

Minutes of the General Education Committee

Wednesday, February 12, 2014

11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m., Hawai'i Hall 208

Attendees: Ron Cambra (OUE), Pete Garrod, Bob Joseph, Joy Logan, Sarita Rai, Stacey Roberts, Scott Rowland, Amy Schiffner, Elisabeth Seamon (ASUH), Kiana Shiroma, Carolyn Stephenson (SEC)

GEO support staff: Dawne Bost, Lisa Fujikawa

Guests: Monica Stitt-Bergh and Debbie Halbert, Institutional Learning Objectives Implementation Committee (ILOIC)

Excused: Todd Sammons (GEO)

Absent: Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

1. Presentation on Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) – Debbie Halbert & Monica Stitt-Bergh

Presentation:

- Mānoa's undergraduate ILOs were drafted by a committee after wide consultation and subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate. Mānoa is now in the process of implementing the ILOs, and members of the ILOIC are visiting various groups on campus (Deans, Directors, Program Chairs, and others) to "get the word out."
- Debbie stressed that individual programs are not responsible for meeting all the ILOs at the program/department level. When assessing the ILOs, all aspects of a student's education at Mānoa are considered, including program and degree requirements as well as participation in co-curricular activities.
- The new ILOs take into consideration what makes Mānoa unique, what knowledge and skills Mānoa wants students to have when they graduate, and what the new WASC requirements are.
- The ILOs have been mapped to different program and degree requirements, and course proposal sheets now include them.
- Efforts to publicize the ILOs include a website and possible bookmarks or brochures to distribute to students. The ILOIC is also working to have the ILOs appear on the four-year plans.
- The ILOIC is currently planning the assessment piece of the project and hopes to start assessment over the summer.
- The Core Competencies memo that the GEC reviewed earlier this year was written by the ILOIC at the request of Reed Dasenbrock. It was an attempt to help clarify the relationship between the Core Competencies and the ILOs and to show how one maps to the other. There was a question about how quantitative reasoning would be addressed in the revised memo, but Monica explained that it is already covered in the footnote of the existing memo.

Discussion:

- One member questioned why the text below ILO #1 (Know-Breadth and Depth of Knowledge) reads, "Students develop their understanding of the world *with emphasis on Hawaii, Asia, and the Pacific...*" He questioned the emphasis on Hawai'i, Asia, and the Pacific. Debbie explained that the group relied heavily on Mānoa's Strategic Plan when formulating the ILOs, and much of the language came from that document.

- Monica explained that UHM wants students to have a liberal arts education, which is what ILO #1 addresses. The hope is that students will leave Mānoa with a broad understanding of the major areas of study. The question now is what level of experience they should have by the time they graduate.
- Because the current ILO document was approved by the Faculty Senate, it cannot be easily changed. A draft was circulated several years ago, and faculty were asked to give their input. The only notable modification was changing “Institutional Learning Outcomes” to “Institutional Learning Objectives.”
- One big change is that annual program assessment reports will now include a question about how the program’s learning objectives relate to the ILOs. (Previously, programs had simply been asked to state their student learning objectives.) No degree program is expected to cover all of the ILOs.
- The Assessment Office (AO) will work with Assessment Coordinators in the Fall to have learning objectives that are related to the ILOs. The responses culled from the assessment reports will go back to the ILOIC so that they can determine where students have the most (and the least) opportunities to meet the ILOs. Co-curricular programs and special programs will also be asked to complete a survey about how their programs may be meeting ILOs.
- It is also expected that program review will be changed to include the ILOs for the undergraduate degrees, and possibly for graduate degrees as well if those ILOs get approved. (Monica said that draft graduate ILOs are currently moving out of the Graduate Council and are being disseminated to other groups for their input. Graduate program chairs should have already been contacted. Monica will send a copy of the draft to Stacey.)
- Monica feels the ILOs help guide curricular development, especially when otherwise “the sky’s the limit.” Several members questioned this assertion, saying that they would never look at or consider ILOs when developing a new course. They thought the ILOs would not be used as a course development tool, but might be more useful at the program level. However, another member said that as a newer faculty member, she did find the ILOs to be helpful when envisioning a new course.
- Debbie felt strongly that the process should be ground up and not top down. She wants the ILOs to be meaningful for the students and the faculty and not just an exercise in meeting WASC requirements.
- One member asked why the group didn’t just use the Gen Ed requirements for the ILOs. Monica said she had made that proposal, but faculty from other areas not represented by Gen Ed (e.g., co-curricular activities, Study Abroad) also wanted to be included. The result was ILO #3, “Value-Personal and Social Responsibility.”

2. **Minutes** from the November 13, December 4, and January 29 GEC meetings were approved as written.

3. **Course-based O Focus for BUS 345 – Review of additional information**

Background: Stacey contacted the department about the GEC’s concerns after the last meeting. One of the instructors provided additional information for the GEC to review.

Discussion:

- One member reiterated the concern that “participation” was being counted as 18% of the oral component of the course, when part of what constituted “participation” was in fact reading comprehension. In addition, the proposal is a written document which is never orally presented.
- This misinterpretation of what “counts” as being an oral activity may have originated with a CTE workshop where the entire process of developing an oral performance was discussed as being part of the oral component. Even “active listening” in class was considered to be part of the oral component, because “not everyone has the opportunity to speak in every class.” Proposals that have followed such guidelines in the past have not been approved.
- In the case of BUS 345, the instructor is counting multiple choice online quizzes as part of the oral component of the course because the quizzes prepare students for class discussion.
- There was continued concern about having the proposal count toward the oral component of the grade, because students may write well but not be able to present the ideas effectively.

- Some felt that the instructor should be given some leeway because he showed initiative by attending the CTE workshop and following what was conveyed. One member suggested that information be put on the Gen Ed website to try to address the problem of misinterpreting the Hallmarks (e.g., “X counts [toward the oral component of the grade] but Y does not”).
- The GEC reiterated that the focus is on oral production; reading, writing, or simply being present doesn’t count.
- The GEC generally agreed that the proposal did not “count” as an oral activity, which meant that students only had two oral activities. The percentage of the grade that was attributed to the oral component of the course was also a concern, but Lisa said that the lower percentage could be addressed by adding a statement on the syllabus indicating that all oral activities needed to be successfully performed in order to pass the course.*

Decision: The proposal was rejected by a vote of 1-8-0. Stacey will contact the instructor and the department to let them know.

4. **E Focus for Sunny Greer’s AMST 320 (has active H, O, and W Focus)**

Lisa explained that the GEC was being asked to review the E Focus proposal because the instructor has three existing Focus approvals for the course. Approval of the E Focus would mean that the course can be taught with all four Focus areas. Last year, the GEC reviewed and approved the other three Focus areas after some negotiation with the instructor. Addition of the E Focus presumes a change in course content, which could in turn affect fulfillment of the existing three Focus areas.

The GEC tabled a vote on the proposal until the next meeting.

5. **Announcements**

- Information about the **Diversification-Social Sciences (DS) requirement in the UHM Catalog** will be footnoted in the 2014-15 Catalog to reflect the GEC’s decision to allow DS courses from the same department but with different course alphas (e.g., FAMR and FDM) to fulfill the “two courses from two different departments” requirement.
- **Articulation of Hawaii Community College (HawCC) and UH Hilo courses** will now be handled as students from these institutions transfer to Mānoa. Previously, students were automatically given elective credit (versus having their courses reviewed for Mānoa course equivalency) unless the sending campus made an official request to have the course(s) evaluated for articulation purposes. Now students can initiate this articulation process.

6. **The next GEC meeting** will be held on Wednesday, February 26 from 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. in Hawaii Hall 208.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Submitted by Lisa Fujikawa, Recorder

* This information was subsequently found to be incorrect. The statement cannot be used in place of having at least 40% of the grade attributed to the oral component of the course. Instead, the statement is required for O Focus courses that are 4+ credits, where the oral component of the course makes up 30% of the grade.