

# 9

## ANNUAL REPORTS

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/gened/gec/annualreports.htm](http://www.hawaii.edu/gened/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  - a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?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](mailto: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 2007-2008

Submitted by Jane Schoonmaker, Chair

Committee members:

Mike Kirk-Kuwaye (V. Chair)

John Engel

Lynne Higa

Susan Johnson

Michael Nassir

Carolyn Stephenson

George Wong

The following is a list of accomplishments, decisions made, and issues addressed.

- A. The following modifications to the *UH Mānoa General Education Requirements* document were presented to the Faculty Senate for action and were passed on September 19, 2007:
- Modification to the section related to Hawaiian and Second Language requirements
  - Clarification of the language regarding student representation on the GEC and boards
  - Deletion of the section on GEC involvement in faculty mentoring
  - Clarification that college and major requirements do not fall under the purview of GEC

Note: These modifications were drafted last academic year by the GEC.

- B. The GEC provided feedback to the SEC on the assessment instrument *Collegiate Learning Assessment*.
- C. A deadline policy was established for changes to Focus section designations after the *Schedule of Classes* had been printed.
- D. The GEC participated in ongoing discussions of Gen Ed assessment. An “assessment preamble” was developed in consultation with the boards and was passed on to the SEC and OVCAA for their approval/information. Student Learning Outcomes for the Foundations, Oral Communication, and Contemporary Ethical Issues areas were developed at a fall assessment workshop, reviewed by the GEC, and sent to the appropriate boards for input. Some Boards are piloting aspects of their assessment plans and rubrics, but all will need support from the UHM Assessment Office to fully implement their plans.
- E. Representatives of the GEC met with WASC Special Visit team member Scott Evenbeck. Discussion focused on mapping of Gen Ed requirements to WASC Core Competencies. The OVCAA was subsequently asked for clarification of the core competency “college level quantitative skills.” To date, no clarification has been received.
- F. Representatives of the GEC met with Chancellor Hinshaw to explain the Gen Ed Program. It was noted that overlap of Gen Ed and college or major requirements can be a source of confusion for students. Subsequent discussions were held to outline

possible means of clarification. The UHM advisors working with the Ka'ie'ie degree pathway program are creating program advising sheets in which Gen Ed requirements are separated from degree and major requirements.

- G. The GEC discussed implementation of Gen Ed language that states that students should complete their Foundation requirements in their freshman year. The GEC decided to focus initial efforts on the FW requirement. A faculty committee was formed and a proposal developed to 1) eliminate the current backlog of students who have not completed their FW requirement, 2) ensure sufficient seats in FW classes for all incoming freshmen, and 3) establish the FW course as an integral part of the freshman experience. OVCAA approved funding for the first year of the proposal. The success of the first year will be assessed and reported to the GEC and OVCAA next year. The committee will continue to seek funding for the remaining aspects of the proposal which include a comprehensive mentoring program for freshmen and transformation of FW courses into freshmen-only courses.
- H. The GEC consulted with the OVCAA on ongoing academic advising initiatives.
- I. Difficulties in classification of courses into the A, H, and L Diversification categories prompted GEC consideration of possible changes, including merger, to the three categories. It was decided that the categories should remain as currently defined.
- J. New Foundations Course: WS 176 (FG-B)
- K. Renewals of Foundations and Diversification Courses

#### Foundations Renewals

- HIST 161A (FG)
- HIST 162A (FG)
- MATH 215/215A (FS)
- MATH 241/251A (FS)
- AMST 150 (FG-B)

#### Diversification Renewals

- F07 - Diversification subcommittee reviewed 398 courses in Natural Sciences, Nursing, SOEST, and TAHR.
- S08 – Diversification subcommittee reviewed 440 courses in Social Sciences, Shidler, and campus-wide.

- L. The GEC reviewed the TIM proposal for the TIM in Singapore Plan. GEC raised concerns having to do with general education needs of the students transferring into the program and with the teaching of focus classes. Representatives of the GEC met with Dean Walter Jamieson and Jennifer Weinman to discuss these concerns and suggested consideration of the Ka'ie'ie model for completion of some general education requirements through courses offered by UH community colleges. In light of the subsequent TIM commitments, GEC recommended approval of the TIM proposal.

---

## Foundations Board

---

AY 2007-2008

Submitted by Stephen Canham, Chair

Committee members:

Henri Casanova	Jim Tiles
Liam Kelley	Deborah Waite
Leilani Takeuchi	Lyndon Wester

### 1. Policies

During Fall 07 the UHM Foundations Board was engaged with the campus-wide imperative for General Education Course Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes in preparation for WASC review. The Board drafted an unsolicited general preamble concerning assessment procedures, issues and safeguards and forwarded it to the GEC for review. This proposal was modified by the GEC and returned to the F Board for approval, which the F Board did, and returned it to the GEC in February 08. It is the Board's understanding that this preamble will be a standing document agreed upon by all parties engaged in the process of course assessment at UHM. See Appendix 1.

In March the Board approved the GEC's emergency proposal for a one-time FW equivalence to clear the backlog of students waiting to fulfill the FW requirement. The Board noted three concerns regarding the equivalence:

1. It must be a one-time emergency action, not a convenient fall-back solution to a systemic problem.
2. The Chancellor must provide adequate funding for instructional staff and program development in order to prevent the backlog from recurring.
3. The situation suggests a need or offers an opportunity for an overall review of first-year requirements, procedures, and curricular offerings.

The Board also clarified language on its request forms for new courses and renewals, especially in terms of electronic submission and length of documents.

### 2. New Course Proposals

The Board received only one request for a new Foundations designation: WS 176 (FGB), History of Gender, Sex, and Sexuality in Global Perspective 1500 CE to Present. The Board accepted the proposal, but with concern that "multiple perspectives" be applied, per the Hallmarks and Notes.

### 3. Course Designation Removals

ECON 301 & 301A: FS designations were removed, per the department's request.

#### 4. Five-Year Designation Renewals

FG: AMST 150 (FGB), with concern that “multiple perspectives” be applied, per the Hallmarks and Notes  
HIST 155 (FGC from FGB), pending as of this writing.  
HIST 161 (FGA) & 162 (FGB )

FS: MATH 215, 241-251A  
NREM 203

#### 5. Multi-campus Foundations Board

The multi-campus 07-08 Foundations Board was composed of representatives from UH Mānoa, Honolulu Community College, Kapi’olani Community College, Leeward Community College, and Windward Community College. In Fall, it considered Maui Community College’s request to join the multi-campus agreement, and after on-line discussion and revision by MCC, the proposal was accepted in January. In Fall the Board also discussed problems of articulation, particularly that of HCC’s Math 135 with UHM Math 100.

At its Spring meeting on April 8, the Board reviewed each campus’ annual Foundations Report, received a preliminary proposal from West Oahu to join the multi-campus agreement, and discussed the Math 135 articulation issue. The Board agreed that the Math 135 issue should be reviewed at some level at UHM and asked the General Education Office for advice in finding the appropriate body to do so.

#### 6. Ongoing Concerns and Issues

The UHM F Board is concerned about the backlog of FW students identified by the GEC in its equivalency proposal of March 2008. It recognizes the GEC’s review of first-year students’ “experiences” and looks forward to possibilities for improvement.

Articulation issues among UH campuses remain troubling, whether a campus is or is not a member of the multi-campus agreement. It is in the best interests of all concerned, and especially the students, that equivalences be streamlined without undermining the professional integrity of courses at either end of the process. If the University of California system can do it, surely we can.

Finally, a thought from the Chair. For continuity and efficiency, the Foundations Board Chair should serve a two-year term, rather than a one-year term. The learning curve is too steep and annual new Chairs must reinvent too many wheels to get up to speed. But a two-year sentence to the Chair should be accompanied by formal release time of one course per year to compensate. Tom Hilgers once mentioned to me that the original GEC curricular revision stipulated release time for a *one-year* F Board Chair, but this has never been supported by the administration. It should be. I suggest that the two-year term for UHM F Board Chairs begin in Fall 09 and that the 08-09 F Board make this an early priority next year.

Appendix 1. GEC Assessment Preamble as approved by the F Board 2/15/08

**Assessment of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa's General Education Program:  
A Preamble (Second Version February 13, 2008)**

The primary goal of General Education assessment is to improve student learning. Effective assessment can provide useful feedback on student performance as it relates to General Education's goals. Successful academic assessments typically involve identifying appropriate student learning outcomes and/or objectives; collecting evidence (e.g., samples of student work); evaluating and interpreting evidence; and using results to guide student-learning initiatives (e.g., initiatives to improve the quality of what is taught and how it is taught; initiatives to improve the effectiveness of assignments). To be effective, student-learning assessment requires extensive faculty involvement in all of assessment's phases, including use of results. Thus, at UHM, assessment of the General Education Program will be faculty initiated, driven, and supervised.

A. Assessment of the General Education Program will be used to determine the institutional effectiveness of the Program and, more importantly, to guide efforts to improve student learning through that Program. Assessments of General Education will not be used to evaluate the performance of an individual student, faculty member, department, or instructional unit.

B. In order to interpret and use assessment results, the educational circumstances of students involved with the assessment research often need to be known. At the same time, it is absolutely necessary for educational assessment to be conducted with scrupulous attention to the confidential use of collected evidence. At UHM, all personal identifying information will be removed before any evaluation of evidence. All reports of results will scrupulously maintain the confidentiality of the individuals involved.

C. Faculty members from departments that offer General Education courses will be engaged at all stages of General Education assessments. Faculty members will

- a. participate in the development of both student learning outcomes and assessment rubrics;
- b. assist with the selection and development of methods to gather evidence of student learning;
- c. contribute to the interpretation of the data that are collected; and
- d. participate in using the results to improve the quality of the General Education program.

D. Courses in different departments may share the same General Education outcomes. However, the assessment methods or rubrics used to analyze evidence may vary because of differences in the methods and structures of individual courses. Faculty members will work to ensure that the assignments and questions used in such assessments are tailored to specific course content, especially when they are integrated into courses or final exams.

E. The desired outcomes of the General Education Program include developing an appreciation of the complexities and potentialities of human experience and encouraging an understanding of imagination and creativity. Assessment goals and procedures may be developed to find out how well the General Education Program achieves these less tangible outcomes.

---

## Contemporary Ethical Issues Board

---

AY 2007-2008

Submitted by Roger Babcock, Chair

The Board members included Roger Babcock (Chair), Dian Dooley, Zoe Hammatt, Jonathan Okamura, and John Zuern. Carolyn Stephenson served as GEC liaison.

The CEI Board reviewed 66 course proposals and had discussions regarding the intent of the E focus hallmarks and how to clarify proposal requirements so as to improve quality and reduce requests for clarification. The Board also held a workshop to help instructors meet proposal requirements, at the beginning of the Spring 2008 semester.

As my third year on the Board concludes and after serving as Chair all three years, it is with pleasure that I submit this final report and turn the reins over to someone else. I have truly enjoyed working with all my faculty colleagues on this Board and with the helpful, friendly, and capable staff at the Gen Ed office. I especially note the highly capable Elaine Nakao; thanks for putting up with me and us!

### Policies and Hallmarks

The CEI Board had changed the proposal questions two years ago in order to clarify the requirements for successfully obtaining an E designation and began requiring all proposals to include a syllabus. This was a somewhat controversial issue. In addition to the syllabus requirement, some instructors have said that the Board interpretation of the Hallmarks may be too prescriptive. Based on these concerns, some minor changes were made to the proposal application form. We will now allow a "detailed course description" for new courses that do not already have a syllabus. For renewals, an actual syllabus is still required. In addition, we changed the wording in question #3 to remove the perceived idea that a specific "framework" must be identified. We hope these changes will result in less confusion and less requests for additional information next year.

This year there remained quite a few proposals (38%) that had to be returned to the applicants for revisions. The reasons for this seemed to be mainly a lack of thoroughness; which is really just a nice way of saying a lazy proposer. Very few instructors seemed unable to understand the proposal requirements; rather they just chose to not answer the questions or to provide irrelevant/incomplete answers. Hopefully, the modifications made to the proposal for Spring 2009 will be helpful.

The E focus Board supported the change to make renewals good for 5 years and leave new approvals at 3 years.

The E focus Board continued its policy instated last year for Staff Proposals to have the Gen Ed staff automatically accept them without Board review.

The E focus Board conducted a workshop for new applicants at the beginning of the Spring 2008 semester (January 23, 2008, 1:30-3:00) to help clarify proposal

requirements and share examples of integrating ethics into curriculum in different disciplines. The workshop was a success with approximately 10 attendees.

The E focus Board was a big promoter of on-line review of pending proposals and was delighted that the GE office initiated the WebCT review program. This worked very well and made service on the board much easier. The Board hopes that soon all proposals will be encouraged to be submitted on-line to reduce the need for GE office staff to scan documents into WebCT.

### Proposal Review Statistics

Proposals	Spring 2008	Summer 2008	Fall 2008	Total
Approved	30	6	19	55
Pending	0	0	1	1
Denied	0	0	3	3
Withdrawn	2	1	4	7
Total	32	7	27	66
Notes	1 course proposal approved			

Note: Additional information was requested from approximately 25 applicants.

### Other Issues and Goals

No changes were found necessary for the end-of-semester survey. And it was noted that such changes should be very carefully considered and only made for well-defined reasons since surveys are most useful for comparative purposes.

The E Board plans to repeat the workshop for new applicants at the beginning of the Fall 2008 or Spring 2009 semester to help clarify proposal requirements and share examples of integrating ethics into curriculum in different disciplines.

---

## Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Board

---

AY 2007-2008

Submitted by Carlos Andrade

The Board consisted of Carlos Andrade, Chair (Center for Hawaiian Studies), Naomi Losch (Kawaihuelani Center for Hawaiian Language), Reina Whitiri (English), Lonny Carlile (Asian Studies) and Jane Moulin (Music). Susan Johnson served as liaison to the GEC. Elaine Nakao (General Education Office) provided administrative assistance.

### Courses Reviewed and Approved for Academic Year 2007-2008

	F07	S08	SS08	F08	TOTAL
approved	9	14	0	5	28
denied	0	3	0	0	3
withdrawn	0	1	1	0	2
TOTAL	9	18	1	5	33

### Procedures

1. The use of WebCT made reviewing proposals quicker and more comprehensive as everyone could have an individual copy and review them as well as make comments for other members of the committee to see when their schedules permitted.
2. The Board met whenever there were proposals needing to be reviewed. The Board met more frequently when there were outstanding proposals and deadlines approaching.
3. The Board worked by consensus for the first review and by vote for the final review. For the first review if **any** Board member had a question, an issue regarding a submitted course or suggestions for making adjustments the HAP Chair would communicate these via e-mail to the faculty member whose proposal was being reviewed. Each proposing faculty was given the opportunity to revise the submittal and the course was reviewed a second (or sometimes more) time. This process worked well for all concerned. Some faculty opted to revise and others withdrew their proposals.

### Year Highlights

1. There were several new proposals that used the HAP Hallmarks as a springboard to include and expand the number of contributions from the "native voice" in their courses. In addition, more attention and inclusion of ways in which the intersection of Hawaiian and Asian and/or Pacific Island cultures were apparent in the proposals in response to the consultation with the HAPS board.
2. The most common problems were proposals that did not adequately address two of the HAP Hallmarks, HAP 1 and Hap 2.
  - a. HAP 1 requires a course to reflect the intersection of Asian and/or Pacific Island cultures with Native Hawaiian culture. Several proposals did

not have adequate intersection beyond Hawaii. Some revised to include the intersection and were approved. Others decided to keep their focus entirely on Hawai'i and so decided to withdraw their proposals.

b. HAP 2 encourages learning that comes from the cultural perspectives, values, and world views rooted in the experience of peoples indigenous to Hawai'i, the Pacific, and Asia. This is interpreted by the Board to be "native voice" or writings, oral presentations, or videos by indigenous people representing the places of intersection. Several submittals did not have adequate "native voice".

3. The HAP Board requires a complete course syllabus as well as complete bibliography of course readings. Some initial submittals did not include these items making the review delayed. One issue involved in this area is the recognition of the indigenous contributions. The HAPS board put together several examples of syllabi with the indigenous contributors highlighted as well as the intersection of Hawaiian with Asian and/or Pacific cultures which assisted both the faculty submitting proposals as well as facilitating review by the board.
4. A continuing issue seems to be that instructors were changed after the posting of courses on Banner, most who are GTA's. This was particular to the introductory survey course, HWST 107. Often new instructors did not use the approved syllabus of the listed instructor or the standard HWST 107 syllabus. This issue was and continues to be addressed with the Hawaiian Studies Chair regarding development of a standard, approved syllabus which is used by all who teach that course.
5. An all campus committee was set up to discuss multi-campus articulation and approval of HAP courses reviewed and approved at the campus level. There were several meetings and official written agreement is being reached on articulation as each campus submits its own plan. The main point is that each campus will have the freedom to work out their own procedures in setting up a HAP Board and procedures for review. However, all review and approval of the H focus will be based on the Hallmarks as they stand and that they remain as the standard for assessing proposals across all units in the system.

### **Assessment**

The enrollment in HAP courses was down with 2081 students in the Spring 07 term compared with 2229 students in the Fall 06 term. The vast majority of students (1090) are enrolled in HWST 107.

The results of the HAP survey for Fall 06 classes were very positive that the Course work assisted the students in better understanding the indigenous culture of Hawai'i. In Fall 06 there was a response rate of 65% in surveys returned, down from 72% from Spring 06. Several approved courses consistently did not return the surveys.

The issue of consistent learning outcomes for the HAP Hallmarks was discussed and as yet, there has been no procedure set up for assessing these outcomes. However, this will continue to be an area that the board will need to develop more fully.

---

## Oral Communication Focus Board

---

AY 2007-2008

Submitted by Byron Gangnes

This year's Oral Focus Board consisted of Byron Gangnes (Chair), Amy Hubbard (Spring only), Tamara Albertini, Joan Dodgson (Fall only), Randy Hensley, and Renee Strom (Fall only). George Wong served as our liaison to the GEC and Jo-Anne Nakamoto as recorder.

The Board met on five occasions during the course of the academic year. Much of the review and approval process for O Focus proposals was conducted via WebCT and email correspondence.

### 1. Policies and Hallmarks

#### a. Policy decisions and rationale

There were no significant policy changes made by the Board this year.

A number of issues were discussed by the Board over the course of the term, including the desirability of having oral focus learning outcomes in all syllabi, the difficulty getting appropriate responses to our renewal questions and whether they are practical, whether we should be more insistent on having student evaluations on file for each renewal (we require this on paper but rarely check). No changes in policy were made as a result of these discussions. I would note that because we are now seeing many more renewal applications it would probably be a good idea to take another look at the renewal questions to decide whether any changes are warranted.

#### b. Hallmark revisions and rationale

No changes to the Hallmarks were made this year.

#### c. Information for future Boards regarding how hallmarks were interpreted and applied and problems with interpreting hallmarks

Last year we noted that proposals for O designation for language courses are among the most challenging, and that we have made some progress communicating to language course instructors the need for the proposals to identify oral communication activities that go beyond language acquisition per se, as well as appropriate training and evaluation. Several Board members have individually developed standard email text that they use to request additional information from language instructors. Last year, the board agreed that it would be useful to develop a frequently asked questions (FAQs) web page with suggestions and examples specifically for faculty who teach language classes; we were not able to take up this issue this year.

There are sometimes differences of opinion among Board members about how precisely we should enforce particular aspects of the hallmarks, or rather the documentation from instructors that the hallmarks have indeed been met. Examples are whether we absolutely require that a renewal applicant provide example rubrics, and what constitutes adequate syllabus language regarding the hallmarks. It is not clear that we can avoid judgment calls in these areas. Typically we try to be flexible if we are fairly confident that they have met the hallmarks.

## 2. Proposal Review

- a. Proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration:

	S08	SS08	F08	TOTAL
Approved	48	9	29	86
Pending	0	1	1	2
Denied	2	0	2	4
Withdrawn	0	2	0	2
TOTAL	50	12	32	94

Note: Includes both "staff" proposals and proposals subsequently submitted by the assigned instructor, if reviewed in the same semester.

- b. The number of proposals reviewed increased from 70 in the 2006-2007 academic year to 94 proposals this year. There were a large number of proposals for which instructors were contacted because their proposal did not readily meet the oral Focus standards. Most were revised by the instructor and subsequently approved; four proposals were denied because we were unable to obtain satisfactory responses after one or more attempts. Two proposals were withdrawn by the instructor.

- c. Changes in procedures

There were no significant changes in procedures this year. As we did last year, much of the proposal review took place within WebCT, which increased convenience for Board members and ease of communication among the Board. There is the need for a spreadsheet or other online record to track the various proposals we are reviewing, their current status, who has been assigned to review them, etc.

- d. Changes to the proposal form

There were no changes made to the proposal form this year.

Last year, the GEO asked whether the Board wanted to consider using a chart modeled after the one used by the W Board. The Board favored this option and intended to discuss it further in F07. This was not taken up this year.

There appears to be some confusion among renewal applicants about which questions they are to answer (they are different from the questions used for initial

applicants). The Board should consider whether there is a way to better communicate this—for example, do we want a separate renewal form?

3. The following are the number of O sections offered or scheduled to be offered from Spring 2008 through Fall 2008:

	S08	SS08	F08	TOTAL
Sections	134	31	116	281

I do not have directly comparable data from last year, however I note that the number of O sections offered Spring 2007 was 131, and there were 85 sections offered in Fall 2006.

4. Faculty development efforts. This year, the O Board was unable to arrange workshops for faculty interested in teaching O Focus courses. Efforts made to arrange an April workshop were unsuccessful because it was difficult to recruit panelists for the mid-to-late April period. In the future, planning needs to begin at the start of the semester.

The Board continued a discussion begun by Tom Hilgers in past years about the need to recruit O Focus instructors from underrepresented areas. Because of time constraints, no significant efforts were made to address this during the past year. This is an area that deserves additional attention in the future.

#### 5. Assessment

##### a. End-of-semester survey

The Board continued to invite instructors of all O Focus courses to conduct an end-of-semester student survey provided by the GEO. We inform instructors that they will be required to have at least one set of survey responses on record when they come up for renewal. Some revisions to the O Survey form were made, primarily to improve clarity.

##### b. Hallmarks: assessment of how effective the Hallmarks are in designating courses that meet the spirit of the Foundations or Focus area

The O Board was called to review the Student Learning Outcomes draft prepared at a workshop led by Mary Allen of California State University, Bakersfield. The Board offered some suggested edits, which were incorporated into the draft. We were told that the administration wanted a pilot study done with 1 outcome during Spring 2008.

In February, Monica Stitt-Bergh (GEO) provided an assessment update, and described a plan to videotape 5 student presentations from five courses as a pilot assessment during spring term. We would recruit 2-5 faculty members to score, with the intent of determining whether the draft rubrics can be applied consistently. The committee was concerned that this was might be too large number of presentations to review, and was also concerned about recruiting faculty to do the assessment. We discussed the need to evaluate the usefulness of the rubric for different types of oral presentations (e.g. debate, group,

individual). We talked about the need to get feedback from faculty about how useful the rubrics are. The assessment piloting was tabled for Spring 2008.

## 6. Current concerns and issues

The board was understaffed throughout the academic year, first with four members (instead of 5) in the fall, and at one point early in the year with only three members before Amy Hubbard's gracious offer to step in was approved by the GEC. This made it more difficult than in past years to obtain the necessary three committee votes for approval, and it also reduced the manpower for committee work. While we understand the challenge faced by the GEC staffing these committees, it is extremely important to the work of the committees. It is also important to make sure potential committee members understand the nature of the work and the likely time commitment, which is significant.

This was a transition year for us, with the retirement of Barbara Mueller-Ali and the start of work by Jo-Anne Nakamoto. We were very pleased that it went relatively smoothly, and this is a testament to the effort of Jo-Anne and other GEO staff. Because of the change in staffing, we had a somewhat more difficult time tracking the progress of the committee on proposal reviews. It is probably not realistic to expect the Board Chair to keep track of this; we need the GEO to track the status of proposals and provide some way for us to see easily what needs to be done. (Of course, we continue to value the reminders that the GEO provides!) While WebCT is great, some kind of online list summarizing the status of the proposals is probably needed.

There is some concern about how assessment will be implemented and whether there will be adequate GEO support for this effort. It is unlikely that the Board will have the time and energy to shepherd this, considering its other responsibilities.

## 7. Future priorities and goals

The issues of adequate committee staffing and clear administration of the review process are important priorities going forward. Clearly a continuing priority must also be recruitment of O Focus instructors, both overall and from underrepresented areas. It will be important for future Boards to arrange for regular workshops for interested faculty and to recruit more directly from underrepresented majors.

Other recommended agenda items for next year, several of which are carryovers from 2006-2007, include:

- a. Discuss using a chart modeled after the one used by the W Board for O-designation requests.
- b. Work with GEO to post exemplary proposals at the Gen Ed web site.
- c. Finalize draft FAQs for language instructors.
- d. Review oral focus renewal questions for potential changes or clarifications. Consider whether there is a way to better communicate to renewal applicants that renewals have different questions from initial applications.
- e. Implement assessment and provide sufficient GEO support.

---

## Writing Focus Board

---

AY 2007-2008

Submitted by Tom Hilgers, Chair

### NEW MEMBERS

- Lynne Higa, Arts & Sciences Student Academic Services (liaison from GEC)
- Sterling Keeley, Botany (NS representative)
- Trina Kudlacek, Student-Athlete Academic Services (advising representative)
- Rikki Mitsunaga, Shidler Student Academic Services (professional school representative)
- Nobuko Ochner, East Asian Languages and Literature (LLL representative)

The W Board said farewell to Andrew Crislip (AH) and Puakea Nogelmeier (LLL), who resigned at the end of F07.

Continuing members included Kenton Harsch (ELI Director), Jim Henry (Composition & Rhetoric Director), Weilin Qu (professional school representative), and Eldon Wegner (SS).

### ASSESSMENT

Guided by a September workshop offered by WASC-nominated assessment specialist Mary Allen, W Board members Henry, Harsh, and Hilgers worked with the English and ELI faculties to devise pilot FW assessments. As a result, the ENG 100/101 faculty and the ELI faculty will assess a sample of essays written by students during S08. The focus for the assessment will be student proficiency at writing for a specific audience.

The W Board also discussed assessment of the Writing Intensive Focus requirement. Because W Student Learning Outcomes focus on the Writing Intensive *program*, not on individual W classes, assessments of writing should occur at the end of students' fifth and final W class. The Board considered several ways that this might be accomplished. MWP currently has writing samples from W classes that can be used to create a scoring guide/rubric. A key question is, should the scoring guide cut across disciplines, or should it be discipline specific? The Board will continue this discussion in AY 2008-09.

The W Board, along with other General Education committees, approved a statement of policy to govern assessment of the General Education Program. The statement will be offered to the administration.

### ELIMINATING THE FOUNDATIONS/WRITING PLACEMENT EXAM

W Board members supported the English faculty's vote to eliminate the placement exam for General Education Foundations-Written Communication (FW) courses, effective December 2007. The decision was informed by the slow erosion of first-year writing-course options as well as repeated requests from the UHM Admissions staff to "even the playing field" for incoming freshmen from the Mainland. For most native speakers of English, placement will henceforth be determined by standardized test scores. Native speakers without scores place themselves using information provided by the English Department and the MWP. Non-native speakers will continue to be placed by the English Language Institute (ELI).

### MAKING FOUNDATIONS-WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (FW) A TRUE FIRST-YEAR REQUIREMENT

Ever since it was established in the late 1980s, the W Board has urged that students be required to satisfy the FW requirement during their first year at UHM. Hence, the Board supported the 2008 General Education Committee's efforts to secure policies and budget to really make this possible.

W Board members, the English and ELI departments, and UHM administration worked intensively during S08 to draft policies around this initiative. An implementation plan was drafted and adopted, and funding for the next academic year was secured. The plan should allow both returning students and F08 first-year students to fulfill their FW requirement before F09. If funding then becomes permanent, introductory FW classes offered from F09 on will be designed as "first-year experience" courses.

### CLARIFYING BOARD PROCEDURES

The Board clarified its own review procedures regarding W and written examinations (they "count" only if guided revision is part of students' writing process) and W renewals (applicants are required to answer renewal questions and provide requested course information either by answering specific questions or including requested information in submitted syllabi). The Board also consulted the General Education Committee when it had to deal with complex issues.

### INSTRUCTOR TEACHING LOAD AND W CLASSES

Consideration of certain proposals led to the Board's awareness that in some instances, lecturers are being assigned 120 or more W students per semester. The Board, the GEC, and the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee were all troubled by this situation and will consider possible policy next year.

### W COURSE AVAILABILITY

The UHM faculty offered more than 500 approved W classes in S08 and will offer 500+ W classes in F08 as well. In addition, over 100 Summer 2008 sections fulfill the W Focus requirement.

### UH SYSTEM W COOPERATION

The Mānoa Writing Program staff, with input from the W Board, arranged three meetings to discuss FW and W courses across the System campuses. All campuses continue to offer W classes. Many campuses report that the preponderance of W classes involves English and other humanities departments, an imbalance given the broad goals of the W requirement. All campuses have been informed of changes in UHM's FW placement policies and will adjust local policies to reflect UHM's new practices. MWP is supporting UH West Oahu's efforts to develop articulatable courses as it develops its full undergraduate program. All campuses welcomed the news that Kauai Community College's faculty is working on a proposal to make W classes a required part of the KauCC AA degree.