The following is a list of accomplishments, decisions made, and issues addressed by the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Faculty Senate’s General Education Committee (GEC) and its associated Foundations, Diversification, and Focus boards during the 2009-2010 academic year. The 2009-2010 GEC consisted of Scott Rowland (Chair), Ernestine Enomoto (Vice Chair), Lynne Higa, Mike Nassir, Todd Sammons, Galen Sasaki, Mamoru Sato, and Carolyn Stephenson. Our meetings were made more lively and productive by ex-officio participation by Ron Cambra, Jan Heu, Garett Inouye, Steve Rola, Ryan Yamaguchi, and SEC Liaison Susan Hippensteele. Finally, we would have gotten nowhere without the huge assistance of the General Education Office, including its Chair Tom Hilgers, plus Jo-Anne Nakamoto, Lisa Fujikawa, and Elaine Nakao. Mahalo to all of you for your hard work!

The work of the GEC and its boards can be divided into two main parts. First, we review applications from individual faculty and academic departments for courses to receive GenEd designations. Second, we consider GenEd policies and requirements, and when required, recommend changes to these, some of which require Faculty Senate approval.

With regard to the first, we reviewed proposals for 2 Foundation course renewals, approximately 50 new and renewal Diversification courses, and over 300 new and renewal Focus courses, of which 33 were course-based and therefore required a vote of the full GEC. With regard to the second part of the GEC’s kuleana, we spent a considerable amount of time discussing problems with the FS (Foundations Symbolic Reasoning) requirement, specifically the facts that <25% of incoming freshpeople complete the requirement within their first year, and that many of the students who need to take only one FS course struggle with it regardless of when they take it. Our recommendations regarding FS are based in large part on recommendations produced by a FS Working Group (see their final report appended below). We also spent considerable time reviewing and re-writing a Memorandum of Agreement between campuses regarding General Education requirements of in-system transfer students. We abolished the Focus pro-rate system, and discussed phasing out 400-level Diversification courses. GEC members spent considerable time preparing for, and participating in, the December 2009 visit by members of the WASC team.
I. General Education Designation Approvals (Boards, Subcommittees, full GEC):

A. The AY 2009-2010 Foundations Board consisted of Eric Guentner (Chair), Daphne Dresser, Jim Bayman, Jodie Mattos, Gay Reed, and Leilani Takeuchi. Galen Sasaki was the GEC liaison.

Two Foundations courses were renewed, but no new Foundations courses were proposed during this academic year. This turns out to be part of the FS problem, as is detailed below.

B. The AY 2009-2010 Oral Communication Focus Board consisted of Margit Watts (Chair), Amy Hubbard, Jan Sung, Joel Moffett, and Dominic Franchini. Carolyn Stephenson was the GEC liaison.

The O-Focus Board received 61 proposals for new and renewal O-Focus courses. Of these, 58 were approved, two were denied, and one was withdrawn.

Despite changes to the hallmark explanatory notes made in both 2008 and 2009, the Board still found that many of the O-Focus proposals lacked information about how students would be trained in oral-communication skills. This meant that considerable back-and-forth discussions with the proposing faculty and departments were required to finalize the proposals.

The O-Focus Board held four meetings with faculty from second-language departments to clear up confusion that seems to exist regarding language acquisition as opposed to oral communication skills. Oral communication skills are not merely the ability to speak a language, but importantly they include training in the skills necessary to make persuasive arguments in front of an audience, during an interview, etc. These “how to” skills do not preclude a language course from obtaining an O-Focus designation. However, if a language course consists only of obtaining proficiency in the language, that by itself is not sufficient for the designation. This issue is similar to one faced by the GEC when it has been asked to approve non-course O-Focus exemptions (see below).

The O-Focus board also held a workshop to address the training component of the O-Focus hallmarks. The workshop was attended by instructors from 11 different disciplines, who commented that it had been excellent. The O-Focus board believes that more workshops should be offered, especially if it helps to encourage departments that do not currently offer O-Focus courses to do so.

C. The AY 2009-2010 Contemporary Ethical Issues Focus Board consisted of Ned Bertz (Chair), Helen Baroni, Spencer Leineweber, Ilan Noy, and Jonathan Okamura. Lynne Higa served as GEC liaison.

The E-Focus board received 50 proposals for new and renewal courses. Of these, 48 were approved, and two are still being reviewed. Roughly one third of the proposals required additional information and/or explanations from the proposing faculty and departments.
The largest source of confusion in E-Focus applications continued to be the lack of inclusion of a framework of ethical decision making, specifically an approach, methodology, process, or set of tools, which students will learn. The E-Focus board produced a form-fillable application form, which was designed in part to reduce this confusion.

The E-Focus board was also concerned with course-based applications. A course-based focus designation means that a course will carry a Focus designation regardless of who teaches it. Those course-based applications that the E-Focus board reviewed often did not provide sufficient information regarding how E-Focus hallmarks would be met, and this was seen partly to be a problem with the staff-based E-Focus application. The E-Focus board recommended that next year’s board consider changes to the application form itself to try and alleviate some of the problem.

The Assessment Office designed a full evaluation of the Contemporary Ethical Issues focus program. A faculty-led group created a rubric for scoring last semester, which was made available to all instructors. This semester, a random sample of student work from E-focus courses was solicited and is currently being collected for review this summer.

As last year’s E-Focus board noted, there are several majors which neglect to offer E-focus courses entirely.


The H-Focus board reviewed about 20 proposals. They approved 2 course-based H-Focus proposals and voted to allow 1-semester “staff-based” H-focus designations when an instructor for an approved H-focus course cannot be found prior to printing of the Schedule of Courses. The H-Focus board also met with members of the UH System H-Focus board.

E. The AY 2009-2010 Writing-Intensive Focus Board consisted of Tom Hilgers (Chair), Mike DeMattos, Sterling Keeley, Trina Kudlacek, Brad Nakamura, Lourdes Ortega, Weilin Qu, Kathleen Sands, Kenton Harsch, and Darin Payne. Todd Sammons served as GEC Liaison.

The W-Focus Board reviewed 330 new and renewal proposals.

F. The GEC itself must approve proposals for course-based Focus designations (i.e., for all sections of a course). We also must approve proposals for courses that will carry >1 Focus designation. In both cases the GEC makes its recommendation only after the course has been approved by the appropriate Focus board(s).

In 2009-2010 we approved 34 course-based focus proposals. Some of these course-based Focus proposals stretched to >100 pages, mostly because of the requirement that multiple syllabi be attached. Almost all of this syllabus material is irrelevant to the Focus designation, so the GEC discussed ways to streamline the
application process. Additionally, even with all this information, more often than not, the proposing departments did not adequately address how the various hallmarks would be met, and the GEC also discussed ways to make it easier for a proposing department to understand what information is being requested. A form-fillable pdf application might solve both the problem of too much (mostly irrelevant) information being submitted and the lack of clear addressing of hallmarks.

In 2009-2010, the GEC approved 2 courses with 3 Focus designations. We turned down the rest of the multiple-focus applications despite the fact that the individual Focus boards had recommended approval. In these instances GEC was concerned that there would be inadequate coverage of all the focus hallmarks within a single course. We discussed whether we should require a course to carry at least one credit hour per focus designation, but did not act on this.

G. The 2009-2010 Diversification Subcommittee of the GEC consisted of Mike Nassir, Todd Sammons, and Carolyn Stephenson. In 2009-2010, 30 applications for Diversification designations were submitted. Of these, 26 were approved and 4 were rejected. Because the Diversification Subcommittee consists wholly of GEC members, both they and the GEC as a whole decided that subcommittee recommendations would no longer require GEC approval unless there was disagreement among subcommittee members about the designation decision for a particular course. The Diversification Subcommittee also spent considerable time discussing whether or not 400-level diversification courses should be phased out. This issue was brought to the full GEC for additional discussion as is noted below.

II. General Education Policy:

1. FS - Foundations, Symbolic Reasoning. FS is one of three Foundations requirements that, according to the UHM Course Catalog, are supposed to be completed during a student’s first year. Typically, only about 20% of the students in an incoming Freshperson class (i.e., not counting transfer students) completes actually does so. A similar situation existed with FW (Foundations Written Communication), and it was traced to a lack of seat availability. As is detailed in last year’s GEC report, this particular FW issues has been solved.

   Unlike FW, there is not a lack of seats in FS courses as a whole, although specific FS courses are occasionally full. Other reasons why this requirement is not met by most students include: 1) difficulty with, and/or fear of, the subject material (quantitative and/or logical); 2) the availability of 200-level FS courses, which suggest (quite understandably) that they are not first-year requirements; and 3) the fact that students in some majors are advised to take the classes in the second year because they fit better in the overall curriculum at that time. For many students, the FS course is, or at least it is seen as, a stumbling block toward graduation.

   At the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, the GEC promised the Faculty Senate that it would present a proposal in Fall 2009 to deal with FS, and we predicted that our proposal would be to make FS a requirement that should be fulfilled by the end of a
student’s second year at UHM. Furthermore, it would be a requirement that unlike at present, would be enforced, mainly by limiting enrollment in 100-level FS courses to first- and second-year students.

The GEC started its 2009-2010 year with this issue, and quickly realized that it was more complex than we had imagined. For one thing, we could not adequately defend the proposition that FS actually should be taken early in a student’s career. This is certainly the opinion of most faculty, but we had no basis for this opinion other than anecdotal evidence and our own assertions. Nor were we even sure that FS, as it was defined at UHM in 1999, was providing students with the knowledge and skills that are appropriate for a college graduate, particularly those students who need to take only a single FS course in their entire college career.

We therefore had to take a couple steps back and examine the bigger picture. We did this in two ways. First, we requested from Admissions and Records, a set of data for the Fall 2003 entering Freshperson class with regard to when they took their various Foundations classes, what their grades were in these classes, what their majors were, etc. We requested 21 different sets of data which we hoped would allow us to assess whether or not it made a difference when any of the Foundations requirements (1 x FW, 1 x FS, and 2 x FG) were met. Second, we convened an FS Working Group consisting of faculty from departments that offer the majority of FS courses (Math, Philosophy, Computer Science) as well as from some of the departments where only a single FS course is required (e.g., non-sciences in A&S, SPAS, and certain majors in CTAHR). The working group was chaired by Mike Nassir of the GEC and Monica Stitt-Bergh of the Mānoa Assessment Office.

The charge given to the FS working group was to examine UHM’s FS requirement and suite of FS courses to determine if they were providing students that are necessary and appropriate for a 21st century college graduate. We pointed out that this concern is mainly for those departments that require only a single FS course. This is because science and engineering majors in all colleges are required to take two, and in many cases many more than two, math, statistics, or other quantitative courses. Although this does not guarantee that these students necessarily do any better in these types of courses, they must at least take the courses early in their careers in order to satisfy prerequisite and major requirements. We also mentioned that there was some concern that WASC would look unfavorably upon our current FS requirement, although the WASC requirements are rather vague. The working group was given its charge right before the Winter break, and they provided the GEC with a final report in mid-April. It is attached as an appendix, and we summarize a couple of their major findings here.

First, the working group considers the FS requirement as it is currently defined to be fine, and they did not recommend any changes to the hallmarks. However, they did not feel that the current set of 100-level FS courses may not be adequately preparing students for post-college life, especially if a student only takes one of these courses while in college. They noted that most students are having trouble with the intellectual rigor of some of the 100-level FS courses (Philosophy in particular), and with the large class size of others (MATH 100 in particular). The GEC learned recently, for example, that 64% of the students who took MATH 100 in the Fall 2009 semester received grades of D, F, or W.
Among the working group’s recommendations are to relieve the pressure on MATH 100 so that it no longer needs to be taught in class sizes of a few hundred students. Instead, resources need to be directed to not only the Math Dept., but other Depts. as well so that they can develop smaller FS courses that can deal more easily with students that are having trouble more easily. They also recommended making the current somewhat vague combination of both quantitative and logical topics within FS more explicit. One way this could be achieved might be by requiring students to take two courses, one of which is quantitative and the other logical. Or, FS courses could be developed that covered both of these topics, and again, there is no reason why such courses couldn’t be offered by a variety of departments and colleges on campus.

The GEC took these recommendations into consideration and also looked at the question of whether taking Foundations courses (and FS in particular) has an effect on any measure of student success. This was done via analysis of grade and graduation data about Foundations courses that were provided by Admissions and Records. A big mahalo goes out to Roy Suda of A&R for all the time and effort he put into this. We received an enormous Excel file with all the data required for us to answer the multitude of questions we were asking about Foundations course efficacy. Unfortunately, we have only been able to scratch the surface of these data at the time of this report. We provide three examples. Figure 1 shows the percentage of the incoming class of Fall 2003 who graduated, divided into 3 populations, those who completed all their Foundations courses in the first year, those who didn’t, and the class as a whole. Included in this particular compilation are students who entered with Foundations credit (e.g., via high scores on AP exams) as well as transfer students. Nevertheless, it is clear that at least up to Spring of 2007, which is 4 academic years after they entered, the chances of graduating for students who did complete their Foundations classes in their first year is higher than for those students who didn’t.
Figure 1: Graph showing the % of students in the Fall 2003 entering class who graduated in each of the following semesters. Note that this population includes new students, transfers, continuing students, everyone. The students have been divided into two groups, those who completed all their Foundations courses during their first year (blue) and those who didn't (pink). See text for discussion.
Figure 2 is a plot of the time required to complete FS vs. the time taken to graduate, and the size of the symbols is scaled to each student’s grade in the course (big symbols are better grades). From this, it is clear that the highest grades were earned by the students who took their FS courses during their first or second years, especially if they graduated in 3 or 4 years. The average FS grade for those students who graduated in 5 years is slightly lower, and for those who graduated in 6 years it is clearly lower. The average FS grade is highest for those students who took their FS course in their first and second years, drops off slightly for those who took it in their third, fourth, or fifth year, and it is significantly lower for those who took their FS course later.

The big question, of course, is whether any of these correlations between some measure of FS completion and/or ability and some measure of student success (e.g., graduation time) are associated with any causality. We have been able to make such a determination, but again, we have not had these data for very long. We hope that continued analyses of the data set (which is huge) will yield answers to this question. What is clear is that students who take their Foundations courses early are more likely to graduate early and are more likely to do well in the courses themselves.

How can all of these FS findings and recommendations be put to practical use? One suggestion is to “do the experiment”. Specifically, make the FS requirement one that must be completed by the end of a student’s second year, and enforce it. 100-level FS courses would be limited only to first- and second-year students. Students who do
not fulfill the requirement are not granted junior status, and will need to fulfill the requirement at a Community College. In this way, FS would be analogous to FW (except that FW is a first-year requirement). We feel that given all the complications mentioned above including 200-level FS courses, advising practices, etc., it would be unreasonable at the moment to require students to complete their FS requirement in their first year. Our discussions of this FS issue will continue in the next academic year.

2. The Articulation MOA. In September of 2009, various faculty committees were given a draft Memorandum of Agreement that was being circulated among the various UH System campuses. This MOA dealt with the general education requirements of in-system transfer students. Specifically, its goal was to make the transfer of these GenEd requirements more straightforward. The GEC and other Faculty Senate committees spent considerable time and effort analyzing the ramifications of this MOA.

Our specific concerns dealt with the subtleties of the MOA’s wording, specifically regarding when it would go into effect, who would do the checking on whether or not a student had actually satisfied his/her GenEd requirements, and so on. It was pretty clear that the memo had been written without much thought having been given to these details and subtleties. Our efforts were helped greatly by Ruth Bingham and the Council of Academic Advisors. In our report on the MOA to the Faculty Senate, we recommended that the MOA not be approved by the Faculty Senate until it was re-written, and we provided suggested wording to help in the re-writing process. The Faculty Senate’s CAP also suggested that the MOA needed to be re-written, although for different reasons. At its Dec. 2, 2009 meeting, the Faculty Senate voted unanimously to accept the GEC and CAP recommendations to send the MOA back to its source for revision.

In February of 2010, we received a revised version of the MOA, and it matched, almost word for word, our suggestions of the previous semester. However, it now included a new, fourth point, which was similarly written with little thought to its actual ramifications or implementation. Once again, we have provided suggested wording in our report to the Faculty Senate. Our GEC recommendation is that the Senate should approve the MOA in principle, but that final approval should come only after the MOA is re-worded, and after the other 9 campus’ faculty senates have had a chance to vote on the latest version.

3. Focus pro-rate. Ever since the current GenEd system was adopted in 2000, there has been a set of rules that govern pro-ration of Focus requirements for in-system transfer students. The original reason that these rules were written was that there were not sufficient Focus courses available at the Community Colleges, which put students who transferred from them at a disadvantage compared to students who started out at UH Mānoa.

With time, the evolution of UH Mānoa’s GenEd requirements, and the proliferation of different agreements between campuses (e.g., Ka ‘iʻeʻie), the Focus pro-rate system became extremely complicated. No less than 8 different permutations existed depending on which campus a student was transferring from, when the student first started in the system, whether or not the student stopped attending for a while, etc. Ruth Bingham of the Council of Academic Advisors told the GEC that this Focus pro-
rate system was the single largest source of confusion among not only students but advisors as well. Additionally, the original reason for the pro-rate system, the lack of Focus courses at the Community Colleges, no longer exists because there are many such courses now. Finally, the system had become unfair to those students who started out at UH Mānoa. A Mānoa student is required to take 8 Focus courses to graduate (1 x H, 1 x E, 1 x O, and 5 x W). However, via the Focus pro-rate and depending on various factors listed above, it was possible for a student transferring in from a Community College to end up only ever having to take 3 Focus courses.

Because the Focus pro-rate had been established originally by a vote of the GEC, we determined that we could also abolish it. At our Oct. 28, 2009 meeting, we did just that, effective Fall 2011. However, it is unclear whether notice of this has been transmitted officially to any of the other campuses in the UH System. We are concerned because this change in policy will have potentially significant impacts on some students transferring to UH Mānoa, and they therefore need to be aware of the changes as soon as possible.

4. 400-level Diversification courses. The Diversification Subcommittee of the GEC (essentially half of the GEC) has for the past two years been considering whether or not there should be 400-level diversification courses. The full GEC took up this discussion during the latter months of the 2009-2010 academic year. The arguments against 400-level diversification courses are three-fold. First, because almost all 400-level courses carry pre-requisites which almost always carry the same diversification designations, almost no students are actually taking 400-level courses for diversification purposes. This is because except for DS, a student only needs one course in each of the diversification categories to graduate. Second, it was argued that by definition, a 400-level course is so specialized that it would not provide much “diversity” to a student’s education, and thus is not fulfilling the goal of the requirement in the first place. Third, anecdotal evidence showed that some departments are offering 400-level diversification courses with very low enrollment while at the same time, lower-division courses in those same departments are closed due to over-enrollment. The justification for offering these low-enrollment courses is that they are general education courses and therefore must be taught.

It would be unfair to remove the diversification designations from all the 400-level courses that currently hold them, but we considered not accepting any new applications for such courses and allowing existing designations to lapse after their existing 5-year span. However, a number of arguments against getting rid of the 400-level diversification designations also appeared. First, but probably least important, WASC likes the fact that our general education system spans all the years of a student’s college career. This argument is relatively weak because both O-Focus and E-Focus courses must be numbered 300 or above, meaning that at least this part of general education occurs late in a student’s career. Second, a random (although relatively small) sampling of graduating students showed that ~10% of them used at least one 400-level course to satisfy a diversification requirement. Third, there is a very small number of 400-level courses that carry a diversification designation, but don’t have a pre-requisite with that same designation (or may have a class-standing prerequisite). Finally, it is very clear that both students and faculty consider classes to be more
valuable if they carry some sort of GenEd designation. Experience shows that the same class, when offered with a GenEd designation of some sort, attracts many more students than when it doesn’t. This occurs even when these students have already satisfied the particular diversification requirement attached to the course (usually by satisfying the prerequisite).

Needless to say, the GEC has not come to a decision on this issue, and we'll have to leave it to next year's group. In particular, we would like the GEC (and eventually the Faculty Senate) to decide on how it defines diversification. The official definition (in the catalog and on the GenEd website) is: "The Diversification requirement is intended to assure that every student has a broad exposure to different domains of academic knowledge, while at the same time allowing flexibility for students with different goals and interests." Unfortunately this can be interpreted in two ways. One is that by taking any course outside a student’s major, his/her college career is made broader. This seems to be the interpretation that most faculty and students have, which helps to explain why ~42% of all the diversification courses at UHM are 400-level courses. Another interpretation, however, is that students need to have a broad knowledge of the fields that they are being exposed to, and therefore a very specific, 400-level course will not suffice. In the meantime, we ask our Faculty colleagues to consider not requesting diversification designations for all their 400-level courses unless there is a clear reason to do so.

5. GEC Outreach. Early in the Fall Semester, we put together a powerpoint presentation that explained UHM’s General Education system, what its component parts are, and what they are intended to accomplish. Our goal was for GEC members to adjust the presentation for specific departments and/or colleges, and present it at departmental faculty meetings. Unfortunately this only occurred once, but we hope that a newly formed GEC alumni association will be willing to spread the good word during the next academic year.

6. WASC. Finally, members of the GEC, led by Vice Chair Ernestine Enomoto, met with members of the visiting WASC committee to speak about our GenEd system and any challenges it is facing. From all accounts, the WASC commissioners were very favorably impressed by the GenEd efforts that UH Mānoa undertakes, including the fact that so many faculty have risen to the call of offering GenEd classes (the 400-level diversification issue not withstanding). We can only echo these favorable impressions among you, our colleagues, and make the request that you consider offering as many E-, O-, H-, and W-Focus courses as you can. We would also like you to consider developing FS courses in your particular disciplines, not only for your own students, but for other students as well. It would be great for students to learn their quantitative and logical skills while also being exposed to a discipline that they otherwise might never have experienced.
Appendix 1. FS Working Group Report:
Foundations Symbolic Reasoning Working Group
Final Report
April 8, 2010

Members: Mike Nassir (Physics & Astronomy) & Monica Stitt-Bergh (Assessment Office) co-chairs; Ron Bontekoe (Philosophy), Jonathan Deenik (Tropical Plant & Soil Science), Heiner Dovermann (Mathematics), Erik Guentner (Mathematics), Mike Kirk-Kuwaye (Arts & Sciences Advising), Jonathan Morse (English), Matthew Romaniello (History), Mel Spencer (Education), Susanne Still (Information & Computer Sciences), Lorey Takahashi (Psychology)

Background
The General Education Committee (GEC), via the Faculty Senate, created a Foundations Symbolic Reasoning (FS) working group to answer three questions. The working group investigated other campuses’ general education requirements, reviewed accreditation requirements, and discussed the group members’ expectations with regard to college graduates’ FS knowledge and skills. Below are answers to the GEC’s questions along with the working group’s observations and recommendations to improve our undergraduates’ FS skills and knowledge.

Answers to the GEC’s three questions
1. What is Foundations Symbolic Reasoning?
   The current Hallmarks sufficiently describe FS. The working group recommends maintaining the current Hallmarks.

2. Do courses that satisfy the FS requirement teach students what we want them to learn with regard to quantitative and symbolic reasoning skills?
   Not always. See recommendations below.

3. Should students complete the FS requirement before their junior year?
   Yes. The working group recommends that students satisfy the FS requirement during their first year at UHM. All students must satisfy the FS requirement before earning 55 UHM credits.

Observations and Recommendations
The recommendations are not mutually exclusive; some are complementary.

1) The FS Hallmarks do not require “quantitative skills” which is specified by WASC CFR 2.2a.
   a) Adopt the approach seen on the mainland (e.g., University of Colorado) where students satisfy the FS requirement by doing one of the following:
      i) Complete one 3-credit 100- or 200-level course that involves both quantitative skills and critical/formal reasoning. 3 credits total. Departments may wish to modify existing FS courses so they meet this option.
ii) Complete one 3-credit 100- or 200-level course that involves quantitative skills and one 3-credit 100- or 200-level course that involves symbolic reasoning. 6 credits total.

2) The issue is with MATH 100, PHIL 110, and PHIL 111, which account for about 50% of the students enrolled in FS each year. The transition from high school into these courses appears very difficult for many students. They are not prepared for the academic rigor of PHIL 110 and 111 and the 400-person lecture format of MATH 100.

a) Revamp MATH 100. Provide (summer) stipends to faculty members so they can redesign MATH 100 into a hybrid course that combines face-to-face instruction with online or computer-based learning. Because the amount of classroom seat time will be reduced, the classroom size can be smaller.

3) There is too much enrollment pressure on MATH 100.

a) Encourage appropriate departments to develop and apply for the FS designation for entry-level courses. The new FS courses should not have any pre-requisites.

For example, create a new Colleges of Arts & Sciences 100-level course that combines quantitative and critical/formal reasoning, possibly team-taught by Philosophy and Math professors. The team-teaching format would model ENG 313 or LLL 150: one professor teaches the first half of section one and then the second half of section two.

4) UHM’s stated practice in granting transfer credit for math courses has been overridden by the general education foundations articulation agreement. Page 11 of the UHM Catalog, under Notable Restrictions on Transfer Credits, states, “Courses not accepted for transfer credit include, but at not limited to, the following: . . . Mathematics courses considered below college level: courses include, but are not limited to, basic math, business math, college algebra and trigonometry.” UHM currently grants transfer credit to students who have completed such courses from UH campuses because those courses have been approved as FS by the sending campus.

a) The General Education Committee needs to reconcile the discrepancy between the general education foundations articulation policy and the Catalog page 11, Notable Restrictions on Transfer Credits. UHM does not accept math courses listed on page 11 from non-UH campuses, but it does accept such courses from UH campuses if they have been approved as FS by the sending campus.

5) Qualified students need additional ways to test out of the FS requirement.

a) Offer students ways to test out of the FS requirement but ensure that the instrument/procedure is valid given the FS Hallmarks. The working group encourages the GEC to explore additional ways to test out of the FS requirement.

b) Remove the existing option that allows students to earn FS credit via CLEP’s College Math exam because that exam does not meet the FS Hallmarks.