Membership: Ernestine Enomoto (chair), Joe Jarrett (vice-chair), Jim Caron, Sianha Gualano (ASUH), Mike Nassir, Mamoru Sato, Galen Sasaki, Comfort Sumida, Wei Zhang; with ex officio support from Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa (SEC liaison), Todd Sammons (GEO), Lisa Fujikawa (GEO), Jo-Anne Nakamoto (GEO), Ron Cambra (OVCAA), Garett Inoue (A&R), and Ryan Yamaguchi (A&R).

Summary of Activities and Actions
The following summarizes the activities and actions taken by the General Education Committee (GEC) and its associated Foundations and Focus boards during the academic year Fall 2010 – Spring 2011.

Individual reports from each board indicated that the following numbers of proposals were reviewed, were approved, and are still pending. It is the practice of the boards to work toward getting course applications approved, which involves contacting the instructors for clarification or explanation if applications initially fall short. Also, numerous outreach efforts to increase and improve applications were made through workshops (O-board held 2; W-board held 3 this year) and individual meetings with faculty proposal submitters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Board members</th>
<th>Proposals reviewed</th>
<th>Recommended or approved</th>
<th>Still pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Focus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Focus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Focus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-Focus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with our specific GEC responsibilities, we reviewed applications for GenEd multi-focus and course-based designations, considered focus exemption requests, and reviewed and/or revised policies related to General Education that were within our governance.

General Education Applications and Focus Exemptions
Applications for multi-focus designations (i.e., those requesting three or more focus designations) were reviewed first by the respective Focus Boards and then presented to the GEC for approval. In particular we attempted to determine whether a course could sufficiently integrate the varied foci (E, H, O, or W) while accomplishing the hallmarks of each individual focus. All four courses reviewed were discussed and approved.

Applications for course-based focus designations were reviewed for five courses. In this category, courses which by their content and delivery meet the focus hallmarks were reviewed and discussed by the GEC. All five courses were subsequently approved.
Foundations course applications are submitted in a two-stage review process as the Foundations Board recommends and the GEC approves the recommendation of a course application for FW, FS, or FG. We had hoped to encourage more applications and thereby increase the number of course options available to students especially to meet the FS requirement. In total there were five new courses proposed and reviewed by the Foundations Board; three were recommended for approval; one was granted a one-year provisional approval, and one course was denied.

Of the six focus exemptions requested by students this year, we reviewed and approved three requests. When a request is denied, we indicate in a memo to the student requestor the questions the GEC raised about that student’s educational experiences related to the focus hallmarks. For example, if an O-focus exemption is requested, did the student engage in varied oral presentation activities and receive feedback from an instructor or supervisor throughout the learning process?

A GEC subcommittee on diversification (Caron, Nassir, Sasaki, Sumida; staff support by Fujikawa) was constituted to review applications for the Diversification designation. We decided early on that the subcommittee’s decisions would hold unless there was disagreement among the subcommittee members. Of the 45 courses reviewed for Diversification, 31 were approved. The subcommittee did not bring any issues to the GEC.

**GEC Policy Review and Recommendations**

A major concern from last year’s GEC was related to courses taken for FS (Foundations – Symbolic Reasoning). We had found that only about 20% of our incoming Freshmen complete their FS in the first year, a problem not because of lack of seats but for other reasons more complex. Further there was discussion about clarifying the hallmarks and implementing student completion of their FS requirement in a timely manner. As a result, the GEC constituted a working group that came forward with its recommendations for action by the end of last academic year. For details of the issues and outcome, refer to Scott Rowland’s GEC Fall 2009-Spring 2010 Annual Report. This year, we had wanted to devise a resolution on the FS requirement but felt it needed to be initiated by the Foundations Board. A resolution to address several FS related matters was discussed and passed by that Board. It was subsequently passed by the GEC at its April 26th meeting. See Appendix A.

Another issue from last year dealt with the determination of passing grades for earning Gen Ed credit. Should passing grades be C or better? At present, a D is sufficient to earn a Gen Ed credit. When entering UHM, students may transfer in only grades of D or better. However with the SEC requesting our examination of High Failure rate courses, we decided to table this matter for later discussion.

A third carryover from last year was about 400-level diversification courses. Does each diversification course need to meet the goal of assuring that students have broad exposure to different domains of academic knowledge? It was supposed that an upper division course (i.e., 400 and above) might offer more depth than breadth. The Diversification...
subcommittee discussed the matter and brought it to the GEC. It was decided that as long as a course provided basic structure and pedagogy, it would fulfill the diversification designation. It was also suggested that adding that information to the description of Explanatory Notes might be useful.

Other GEC Activities
As has been the practice, the GEC together with the General Education Office holds a fall orientation for new and ongoing committee and board members. Twenty-six members attended that meeting held on August 19, 2010. Because not all members of the GEC and its boards were appointed at the beginning of the fall semester, Enomoto and Sammons held individual orientation sessions for the four GEC members who came onboard later.

A one-day WASC visit was made on March 15, 2011. GEC members (Enomoto, Jarrett, Sammons) together with the Assessment Office (Lowe, Stitt-Bergh) participated in the focus group on assessment of general education. The session with the visiting committee members went well.

Manoa Faculty Senate Charges to the GEC
In addition to our GEC responsibilities, the SEC asked that we consider the following:

1. **Consolidating OFDAS, GEO, AO.** A working group from GEO and AO was constituted to consider issues and concerns related to consolidating these separate units. Sammons was our representative. The group decided to retain the status quo and requested reports on the collaborative efforts made among OFDAS, GEO and AO.

2. **Review of High Failure Rate Courses.** Last October, a working group consisting of members from CAPP, GEC and MAC was assembled to address this charge. GEC members included Enomoto (convener), Jarrett, Sammons, and Sato. Examining data prepared by the Manoa Institutional Research Office (Merrill), the group raised numerous questions and sought feedback from key departments, faculty, students, and advisors on the problem of “failing to proceed” in certain challenging courses. A summary report of the work conducted along with findings and recommendations was presented to the faculty senate on April 20th and approved. See Appendix B.

3. **Proposed CAPP resolution for a Freshmen Seminar/Retention.** The GEC was asked to review a proposal for implementing a 9-credit freshman colloquium. Concerns were raised with a joint committee made up of CAPP, GEC and CSA members. Representing the GEC were Enomoto, Jarrett, Sumida, and Yamaguchi. The resolution was revised to direct the administration to address technical and administrative barriers to collaborative teaching arrangements for all courses, not only freshmen. The GEC supported this revised resolution.

4. **General Education Course Numbering Schema.** Faculty senates of all UH system campuses were asked to review and endorse a request to have common course numbering for General Education courses. This would facilitate articulation among the system campuses. While the GEC was generally in agreement that all campuses share common numbering, we did raise issues about implementing and deciding when course numbers and/or content were not the same.
Future Activities

Assessment and course review. It had been noted last year that it takes as many as three years to complete a review of courses that carry Diversification designations. This can be problematic if reviews for these courses are to be done routinely on a five year cycle. In addition, it would help to have longer term assessment data for determining how students are faring in our General Education courses. The Assessment Office has begun a longitudinal study of 250 students that will offer useful data to the GEC. Some work has also begun on W-focus and E-focus courses in conjunction with the Assessment Office. The GEC might consider how to proceed with periodic assessments and timely course reviews.

Foundations – Symbolic Reasoning (FS) resolution. As the FS resolution had been passed at the end of this academic year, it would be appropriate to consider its implementation in the coming year. Further, the GEC might need to consider how students are faring in completing their Foundations – Global and Multicultural Perspectives (FG) requirement.

Passing Grades for General Education credit. Consideration might be given to whether the GEC should recommend changes to the passing grades for General Education course credit. This discussion was tabled this current year but may be recalled in 2011-12.

Before concluding this report, I would like to thank the General Education Office staff so capably led by Todd Sammons in his initial year as GEO director and Jim Henry, the new Manoa Writing Program director. Special thanks to Lisa Fujikawa, Jo-Anne Nakamoto, and Elaine Nakao for their dedicated work keeping our boards informed, connected, and productive this academic year. It was truly a privilege to work with all the GEC faculty, staff members, and student representative on improving the general education experience for our UHM students.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernestine Enomoto
GEC chairperson, Fall 2010-Spring 2011