Each May the chair of the GEC submits an annual report to the Senate Executive Committee. Foundations and Focus Board chairs submit their annual reports to the GEC at the end of April. The annual reports for the last academic year are included here. Earlier reports are at the Gen Ed web site, www.hawaii.edu/genic/gec/annualreports.htm.

**Report Guidelines**

Annual reports that answer these questions can serve as a useful resource for future boards.

1. **Policies and Hallmarks**
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? (Provide the rationale for the revisions.)
   c. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting hallmarks?

2. **Proposal Review**
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?
   b. How many instructors were contacted because their proposal fell short of the Board’s expectations? What was the result of the negotiation (number revised and approved; number denied)?
   c. Changes in procedures: Did the Board establish or change any procedures that may help future Boards keep the business of the board running smoothly? What should future Boards beware of?
   d. Were there any changes to the proposal form (include rationale for the changes)?
3. What is the current status of offerings? (e.g., courses and number offered, number of students enrolled). Contact GEO, gened@hawaii.edu, if you would like to include data.

4. What efforts were made in the area of faculty development? (E.g., describe type of workshops presented, networking/recruitment efforts, summarize the materials posted on GenEd website, system meetings attended).

5. Assessment
   a. Was an end-of-semester survey form used? Were changes made to the form? (list the changes made, if any, and rationale behind the change?). What were the results? (GEO summarizes the survey data)
   b. How effective were the Hallmarks in designating courses that meet the spirit of the Foundations or Focus area?

6. What are the Board’s current concerns and issues?

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
General Education Committee

AY 2011-2012
Submitted by Joseph T. Jarrett, Chair

Membership: Joe Jarrett (Chair), Dore Minatodani (Vice Chair), Fred Birkett, Jim Caron, Sianha Gualano (ASUH), Scott Rowland, Mamoru Sato, Comfort Sumida, Wei Zhang; with ex officio support from Dick Chadwick (SEC liaison), Todd Sammons (GEO), Lisa Fujikawa (GEO), Jo-Anne Nakamoto (GEO), Dawne Bost (GEO), Ron Cambra (OVCAA), Garett Inoue (A&R), and Ryan Yamaguchi (A&R).

1. Course Proposal Review

A. Summary. Each of the following General Education Boards met several times from October 2011 – April 2012, and the following total number of course proposals were reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Board members</th>
<th>Proposals reviewed</th>
<th>Recommended or approved</th>
<th>Pending, withdrawn, or denied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Focus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Focus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Focus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-Focus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with our specific GEC responsibilities, the full GEC reviewed applications for general education foundations, multiple focus, and course-based focus designations, and considered focus exemption requests.

B. Foundations course applications were referred to the Foundations Board for review and the F Board returned recommendations back to the GEC. Two new FG courses were recommended for approval (HAW100 and LING 105, both for FG-B), one new FS course was rejected for a full designation, but was supported for a continuing probationary designation (SOCS 150 for FS, see below), and several courses were recommended for renewal. One course was not recommended for renewal (ANTH 151 for FG-A) due to overemphasis on one specific global region and due to significant variation between multiple course syllabi. The GEC voted on and confirmed all F Board decisions, and decided to approve SOCS 150 for a 2 year probationary approval for the FS designation.

i. Probationary approval for SOCS 150: “Street Science: Evaluating and Applying Evidence in Daily Life.” One particularly challenging course review centered on the application for Foundations-Symbolic Reasoning (FS) designation for SOCS 150. This course was approved for a probationary one-year approval for the 2011-12 academic year. In Fall 2011, a resubmission was rejected by the F Board due to a lack of symbolic content throughout the course. Following joint meetings between the GEC Chair, the F Board, and the SOCS 150 course
directors, a redeveloped course proposal was submitted and reviewed in Spring 2012. The course content had been adjusted to include a significant amount of symbolic reasoning in the form of deductive and inductive logic. However, the F Board felt that the level of the incorporation into most of the course lectures and readings was cursory, and that the homework and exams were not sufficiently rigorous with regards to symbolic reasoning. The course was unanimously rejected for not meeting the FS Hallmarks. However, the F Board voted for an additional one-year probationary approval. The GEC carefully considered the F Board’s recommendations, but decided to grant a two-year probationary FS designation to allow the course directors an additional year to modify the course content and improve the next application. Resubmission is requested in Fall 2013.

C. **Multiple focus designations.** 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.

D. **Course-based focus designations** were reviewed for seventeen courses. In this category, courses with multiple sections and instructors, which, by their content and delivery meet the focus hallmarks, were reviewed and discussed by the GEC. All seventeen courses were subsequently approved.

E. **Focus exemption applications.** The GEC received two applications for exemption from a W-focus requirement from two students that had taken a study-abroad course in Japan with a professor from the University of Illinois. Both requests were approved. In the course of the application process, the question was raised by one of the students as to whether several students in the same course could file a joint application through the GEO. Jarrett decided that the applications should be filed separately, but that any supporting documents such as course syllabi and the mentors letter could be filed once and the GEO staff would make copies for each application.

F. **Diversification designations.** A subcommittee of the GEC (Caron, Sumida, Rowland, Birkett) reviewed requests for a Diversification designation. The decision of the subcommittee stands unless there is significant disagreement among committee members. Of the 37 courses reviewed, 28 were approved for a diversification designation. No issues or disagreements were brought to the full GEC.

2. **Manoa Faculty Senate Charges to the GEC**

In addition to our GEC responsibilities, the SEC asked that we consider the following:

A. **Critical Thinking.** GEC (Sammons, Caron) took the lead to convene a working group (WG) with representatives from CAPP and MAC to consider the development and inclusion of critical thinking skills development in the curriculum. The WG has met 9 times and has examined and discussed the Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) as a vehicle for determining whether critical thinking skills are being taught in selected courses on campus. Susan Hippensteele is taking the lead in coordinating this exam as part of the new course, SOCS 150, which is designed around instruction in critical thinking skills. The WG will monitor these efforts and will issue
recommendations regarding the use of the CAT exam. The WG decided to adopt the definition of critical thinking skills as defined in the CAT exam. The WG also examined undergraduate program SLOs at UHM to determine whether critical thinking skills, as defined by the CAT development team, are already included in the description of some undergraduate degrees. An exhaustive catalog of existing program SLOs was assembled and reviewed, leading to the conclusion that many disciplines are already aware of the importance of critical thinking skills and have incorporated these concepts at the program level. Finally, the WG recommended that the Assessment Office become involved in developing ways to assess critical thinking in GenEd courses and in the various disciplines.

B. Institutional Learning Objectives. A working group headed by CAPP included two members from GEC (Minatodani, Rowland). The working group was charged with drafting Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) in response to a WASC requirement that became apparent during the recent UHM reaccreditation process. The WG discovered that a previous faculty committee convened by the OVCAA had drafted a document titled the Manoa Undergraduate Learning Outcomes (MUGLOs), based largely on the previously published Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) outcomes (see http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm). These became the starting point for the revised draft ILOs. The draft ILOs were then compared to UHM GenEd requirements and program SLOs for twenty representative departments; it was determined that a combination of the GenEd requirements and program SLOs aligned well with the major points of the draft ILOs. Finally, since the UHM strategic plan includes Hawaiian cultural knowledge, a section was added to the draft ILOs to support this institutional goal. One noted deficiency in the UHM curriculum relative to the ILOs is the lack of any uniform requirement for civic engagement or environmental stewardship. The draft ILOs were forwarded to the MFS for further comment and review.

C. High DFWI Courses. Last year, a working group consisting of members from GEC, CAPP, and MAC issued a summary report with suggestions for reducing the high failure rates in specific lower division GenEd courses. This year, a working group was convened led by GEC (Jarrett, Birkett) with additional members from CAPP and MAC, to reexamine this issue and to formulate specific recommendations for ways the campus administration could address the issue. The WG met several times in Spring 2012, and revisited a few of the most problematic departments (Math, Chemistry, Philosophy, Psychology).

The WG determined that Departments have taken significant steps to address student success, particularly in lower division courses that affect large numbers of students. It is expected that those changes alone should have a significant impact on student success. The WG also formulated several recommendations that could be carried out at a campus-wide level. For example, one recommendation was to expand the availability and quality of Student Learning Centers (similar to the Student Success Center, the Learning Assistance Center, and the College of Natural Sciences Student Learning Emporium). In particular, these Centers are able to offer students a convenient place to work through homework with readily available TAs or undergraduate tutors to assist with difficult problems.

Another recommendation was for the implementation of Faculty Academic Development Sabbaticals, in the form of a small number of competitive one-semester teaching buyouts for faculty who wish to devote their efforts to innovative
course design or redesign. The High DFWI WG report was forwarded to the MFS for comment and approval.

3. FS Compliance
A review of banner data by GEO staff indicates that only ~60% of students complete the FS requirement by the end of the 1st year (≥25 credits) and only ~75% by the end of the 2nd year (≥55 credits). There are currently ~1300 students with ≥25 credits that have not completed an FS course (includes recent transfers). The GEC discussed a proposal from the 2010-11 Foundations Board to enforce the FS requirement. A series of email messages were written that remind students of the requirement, with increasing level of sternness progressing from 1st to 4th semester. These email messages were sent to 2745 students in Fall 2011, and 457 students in Spring 2012. We will continue to monitor compliance to see if the reminders are a sufficient incentive to improve the compliance rate. We have also discussed a method for instituting registration holds to enforce compliance; these holds would be applied to students with ≥55 UHM credits that have not completed or are not currently enrolled in an FS course. Tentatively, this may go into effect during the 2012-13 academic year. We recommend that subsequent GECs revisit the issue of FS compliance in order to determine whether email reminders are sufficient and whether registration holds are necessary.

4. Foundations - Symbolic Reasoning (FS) Requirements
In Spring 2011, a Working Group of Foundations Board and GEC members discussed the current FS Hallmarks, and in particular, whether these Hallmarks and current FS courses are in compliance with WASC accreditation standards. WASC requires that all undergraduate 4-year degrees should include core education in “quantitative skills”. It was concluded that the wording of the FS Hallmarks allows a subset of students to avoid quantitative skills by taking logic courses and avoiding math and statistics courses. The WG forwarded a resolution calling for a change in the explanatory notes to the FS Hallmarks, which would require that future FS courses include some instruction in quantitative skills.

The resolution was forwarded as a proposal for review by the Multi-Campus Foundations Board, which includes one member from each of the campuses that are party to the Multi-Campus Articulation Agreement (E5.209). After much discussion, a multi-campus working group was constituted to study the issue.

The final recommendation, approved by the Multi-Campus Foundations Board, was to modify the FS Hallmarks as follows:

1. Hallmark 5 would be changed to read: “include computational and/or quantitative skills.”
2. The first explanatory note under Hallmark 5 would be changed to read: “The course will not focus solely on computational skills, i.e., the application of algorithmic processes leading to determinant answers.”

This recommendation was approved by individual campus representatives, and many of the campuses will update their FS Hallmarks in Fall 2012. At the UHM campus, changes to the Hallmarks that do not make fundamental changes to the GenEd requirements still need to be approved by the GEC. The GEC unanimously approved these changes at the May 2012 meeting.
Alternative, more drastic changes have been discussed within the GEC. One solution discussed at length by the GEC involves splitting FS into two components, Quantitative Skills (FQ) and Logical and Critical Reasoning Skills (FR), with a requirement for 3 credits of each requirement by the end of the 2nd year. An overlapping course approval could be set up in which certain courses could be given simultaneous FQ and FR designation, while other courses such as Statistics or Business Accounting might be given only the FQ designation and non-quantitative courses such as Philosophy might be given only the FR designation. The Multi-Campus Foundations Group noted that other campuses should be involved in developing and approving the hallmarks for any new GenEd requirements, but that they would expect UHM to take the lead in initiating the process.

5. WASC Accreditation and General Education
At several meetings hosted by WASC representatives over the 2011-12 academic year, members of the GEC (Jarrett, Minatodani) and the GEO (Sammons, Fujikawa, Bost) were informed of upcoming changes in the reaccreditation process that will impact General Education at UHM. The current accreditation handbook (WASC Handbook of Accreditation) describes the following core competencies (criteria for review 2.2a):

- college-level written communication
- college-level oral communication
- college-level quantitative skills
- information literacy
- the habit of critical analysis of data and argument

WASC is in the process of redesigning the review process, and has issued a summary of the changes (Commission Resolution Nov 3 2011). A primary change was the requirement that institutions come up with methods for assessing the success in delivering the five core competencies, with an initial request that institutions pick three competencies and design specific quantitative methods for assessing quality and success. Institutions would then be expected to use this data to improve the design of the core courses or the general education curriculum.

These changes could impose a significant burden on the GEO to collect data regarding courses in the GenEd curriculum; for example, to assess student learning of “college-level written communication” through FW and W focus courses. There are currently approximately 100 sections of FW courses and more than 1100 sections of W focus courses in the Fall and Spring semesters combined, and this presents a challenge to simply assemble the data. This assumes, of course, that we can reach a reasonable consensus on what type of data should be collected and how that data will be used.

Currently, WASC has come under significant criticism and resistance from several large California universities. They are further studying the issue, and are requesting additional comment from institutions and other stakeholders. A final decision on accreditation redesign will be issued in November 2012 (redesign February 2012 update).

WASC is also studying a completely different method for assessing educational success through a scheme referred to as the “Degree Qualifications Profile” or DQP. The DQP was developed by 4 national leaders in educational assessment, including AAUP president Carol Geary Schneider. The DQP follows a similar list of outcomes as described in the LEAP report and retained in our own proposed ILOs (see discussion
above). The DQP concept differs dramatically from the current scheme in three major ways:

1. Institutions would define the essential learning outcomes for each program in five broad categories:
   1) Intellectual Skills  (our current Foundations and Focus)
   2) Broad Integrative Knowledge (our current Diversification)
   3) Specialized Knowledge (major)
   4) Applied Learning (major)
   5) Civic Learning (we currently don’t do this in GenEd or in most majors)

2. Each program would define the different expectation for knowledge, skill set, and abilities for Associate, Bachelor’s, and Master’s Degrees.

3. The outcomes are defined as a series of competency statements that can be directly assessed by the program. For example, “Constructs sustained, coherent argument or presentation on technical issues...” for oral competency.

The University of Hawai‘i system has been volunteered by the system-wide administration to be a test site for this new approach to learning outcomes and assessment. We would be expected to develop a plan to work within the DQP system in parallel to the existing WASC system.

However, in informational meetings with faculty from several UH campuses, it was clear that there is a lot of resistance to the DQP plan as it is currently written. In particular, many faculty found the language of the competency statements to be too prescriptive, as if a student should be able to check off a list of skills and competencies to be awarded a bachelor’s degree, and that programs and courses should also be designed around the same list of skills and competencies. WASC representatives seemed to back away from the idea of immediate implementation, and are now conducting workshops to try to understand whether this “framework” is useful as a mode for educational assessment. I expect that this issue will continue to circulate and some form of this will eventually find its way into the WASC accreditation language.

6. Future Issues

A. Symbolic Reasoning and the FS requirement. Many faculty members would agree that, for the majority of our students, math skills are dismal when they enter UHM and do not get significantly better after 4-6 years of college education. There are undoubtedly a number of potential causes, including lax admission standards for entering freshmen, community college transfer students who don’t meet minimum admission standards, avoidance of the FS requirement until sophomore, or sometimes even junior year, and the fact that some FS courses do not teach quantitative mathematical skills. I will recommend to the incoming SEC that this issue be studied by an MFS working group next year with the goal of providing specific recommendations for changes in admissions policy and/or changes in the core GenEd requirements. The overriding goal should be providing students with the knowledge and skills they will need to be productive in a highly technological world.

B. It has come to the attention of the GEC that W focus courses do not have a minimum amount that the W material must count towards the final grade. In a few recent proposals, course syllabi seemed to indicate that the W material was worth <5% of the final grade. This is allowed as long as the syllabus includes a statement indicating that all W assignments must be completed in order to receive a passing
grade in the course. In a few recent proposals, course syllabi seemed to indicate that the W material was worth less than 5% of the total grade. Many members of the GEC viewed this as conflicting with the original intent of the focus requirements. The GEC should consider establishing a minimum for the extent to which the W material counts towards the final grade. If the focus application handouts suggest that the W material should be at least 40% of the final grade for a 3-credit course, then a minimum of 20% would seem very reasonable. There should be no exemption simply for adding a statement to the syllabus.
Foundations Board

AY 2011-2012
Submitted by James Bayman, Co-Chair

Committee members:
James Bayman
Debra Drexler
Gay Reed
Erik Guentner, Co-Chair
Amy Schafer
Leilani Takeuchi
Scott Rowland, GEC Liaison

During the 2011-2012 Academic year the Foundations Board focused on two main activities: 1) reviewing new course proposals for the FS designation, and 2) evaluating several course renewal applications.

**New Course Proposals Approved**
The Foundations Board reviewed and approved new course proposals for HAW 100 FG-B and LING 105 FG-B.

**New Course Proposal Not Approved**
The Foundations Board continued its evaluation of one new course proposal, SOCS 150 for the FS designation. The original proposal was first received in Spring 20011. The majority of the Foundations Board members voted against a 5-year approval of the SOCS 150 course. In a follow-up vote, the majority of the Foundations Board members voted to grant a probationary renewal of one year for the FS designation for the SOCS 150 course. A memorandum outlined the limitations of the course with respect to the Foundations Hallmarks. In a third vote, after meeting with the GEC chair, the majority of the Foundations Board members reaffirmed their view that the SOCS 150 course proposal should be granted a one year probationary renewal.

**Five-Year Designation Renewals**
The Foundations Board approved all but two course renewal applications for the standard duration of 5-years. Final decisions for two courses, i.e., ANTH 151 and ANTH 152, are still forthcoming.

**Ongoing Issues**
The interpretation of Hallmarks is an ongoing topic of discussion when course renewals and new course proposals are considered. The board found the Hallmarks to be a useful guide for evaluating new course proposals and five-year designation renewals.

8/16/2012
Contemporary Ethical Issues Board

AY 2011-2012
Submitted by Helen Baroni, Chair

Board members: Helen Baroni (Chair), Ned Bertz, Vickery Lebbin, Njoroge Njoroge, Nori Tarui, Fred Birkett (GEC liaison), Todd Sammons (GEO), Jo-Anne Nakamoto (GEO)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. The Board decided not to alter the proposal application this year.
   b. The Board noted an improvement in the quality of applications this year, especially in the Spring, thus requiring less negotiation. We conjecture that this is the combined effect of revisions made to the application form in earlier years and the new workshop series undertaken in the Fall (discussed below).
   c. The Board moved toward greater flexibility in interpreting the information provided on application forms, provided that the class clearly met the hallmarks and the faculty member provided all the necessary information somewhere in the application. In several cases, we noted that faculty did not put in the information in the correct places on the form. We decided to approve such applications and then contacted the faculty member with suggestions for improving future applications and renewals. Data is included below.

2. Proposal Review
   a. In F2011, the E Board reviewed 36 proposals. All others were eventually approved.
   b. Board members negotiated with 14 instructors for additional information.
   c. Board members contacted 5 instructors after approval with information to improve future applications and renewals.
   d. In S2012, the E Board reviewed 38 proposals. All others were eventually approved.
   e. Board members negotiated with 2 instructors for additional information.
   f. Board members contacted 4 instructors after approval with information to improve future applications and renewals.

3. Current Status of Offerings
   The General Education Office has this information.

4. Faculty Development
   a. In Fall 2011, the E Board helped to organize a faculty development workshop, put on by the General Education Office in conjunction with the Center for Teaching Excellence, held on October 10, 2011. The workshop, entitled “Would Your Course Draw More Interest If It Took an Ethical Approach” drew a good response and was well received.
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b. In Spring 2012, the E Board participated in a faculty development workshop, put on by the General Education Office in conjunction with the Center for Teaching Excellence, held on January 27, 2012. The workshop was entitled “Can My Class Earn a Focus Designation?”

5. Assessment
In Fall, Monica Stitt-Bergh and Marlene Lowe from the Assessment Office presented the findings from the Spring 2011 assessment of E Focus classes. The Board then participated in a brainstorming meeting to come up with ways to respond to the troubling results. At our final meeting, we developed a plan for implementation next academic year: The E Board will invite several faculty who have experience teaching E classes to create a set of signature assignments and best practices for inclusion on the website. We put together a list of ten faculty to invite.

6. Current Issues and Goals
   a. Continue with response to assessment data.
   b. Continue with efforts for faculty development workshops. It may be possible for the Board to create a list of instructors who have submitted exemplary application as a resource for future workshops and new examples for the website.
   c. Attach the rubric to the application form so that faculty can use it in planning their assignments.
Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Focus Board

AY 2011-2012
Submitted by Kalei Kanuha, Chair

Committee Members:
Kalei Kanuha (Chair), Lilinoe Andrews, Peter Mataira, Anne Misawa, Yuko Otsuka

Staff: Elaine Nakao, Todd Sammons

Policies and Hallmarks:
A. Policy Decisions
The HAP Board made no major policy decisions. However we began a lively and stimulating discussion about defining “native” and “indigenous” in the context of the “voice” requirement in the Hallmarks.

B. Hallmark Actions
The HAP Board made no recommendations, changes or deletions to the existing HAP hallmarks.

General Education and Center for Teaching Excellence Workshop Sponsorship and Participation:
Fall ’12 “Develop Courses that Honor & Engage Hawaiian, Asian, or Pacific Issues”
Lonnie Carlile (Asian Studies) and Ty Tengen (Anthropology)

Spring ’12 “Can My Course Earn a Focus Designation?”
Kalei Kanuha (Sociology)

Proposal Review and Procedural Matters:
A. Proposal Review
The HAP Board reviewed 23 proposals this year, all of which were approved and granted HAP focus designation except one that was withdrawn (list of proposals is attached). Instructors who submitted proposals were contacted with specific feedback to strengthen their applications. The majority responded favorably to feedback, re-submitted their proposals and were approved.

B. Changes in procedures
None.

Current and Ongoing Concerns and Issues:
One of the ongoing concerns over the year has been the lack of timely review of HAP proposals. We had a number of situations in which the HAP Board’s review and approval process was “down to the wire” in terms of making a determination by the beginning of
the UHM class registration period. We need to improve upon the HAP Board’s attention to the reviews in order to assure that instructors who take the time to meet the deadline for submission are respected by the HAP Board’s timely review and feedback process.

**Future Priorities and Goals:**

1. Continue participating in campus-wide HAP workshops in conjunction with other Focus boards.
2. Anne will be on sabbatical for Fall 2012 and has recruited Lisette Flanary at ACM to take her place for a two-year term. When Anne completes her sabbatical, she will decide whether or not recommit for her term.
3. Kalei’s term is up in June 2012 but has volunteered to stay on the HAP Board as a member.
4. Yuko has volunteered to serve as incoming Chair starting in Fall 2012.

---

**Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Proposals**

**Fall 2010 and Spring 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SUB/CRSE/SEC</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-26-11</td>
<td>PACE 485</td>
<td>Kuhio Vogler</td>
<td>Topics in Peace &amp; Conflict Resol.: Protest Under Occupation</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-02-11</td>
<td>MUS270 (001)</td>
<td>Heather Strohschein</td>
<td>World Of Music: Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-25-11</td>
<td>HIST 495D (001)</td>
<td>David Hanlon</td>
<td>History in Oceania</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-16-11</td>
<td>AMST 220(001)</td>
<td>Brandy Nalani McDougall</td>
<td>Introduction to Indigenous Studies</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-16-11</td>
<td>BOTANY 446 (001)</td>
<td>Alvin Keali'i Chock</td>
<td>Hawaiian Ethnobotany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-16-11</td>
<td>ENG 370 (001)/ ES 370 (001)</td>
<td>Ku'ualoha Ho'omanawanui</td>
<td>Ethnic Literatures of Hawaii</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-16-11</td>
<td>HWST 270 (001)</td>
<td>Lilikala Kame'elehioiwa</td>
<td>Hawaiian Mythology</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-16-11</td>
<td>POLS 301 (001)</td>
<td>Joseph Salazar</td>
<td>Hawai'i Politics</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13-11</td>
<td>ANTH 350</td>
<td>Guido Pigliasco</td>
<td>Pacific Island Culture</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Proposals
### Summer and Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SUB/CRSE/SEC</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/28/11</td>
<td>NURS 452 (001) TEAM w-Rogers SS12</td>
<td>Joyce Vogler</td>
<td>Cultural Aspects of Health Management in Indigenous Populations</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/11</td>
<td>NURS 452 (001) TEAM SS12</td>
<td>Lynell Rogers</td>
<td>Cultural Aspects of Health Management in Indigenous Populations</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/12</td>
<td>WS 360 (001) / ES 365 (001) SS12</td>
<td>Penny-Be K. Bovard</td>
<td>Pacific and Asian Women</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/12</td>
<td>AMST-201 SS12</td>
<td>Erline-Sunny Greer</td>
<td>Institutions &amp; Movements “Native Perspectives on American Empire”</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/12</td>
<td>POLS 302 SS12</td>
<td>Willy Daniel Kaipo Kauai</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Politics</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/12</td>
<td>ITE 360(001) SS12</td>
<td>Kani Blackwell</td>
<td>Introduction to Multicultural Education</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/12</td>
<td>ITE 360 STUDY ABROAD SS12</td>
<td>Jose A. Torralba</td>
<td>Introduction to Multicultural Education</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/12</td>
<td>SLS430 (001) SS12</td>
<td>Kent Sakoda</td>
<td>Pidgin and Creole English in Hawaii</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/12</td>
<td>MUS457(001) F12</td>
<td>Chet-Yeng Loong</td>
<td>Asian and Pacific in Education</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/12</td>
<td>ES 101(005) TEAM F12</td>
<td>Monisha Das Gupta</td>
<td>Introduction to Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/12</td>
<td>ES 101(005) Not Tchng in F12</td>
<td>Ty Tengan</td>
<td>Introduction to Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10/12</td>
<td>ES101(005) TEAM F12</td>
<td>Willy Daniel Kaipo Kauai</td>
<td>Introduction to Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/14/12</td>
<td>WS 151 (001-004)</td>
<td>Penny-Be Bovard</td>
<td>Introduction to Women’s Studies</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/12</td>
<td>NURS 452 (001-009)</td>
<td>Joyce Vogler</td>
<td>Cultural Aspects of Health Management in Populations indigenous to HI, Pac, Asia</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/12</td>
<td>SAM 227 (001)</td>
<td>Manumaua Simanu-Klutz</td>
<td>Overview of Samoan Literature in English</td>
<td>Appr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oral Communication Focus Board

AY 2011-2012
Submitted by Kate Lee

Board members for 2011-2012
Kate Lee (Chair), Christine Beaule (Vice Chair), Joel Moffett, Tom Pearson, Jan Sung, Comfort Sumida (GEC Liaison), Elaine Nakao (Recorder, Assistance from GEO)

Policies
Beyond its routine duties, the Oral Communication Focus Board (henceforth, O Board) made a new focus form that is similar to the W Board’s chart. The new chart went into effect for the Summer and Fall 2012 proposals.

Networking effort
The O Board continued to network with departments/schools that did not offer any/enough O focus courses for their majors. Each O Board member contacted the assigned Focus coordinator, Chair and/or Dean of the Departments and Schools to request more O focus courses in their departments/schools. Fall 2011, the Department of Art, Biology, and Civil &Environmental Engineering and the School of Nursing and Travel Industry Management (TIM) were contacted. As a result, more proposals for O focus classes have been submitted compared to the last academic year.

Assessment
O Board has been working with the Assessment Office to create direct and indirect assessment of the oral communication learning outcomes. Fall 2011, Monica Stitt-Bergh and Marlene Lowe from the Assessment Office gave a presentation about their current assessment items and findings related to oral communication learning outcomes. O Board created some survey questions with Monica Stitt-Bergh Spring 2012 and the finalized items will be added to the surveys that are part of the longitudinal study of General Education Learning.

Proposal review
The Board reviewed O focus proposals via Laulima and had a monthly meeting. If there is any question/concern regarding a proposal, members posted comments or questions on Laulima and one member contacted the person who submitted the proposal for more information or suggestion. All other unresolved issues were discussed at meetings if necessary.

Spring 2012 - 37
Summer 2012 - 11
Fall 2012 - 39

8/16/2012
Workshop presented

“Animate Your Classroom with Oral Communication Coursework & Curricula!”
Monday, October 17, 2011, Kuykendall 106
Panelists: Jayson Dibble (Communicology), Joel Moffett (Academy for Creative Media), Christine Yano (Anthropology)

“Can My Course Earn a Focus Designation?”
Friday, January 27, 2012, Kuykendall 106
Panelists: Todd Sammons (W focus), Kate Lee (O focus), Nori Tarui (E focus), Kalei Kanuha (H focus)
Writing Focus Board

AY 2011-2012
Submitted by Todd Sammons, Acting Chair (Jim Henry was on sabbatical leave)

The W Board is appointed by the UHM Faculty Senate in accord with Senate by-laws. This year's committee members were:

Virginia Bennett  Languages & Lit. of Europe & the Americas
Dave Bess  Management & Industrial Relations
Mike DeMattos  Social Work
Daphne Desser  English (ex-officio)
Kenton Harsch  English Language Institute (ex-officio)
Michiko Bigus (F11)/Rayna Isaki (S12)  Manoa Advising Center
Brad Nakamura  Psychology
Todd Sammons (chair)  Mānoa Writing Program (ex-officio)
Mamoru Sato  General Education Committee (ex-officio)
Tamara Ticktin  Botany
Jang Hyun Kim (F11)/Robert Tokunaga (S12)  Communicology
Dawne Bost  GenEd Office/Mānoa Writing Prog. (recorder)
Lisa Fujikawa  GenEd Office/Mānoa Writing Prog. (recorder)

The full Board met approximately every third week during both the fall and spring semesters. Much of the Board's deliberations revolved around faculty proposals for new W courses and for renewals of existing W designations; as part of this process, several course-based proposals were recommended to the GEC for acceptance.

In the course of its meetings and discussions with course proposers, the Board

- Reviewed 284 new and renewal proposals.

- Participated in two workshops in collaboration with the UH-Mānoa Center for Teaching Excellence. In the fall, the workshop focused on how adding a writing-intensive (W) Focus designation to a new or existing course benefits teachers professionally. In the spring, the workshop allowed anyone interested in proposing a W Focus course to get help from a W Focus Board member.

- Continued efforts to improve the Mānoa Writing Program web site. Proposed by Jim Henry and designed by Ryan Bungard from the Vice Chancellor's office, who used the web tool Drupal, the new site—which will be much easier for users to navigate than the old site—includes the major categories of Home, Faculty, Students, (Inter)National, and Resources, with a projected section of...
Community to be developed in 2012-13. Over the summer, much of the content was migrated from the old to the new site by the GEO/MWP student assistant Cheri Kau. After we had to wait for the campus’s ITS department to upgrade to the version of Drupal that Ryan used, the new site will have a “soft” launch after this report is filed, probably to people teaching W Focus courses this coming fall semester. Once we deal with the inevitable bugs revealed by this soft launch, we will have a “hard” launch toward the beginning of the next academic year, where the web site will be promulgated to the whole campus. Next on the agenda: developing a file management system accessible through the site for new Focus course proposals (E, O, and H as well as W).

- Began discussion of what we called “Exemplary Writing-Intensive Instructor Certification.” The idea was to recognize those UHM faculty who have taught large numbers of courses as writing intensive by granting them fast-tracking through the proposal process. Subsidiary ideas: to gain good will for the MWP and to save faculty, W Focus Board members, and the MWP staff some work. After much discussion, the idea was tabled until the next academic year. Not tabled was the idea of simply recognizing faculty who had demonstrated commitment to the program via some sort of ceremony at the beginning of the academic year.

- Began discussion of what turned out to be a somewhat vexed question that still needs to be resolved: should we standardize what we require as part of our three different types of proposals? Right now, we require a chart only for new proposals; a syllabus and a chart for renewal proposals; and a syllabus for staff proposals. Part of our difficulties with this issue was the fact that we could not find a day/time during either the fall or spring semesters when all members of the W Board could meet. We have scheduled the last meeting of the spring for a day/time during finals when we hope to have everyone present so that we can finally resolve this issue.

- Recommended to the GEC that the out-of-date language concerning the constitution of the W Focus Board membership be changed as follows: from “1 faculty member from Arts & Sciences Student Academic Services” to “1 faculty member from any of UHM’s advising offices” (see p. 5-4 in the General Education Policies and Practices Handbook). The current language is out of date because it was written when virtually all advising was done out of Arts & Sciences. This is no longer the case. This change just formalizes current practice: both of the last two people in this slot came from the Mānoa Advising Center; their immediate predecessor was from Student Athlete Academic Services.

- Supported the work of the campus Assessment Office on a project that looks at the writing proficiency of students in upper-division Natural Sciences and Social Sciences W Focus courses. Collection of writing samples is scheduled for this April and May.

- Saw 1,338 W (Writing-intensive) classes in 96 subjects offered by the UHM faculty during F11-SS12.