
2. Report: Foundations Multicampus Meeting – to be held on April 13th
Discussion: Does the UHM Foundations Board require input regarding changes to the Hallmarks? There appears a conflict, due to the documents written prior to the articulation agreement.

- Who votes first on any new changes?
- Would each campus’s GEC vote?
- As mentioned in prior meetings, perhaps the UHM group could do the initial write-up.
- Another thought is that quantitative skills might be tweaked into a Focus requirement vs. a Foundations requirement.
- WASC currently hasn’t made any decision regarding FS. We can’t base policy on it, but what is best. If campus-wide consensus is that math is “good”, then we would need a working group to hold community meetings to gather opinions. This goes back to the concept that admitted students should have had adequate math background in high school; also our expectation of what is a “foundational course”? Why the symbolic reasoning tangent, or is it essential to those seeking a liberal arts degree?

- Joe’s review of peer and benchmark schools indicated that half of them have a combination of both logic and computational skills requirements. The others say either-or math or logic (which was included in our original statement of the requirement).

Meeting adjourned at 12:58 p.m.

Next meeting: April 18, 2012, 12:00-1:00 p.m.

Submitted by Jo-Anne Nakamoto, Recorder.