Committee on Educational Effectiveness
Meeting Minutes

MEETING DATE   January 25, 2022
MEETING TIME   1:30 PM - 2:30 PM
LOCATION   Zoom

Attendance

Members

Name	Role	Attendance
Justin Walguarnery	Chair	Present
Gerald Busch	Vice-Chair	Present
Jessica Gasiorek	Secretary	Present
Lori Andersen	Senator	Excused
Oceana Francis	Senator	Present
Aimee Chung	Member	Present
George Harrison	Member	Present
Lorenzo Perillo	Member	Absent
Alice Tse	Member	Excused
Monica Stitt-Bergh	Non-voting ACSC	Present
Logan Dean	Non-voting GSO Rep	Present
Shana Brown	Non-voting SEC liaison	Present

Guests

Name	Role	Time
none		

Subject	Discussion/Information	Action / Strategy / Responsible Person
Call to Order	1. The minutes of the 11/24/2021 CEE Committee were circulated electronically.	The meeting was called to order by Chair Justin at 1:34PM.
Review of Minutes	1. Reviewed.	1. Justin made a motion to approve the 11/24/2021 meeting minutes; Seconded by George. The minutes were approved, 5 in favor; 0 abstention.
Chair's Report	1. None.	1. NA
Action Items	1. None	1. NA
Guest(s)	1. None	1. NA
Committee Reports	1. None	1. NA
Unfinished Business	1. CEE review of Gen Ed redesign for assessment implications. February 15 as deadline for feedback to CAP from all committees reviewing. Question about the format and content of what needs to be submitted. Shana explains that any comments submitted will become part of public record; there is no set format. Justin recaps main points of new structure, including open questions about details related to assessment, shift to "touchpoints", integration across programs (to allow classes to count), and across campuses. Justin notes potential challenges for a system-wide assessment committee; this is something that needs more thought and development. Monica questions why there might be a system-level committee when there is potentially very little in common in students' experiences across campuses (due to variability inherent in the flexibility this program is supposed to allow). Justin suggests that a system-level committee might function as a sort of "clearing house" of assessment options or tools. KHUA as new cross-listing alpha to make transfers across campuses easier (for existing classes, rather than for new classes). Each campus can choose which courses slot into given KHUA designations. Jessica asks about the number of areas in the new proposal -- with 16 areas, issues with assessment (not sufficient resources to be able to assess all these in any kind of depth, or with rigor). Monica also notes that some KHUA courses have 7 capacities in a single course. Justin suggests that capacities could be grouped together; George notes that this is practical but has	1. Justin will create and circulate a Google document for CEE's response.

drawbacks. Question of whether grouping would change what has to be assessed. Response: yes, e.g., could Asia/Pacific be intercultural perspectives? Could teamwork be combined with oral communication?

- "Capacity" vs "Competency" – why use one over the other? Response: assessment details were not included because expertise was not present during the design meetings.
- Why 16? These were the ones presented during the summer institute and the design group felt they were all important and included them all.
- "Competency" typically means students can satisfy the requirements by demonstrating competency instead of being required to complete seat time.
- Many of these 16 are 'values' in nature
- Concern over feasibility of students to demonstrate their competency and how teachers can address all of these. Suggestion to have 7 total.
- Packaging will not be welcomed by faculty groups
- If systemwide, the definition in the document provides guidance which is helpful, but lets each campus do their own mapping to their courses and campuses will decide HOW assessment will occur on their campus/in their courses.
- Provide examples of assessment occurs for different types of courses and class sizes–that would be helpful
- Remember: for students, they just pass courses that touch upon the required capacities. At the school level/program level, it's looking at groups of students and how they perform on each capacity.
- Currently, at UHM, programs do not evaluate GE outcomes. GE outcomes are evaluated as part of GE evaluation
- Adding the capacities to the course–faculty need help doing this and then communicating regularly to faculty what capacities are in their course over time is needed (and will take resources and time)
- Feasibility given the number and flexibility appears to be a very large concern
- A challenge is connecting the outcomes to the existing course outcomes
- "Touched upon" is not difficult to do with 4 capacities; but there is no explicit learning assessment on each of these; students are likely not aware that these are an integral course element
- "Touchpoint" sends the message that the capacities are lightly covered instead of moving the needle on student learning. Exposure vs Assessment. Exposure vs. Intentional learning.
- Format: CAPP has a Google Form that CEE will use to submit our feedback.
  - Overall better or worse?

	○ General comments ○ And more.	
New Business	1. None	1. NA
Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm. The next meeting will be Tuesday, February 22, 2022, 1:30 PM. https://hawaii.zoom.us/j/96916946404 (Passcode: 4812)	Justin made a motion to adjourn; seconded by George. Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Jessica Gasiorek, Secretary
Approved unanimously on February 22, 2022.