Minutes of the General Education Committee  
Wednesday, January 29, 2014  
11:00 a.m.-12:00p.m., Hawai‘i Hall 208  

Attendees: Pete Garrod, Bob Joseph, Joy Logan, Stacey Roberts, Amy Schiffner, Elisabeth Seamon (ASUH), Kiana Shiroma, Carolyn Stephenson (SEC)  

GEO support staff: Dawne Bost, Lisa Fujikawa  

Excused: Ron Cambra (OUE), Sarita Rai, Scott Rowland, Todd Sammons (GEO), Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)  

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m.  

1. Minutes from the remaining Fall 2013 meetings were unavailable. They will be emailed to members for review and voted on at the next GEC meeting.  

2. Revised request for course-based O Focus for BUS 345  
   Discussion:  
   • Some members felt that information about training and feedback was still lacking. Others felt that training had been addressed (e.g., instructor reviews proposals with the students and helps them with how to present the final product to the class).  
   • Another concern was the fact that “participation” was being counted as 18% of the oral component of the course, when the majority of what constituted “participation” was in fact not oral in nature (6% for attendance and 6% for online responses).  
   • A third concern was that one of the three oral activities was the “proposal.” Because “students are not expected to present their proposal,” it was unclear why it was counted as an oral activity. If the proposal is not oral in nature, then there aren’t enough oral activities in the class, and the percentage of the grade that is attributed to the oral component of the course is not sufficient.  
   • One member wondered whether students were getting sufficient oral practice when the oral experience was a group activity. He felt it would be helpful to have a breakdown of the oral component by student, but conceded that it was not required. Another member pointed out that the instructor meets with students both individually and as a group, and that all students go through peer critiquing as well.  

Decision: The GEC voted 7-0-0 to contact the department for further clarification. Stacey will draft the email, asking for clarification about the “proposal” (How is it an oral activity?) and the percentage of the grade that can be attributed to the oral component of the course.  

3. Review of Core Competencies memo  
   The GEC was asked to review and give feedback on a memo drafted by the Institutional Learning Objectives Implementation Committee (ILOIC). Some members were confused about the section on quantitative reasoning. However, it was pointed out that the memo was drafted last November, before the Quantitative Reasoning (QR) Working Group was established. The revised memo will include this new information.  

Amy noted that the idea that all departments are supposed to fulfill all of the Mānoa ILOs is a misconception. The University as a whole needs to meet the ILOs, and generally does so through a combination of major and Gen Ed requirements, and sometimes even co-curricular activities.
4. **Quantitative Reasoning (QR) Working Group**

A QR Working Group has been created to address issues raised by WASC’s new “core competencies,” one of which is quantitative reasoning. The group has five charges which will be addressed over the next year and a half. The first is to define “quantitative reasoning.” The group is made up of seven voting faculty members:

- Scott Rowland (Geology and Geophysics)
- Joy Logan (Latin American and Iberian Studies)
- Mike Nassir (Physics)
- Linda Furuto (Education)
- Miguel Filipe (Music)
- Monica Stitt-Bergh (Assessment Office)
- Gary Takayama (advising)

Dawne, Todd, and Stacey will also attend, but as non-voting members.

A recent announcement at an ACCFSC (All-Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs) meeting about the discontinuation of PHIL 110 as an FS course and the possibility of the dissolution of the Foundations-Symbolic Reasoning (FS) requirement was premature, as the Working Group has yet to meet and has not made any recommendations on FS and/or QR. The ACCFSC will be given this information at its February meeting.

5. **E and O Focus: Results from the Assessment Office (AO) Cohort Study**

**Background:** The AO provided Stacey and Todd with data on E and O course-taking patterns, based on a survey given to the Fall 2010 freshman cohort (currently 140 students) that they have been tracking. According to the survey results, after three years at Mānoa:

- 97% of students who began at Mānoa as freshmen have completed at least one Writing Intensive (W) course.
- 61% have completed at least three W courses.
- 89% have completed their Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues (HAP) requirement.
- 51% have completed their Contemporary Ethical Issues (E) requirement.
- 46% have completed their Oral Communication (O) requirement.

The AO pointed out that half the seniors still need to complete their E and/or O requirement. They wondered if this might be a concern, given that there are roughly 5,000 seniors but only 2,000 students who take an E and/or O course in any given semester. A related question was whether there are enough E and O courses offered in the different majors.

**Discussion:** The GEC felt that there could be a number of reasons for such course-taking patterns. These included:

- capstone courses designated with an E and/or O, and which are normally taken in students’ final year (or semester).
- students deliberately waiting to take a specific E and/or O course.
- the fact that E and O courses are only offered at the 300 and 400 level.
- registration difficulties when trying to take an E and/or O course that has a prerequisite. This is one reason why there is a push to get E and O courses in all of the majors.
- the possibility that there is a limited number of E and O courses due to instructor schedules and classroom availability.
Bob asked if students’ graduation was getting delayed because of the lack of E and/or O Focus courses. Kiana said that she had never had a student with that issue, and that in her experience, graduation delays were usually due to missing major requirements.

6. **Spring 2014 Focus calendar** (for Summer and Fall 2014 Focus proposal review) was distributed.

7. **GEC liaisons** are needed for the Foundations (F) and E Boards, because last semester’s liaisons are unable to make the Spring 2014 meeting times (Fridays at 10:00 a.m. for the E Board; Thursdays at 11:00 a.m. for F Board). Amy volunteered to attend F Board meetings. Dawne will ask Scott whether he is available to attend E Board meetings.

8. **Spring 2014 meetings** will be held on Wednesdays from 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. in Hawaii Hall 208. Remaining dates are as follows:

- February 12
- February 26
- March 12
- April 9
- April 23
- May 7

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

*Submitted by Lisa Fujikawa, Recorder*