

General Education Committee Assessment Meeting
 December 15, 2004
 9:00–11:30 a.m.
 QLC 208 Conference Room

The GEC Assessment Subcommittee (Randy Hensley, Monica Stitt-Bergh, and Megumi Taniguchi) presented a plan to assess the Diversification-Social Science area of the General Education Program. The goal of the subcommittee was to get feedback so that appropriate changes/modifications could be considered.

Attached are documents that were distributed to participants:

- Agenda
- Faculty Concerns about Assessment and the WASC Requirements
- WASC: Educational Effectiveness
- Diversification Social Science (DS) Assessment Plan
- Timeline of Activities (blue)
- Diversification Social Science Scoring Rubric (yellow)
- Resources Needed to Assess General Education and Create a Culture of Evidence (green)

Participants: 24 (GEC and its Boards, and OVCAA staff were invited.)
 (Sorted by boards)

Last Name	First Name	Department	Board
Arno	Andrew	Anthropology	E Board
Bopp	Tom	Chemistry	E
Enomoto	Ernestine	EDEA	E
Chin	David	ICS	F Board
Maynard	Sherwood	Biology/MOP	F
Sammons	Todd	English	F
Weiner	Joel	Mathematics	F Board
Chadwick	Richard	POLS	GEC
Cox	Linda	NREM	GEC
Goss	Jon	Geography	GEC
Hawkins	Emily	HIPLL	GEC
Hensley	Randy	Hamilton Library	GEC
Lum	Jeannie	EDEF	GEC
Taniguchi	Megumi	A & S Advising	GEC
Aune	Kelly	OVCAA	GEC <i>ex officio</i>
Heu	Jan	A & R	GEC <i>ex officio</i>
Ramsey	Tom	Mathematics	GEC-SEC liaison
Solis	Ron	HIPPL	H Board
Prevedouros	Panos	CEE	O
Kadohiro	Jane	Nursing	W Board
Sokugawa	Helene	OVCAA	
Yamada	Myrtle	OVCAA	
Stitt-Bergh	Monica	GEO/MWP	
Lucas	Kawehi	HIPLL	

Assessment Committee's summary of the meeting

After the Assessment Committee presented the proposed plan to assess Diversification Social Sciences, the floor was opened for discussion. Issues raised include:

- It is not feasible and not efficient for faculty members to assess a diverse range of student work (e.g., homework, exams, essays, projects, etc.).
- Sampling issues: selection criteria issues; confound of major; confound of transfer students; etc.
- There should be a control group for comparison.
- “Social sciences” cannot be defined.
- The learning outcomes are too broad to be useful.
- No useful results will occur as a result of the proposed plan. Results will not help faculty members make changes to improve learning, courses, or processes.
 - Assessment should give information back to individual faculty.
- An assessment plan should include a longitudinal element that will let us see student development. For example, a pre-test and a post-test.
 - The tracking issues pose a serious problem (only 1/3 of the Mānoa graduates started at Mānoa)
- Individual students should be tracked through the GenEd requirements.
- Use grades as a means of assessment.
 - Collect syllabi; use grades in the classes that assign “social science” activities as a demonstration of evidence of student learning.
- A “UH Career” assessment is needed instead of assessing individual components of GenEd.
 - Minimize the burden on faculty by choosing a single assessment mechanism that assesses all areas.
 - An exit interview could be used to assess multiple GenEd areas.
 - The current Writing Placement Exam could include questions about the Diversification areas; the essays could be assessed for writing and for Diversification content knowledge.
 - A national standardized exam can be used to assess Diversification (e.g., ACT’s CAAP exam).
 - National exams do not take the local culture and UHM curriculum into consideration.
- Not all areas of GenEd can be assessed in the same way. For example, Oral Communication needs to be assessed much differently than Diversification Social Science.
- The budget included in the proposal needs to be more detailed.
- Release time, not money, is needed for faculty who participate in assessing student work.
- Start small (e.g., ACT exam) and scale up as we can.

After discussion, two possibilities appeared to garner the most attention:

- 1) The Assessment Committee should add more detail to the proposal; a revised proposal should be re-submitted; the scheduled spring activities should take place.
- 2) The Assessment Committee should create an assessment plan that includes a pre-test/post-test component. The plan should include adding elements to the Mānoa Writing Program’s Writing Placement Exam so that additional areas of the GenEd Program can be assessed at the entry-point and exit-point of a student’s academic career.

The Assessment Committee agreed to revise the proposal in ways that will take the discussion into consideration.