

# 9

## ANNUAL REPORTS

Each May the chair of the GEC submits an annual report to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). 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. Report guidelines/templates will be provided to the Board Chairs in Spring 2020 to facilitate drafting of the 2019-20 reports.

### 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  - a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration? (The GEO can provide this information to the Boards.)
  - 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)? (GEO can provide these numbers as well.)
  - 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, explain networking/recruitment efforts, summarize the materials posted on GenEd website, list system meetings attended)

5. Assessment

- a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Foundations or Focus area's student learning outcomes?
- b. What type of feedback has the Board given to help faculty reflect on the Hallmarks of the Foundations or Focus areas?
- c. How have past General Education area assessment results been used or plan to be used by the Board?

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

7. What are the Board's future priorities and goals?

---

## General Education Committee

---

Reporting Period: AY 2018-19

Prepared by: Shannon Johnson

Committee Members: Garrett Apuzen-Ito (Vice Chair, Apr-May 2019), Shana Brown (Secretary), Garrett Clanin, Michael Cooney (Vice Chair, Aug 2018-Mar 2019), Shannon Johnson (Chair), Geoffrey LaFlair (Fall 2018), Micah Leval (ASUH, Fall 2018), Kaliko Martin, Raiyan Rafid (ASUH, Spring 2019), Halina Zalenski; with ex officio support from Christine Beaulé (GEO Director), Ron Cambra (OVCAA representative), Lisa Fujikawa (GEO), Vicky Keough (GEO), Stacey Roberts (SEC Liaison, Fall 2018), Cari Ryan (GEO, Spring 2019), Sheela Sharma (GEO), Carolyn Stephenson (SEC Liaison, Spring 2019), and Ryan Yamaguchi (Admissions)

### Highlights:

- Fall was spent reviewing detailed Internal and External Reports from the first academic program review of General Education at UH Mānoa since the current GenEd curriculum was implemented in 2001. Initial responses were provided in December 2018 to the many recommendations.
- Spring was spent delving deeper into recommendations from the Program Review Reports in smaller Working Groups (smaller GEC breakout groups – no external members) and developing plans of action to help move our GenEd curriculum into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This work will continue into next year and beyond as GEC focuses on providing stronger leadership for the direction, assessment, and information needs for general education.
- The GEC and the GenEd Office are now committed to participating in the 5-year academic program review cycle.
- A 3-year assessment plan for systematic, comprehensive, and ongoing evaluations of GenEd student learning outcomes was finalized.
- Several motions were brought to the Senate floor:
  - Motion to Support Integration of the General Education Office into a Reconfigured Portfolio for the Office of Undergraduate Education – passed on 14 Nov 2018

- Motion to Assign Focus Designations to Courses Rather than Instructors – presented and discussed on 13 Mar 2019, tabled until the following are provided:
  - a clear plan and process for implementation is developed and attached to the proposal
  - the need for this change is documented with systematic, and not anecdotal, data as to how the current system of focus courses has negatively affected students
  - department consultation takes place
- Motion to Simplify “Double-Dipping” Rules for General Education Courses – passed on 8 May 2019
- Motion to Establish a General Education Diversification Board – on MFS agenda for 8 May 2019 but tabled until Fall 2019 due to insufficient time
- The GEC supports UH Mānoa’s participation along with the rest of the UH System in the WICHE Interstate Passport, a national program facilitating block transfer of lower-division general education attainment based on student learning outcomes rather than specific courses, and we mapped out and aligned our existing Foundation and Diversification requirements to the Passport Categories for this articulation agreement
- The GEC exploring ways of providing a more cohesive learning experience for our students that also embeds place-based learning in the curriculum and emphasizes an integrative and diverse general education experience while remaining credit-neutral. So far these conversations have been around how learning can be scaffolded and reinforced as well as what thematic pathways in general education might look like.
- Significant edits are being made to the Faculty Governance of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa General Education document in order to confirm that the GEC is a permanent MFS committee and to clarify and outline the membership and responsibilities of GEC and its Boards.
- A new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was drafted to provide guidance and clarification of the function and relationships between the Manoa Faculty Senate (via SEC), the GEC, the General Education Office (GEO), and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA), or more broadly the higher-level faculty and administration working most closely with General Education at UH Manoa. GEC encourages the inclusion of a detailed set of procedures, deadlines, and roles to ensure timely staffing of the Gen Ed Boards each year. This new MOU is currently in draft form, and ideally a representative from each of the four parties (SEC, GEC, GEO, and OVCAA) will come together to reconcile any clarifications or concerns with this MOU draft as soon as possible. Just as a point of clarification, this MOU does not replace the 2003 MOU, which focuses on the downward relationships between the SEC, GEC and the Gen Ed Boards (we do hope to update that MOU to include the GEO).

- The GEC and GEO met with MFS to discuss vacancies on GEC and its Boards, the length of appointments, and better staffing strategies. The agreed upon strategies for staffing did not work out as planned by the end of the Spring semester, leaving potential vacancies that will inhibit the ability for GEC and its Boards from starting their intensive work as soon as faculty report for duty in mid-August. This continues to be a problem that needs to be resolved.
- The GenEd Boards reviewed a significant number of proposals this academic year:
  - HAP: 18
  - ETH: 75
  - OC: 106
  - WI: 256
  - Foundations: 6 new; 58 TCEs
  - Diversification: no Board, no report (approximately 104)

---

## Foundations Board

---

Reporting Period: AY 2018-19

Prepared by: Daniel Harris-McCoy and Siobhán Ní Dhonacha

Board members: Sarah Allen (Co-Vice Chair), David Brier, Michael Guidry, Daniel Harris-McCoy (Co-Chair), Ramdas Lamb, Siobhán Ní Dhonacha (Co-Chair), Sarah Post (Co-Vice Chair), Kimo Cashman (GEC Liaison), Christine Beaulé (GEO Liaison)

### 1. Policies and Hallmarks

- a. Did the board make any policy recommendations this year? If so, what was the rationale for those recommendations?  
The Foundations Board did not make formal policy recommendations in AY 2018-19.
- b. If applicable, share any issues raised at the System level and whether there has been any resolution to those issues.  
Not applicable. Most System-level work was completed in the prior academic year (AY 2017-18) in connection with the implementation of the FQ designation.
- c. What observations can the board share as to how the Hallmarks are being interpreted or applied by board members and/or proposal submitters?  
See below.
- d. Does the board have any recommendations regarding Hallmark revisions?  
Not at this point. The next phase of hallmark revisions should take place in light of assessment plans developed by the GEC and recently-appointed GEO Assessment Specialist Cari Ryan in AY 2018-19.
- e. Are there any concerns or issues that the board has identified but not been able to address?  
Based on the modifications to Foundations Learning Objectives undertaken in AY 2017-19, the F Board worked on revising Foundations Proposal Questions for FG, FQ, and FW, and tailored these questions to suit the new General Education online designation application/proposal system, which is currently under development. As part of this process, the Board grappled with the perennial problem of the nature and identity of the FG designation, i.e. whether it is meant to serve as a truly global introduction to history and culture, or else emphasize diversity over time and space, or some combination of the two. The problematic nature of this designation was also apparent in our review of the TCE's.

2. Proposal Review

- a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration this academic year?

<b>Foundations Board Proposal Data (as of 05/01/2019)</b>				
Foundations Board Proposals reviewed:	Total number reviewed	Number approved	Number denied	Number withdrawn
Fall 2018	5	4	1	0
Spring 2019	1	1	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	6	5	1	0

<b>Foundations Board TCE Data (as of 05/01/2019)</b>				
Foundations Board TCEs reviewed:	Total number reviewed	Number approved	Number denied	Number withdrawn
Fall 2018	19	17	2	0
Spring 2019	39	22	17	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	58	39	19	0

Of the 15 TCE requests that were denied, six were forwarded to the Diversification subcommittee to determine if the student could receive Diversification credit instead.

- b. How many proposals this academic year required follow up with the instructor and/or department? What was the outcome of these negotiations (i.e., number of proposals revised and approved, number of proposals revised but not approved, number of proposals withdrawn)?

Two of the proposals reviewed this year required negotiation. Both proposals were ultimately approved.

- c. What procedures, if any, did the board establish or change this year, and what was the rationale behind the change(s)?

Procedures were not established or changed AY18-19.

The GEO review process for TCs has changed as the UHM Admissions Office provided access to the GEO to facilitate the use of the new TES system in an effort to streamline

the procedures for recording votes, decisions, and justifications for TCE decisions. This change has significantly reduced the amount of GEO staff time required to process TCEs forwarded to the Foundations Board and Diversification Subcommittees. This new software has positively affected the GEO workflow in terms of receipt of TCEs, but has not changed the Board review process, which remained the same.

- d. Does the board have any recommendations regarding the proposal form or proposal review process? Include the rationale for these proposed revisions.  
See Board work undertaken regarding Proposal Forms in 1e.

### 3. Faculty Development

- a. Describe any workshops conducted, networking and/or community-building efforts made, and resources accrued to promote best practices.  
The Board continued to offer in-person consultations to faculty interested in proposing a Foundations course, and in need of assistance with proposal development or revision. The Board Co-Chairs sometimes met with faculty proposers on multiple occasions with the end result, we believe, being both a much stronger course proposal as well as greater appreciation on the part of the faculty member for the nature and purpose of General Education.

### 4. Assessment

- a. What efforts were made this year to assess the effectiveness of the requirement and/or any WASC core competencies?  
The Information Literacy component of the FW designation was discussed and treated in a more refined manner in the new Proposal questions.
- b. What observations can the board share as to how departments and instructors are assessing whether Gen Ed Hallmarks and learning objectives are being met?  
The assessment section is consistently the area of greatest weakness in Foundations course proposals. Faculty, perhaps understandably if lacking formal training, seem not to completely grasp or understand what is required to effectively assess a course. The Board attempted to improve the situation somewhat in Fall 2018 by clarifying the section on assessment in the new proposal questions developed. The General Education Committee and the General Education Office should continue to assist with assessment efforts on the part of the faculty and, in particular, provide assessment-related workshops for the various designations.

---

# Contemporary Ethical Issues Board

---

Reporting Period: AY 2018-19

Prepared by: Contemporary Ethical Issues Focus Board

Board members: Melissa Jones (Vice Chair), Joni Sasaki, Megan Terawaki (Chair), Jinguang (Andrew) Zhang, Garrett Clanin (GEC Liaison), and Sheela Sharma (GEO Liaison)

## 1. Policies and Hallmarks

- a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
  - N/A
- b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
  - N/A
- c. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how Hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting Hallmarks?
  - Questions on proposal forms should be more explicit:
    - Provide examples of frameworks—instructors would cite “A Framework for Ethical Decision Making” or “Markkula” rather than the individual frameworks/approaches
    - “Provide a list” was taken literally
  - Online/hybrid courses need clarification to conduct discussions in the online classroom (Q.4b: “For courses that include participation in online discussions, explain how ethical deliberation will be facilitated in the online learning environment.”):
    - The Board compared “Student-Instructor” discussions to “Student-Student” discussions
    - 4b is a sub-question -- One possible solution is to make 4b a stand-alone “if applicable” question
  - Clarification for Q.5 (“Explain how you will assess student competencies in relation to the learning objectives for Contemporary Ethical Issues Focus courses”):
    - Copy/paste ELOs in this question for easy reference
    - Note that instructors do not need to address each ELO, but should connect their assessment mechanisms to as many ELOs as possible

## 2. Proposal Review

- a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration? (The GEO can provide this information to the Boards.)
  - Reviewed in Fall 2018:
    - Approved: 35
    - Denied: 0
    - Withdrawn: 1 (was not a 300+ course)

- Reviewed in Spring 2019:
    - Approved: 40
    - Denied: 0
    - Withdrawn: 0
- 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)? (GEO can provide these numbers as well.)
- Reviewed in Fall 2018:
    - Approved following revisions: 15
  - Reviewed in Spring 2019:
    - Approved following revisions: 14
- 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?
- Previous Boards went in order when assigning members to follow up with instructors. We had a participatory and congenial team this year who readily volunteered to contact instructors for revisions.
  - This year's Board agreed to use the Google Sheet as the official voting mechanism for proposal review.
- d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
- Changes were proposed for clarity and to streamline the approval process. Currently, different forms (Instructor Based, Staff Based, Course Based) are being used, depending on the course's situation, and questions differ by each form. The Chair is working on drafting the changes to the forms and will report back to the Board for review.
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.
- a. E sections offered in AY19 (Fall 2018 and Spring 2019): 251
- b. Students enrolled in E courses in AY19: 4,988
4. What efforts were made in the area of faculty development? (e.g., describe type of workshops presented, explain networking/recruitment efforts, summarize the materials posted on GenEd website, list system meetings attended)
- a. No explicit efforts were made in this area, although the Board did take note of exceptional proposals and the Chair intends on requesting the approval of those instructors to post those proposals to the GEO website.

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.)
  - N/A
- b. How effective were the Hallmarks in designating courses that meet the spirit of the Foundations or Focus area?
  - The Board strove to approve courses that met the Hallmarks; instructors were contacted to revise their proposals if the Hallmarks were not being met

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

- a. Getting the Board fully staffed from the beginning of the semester
- b. Encouraging instructors to promote online discourse in a manner that mirrors face-to-face classrooms and successfully explain how discussion is facilitated online

7. What are the Board's future priorities and goals?

- a. Move toward online submission of proposals
  - Incorporating skip logic for online forms: e.g., if "online" is checked, instructors must answer Q.4b
- b. The Chair wants to revise and consolidate the different proposal forms
  - The Board may request that instructors annotate their syllabi to identify Hallmarks and ELOs.
- c. The Chair wants to encourage course-based approval for eligible courses, rather than departments submitting more instructor-based proposals for the same course.

#

---

## Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Issues Focus Board

---

Reporting Period: AY 2018-19

Prepared by: Kapena Shim

Board Members: Keahiahi Long, Joyce Mariano, Craig Perez, Maya Saffery, Kapena Shim (Chair), Shana Brown (GEC liaison), Sheela Sharma (GEO Liaison)

### 1. Policies and Hallmarks

- a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
  - i. No policy changes were made this year
- b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
  - i. No Hallmark revisions were made.
- c. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how Hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting Hallmarks?
  - i. The issue of incorporating Asian indigenous voices came up with course proposals, specifically in many of the Ethnic Studies proposals that we reviewed in Spring 2019. Many of those proposals struggled (in our point of view) with the incorporation of the indigenous Asian voices. Instead, we found that they often included Asian migrants as the intersected Asian voice. A concern was also brought forward by some faculty at an Ethnic Studies faculty meeting that the GEO director attended that the incorporation of indigenous voices and scholars can be problematic in that those perspectives may not always be available depending on the topic and the discipline. They also noted that having the "indigenous voices" language in the annotated bibliography section of the instructor-based proposal form gives off the idea that it is a requirement and the only way. The Board decided to interpret "A" be inclusive by allowing for the intersection of Asian cultures with Native Hawaiian culture and the cultures of Pacific Islanders. Asian perspectives can include Asians (Japanese, Chinese, etc.), indigenous Asians (Ainu of Japan or the Tao of Taiwan, etc.), Asian migrants/diasporas/refugees, Asian immigrants/settlers, Asian-Americans, and mixed-race Asians ("hapa", for example).
  - ii. The board completed their revision of the explanatory notes. Notable changes included: replacing the word "indigenous" with "Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders, and Asians." Initially, a revision was made to use the word "indigenous" consistently throughout the document rather than use the words "native" and "indigenous" interchangeably; added language in the second and third bullet points that provides more explanation on how we expect courses to incorporate and approach the

inclusion of Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islander and Asian voices and perspectives into their courses; added concrete examples to the fourth bullet point to explain how courses can demonstrate fostering respect and understanding by their students; added a footnote that clarifies what we mean when we say Native Hawaiian; and added another footnote to allow for a more inclusive "A". An additional footnote was added to clarify "Pacific Islanders" based on feedback from the Systemwide HAP group.

## 2. Proposal Review

- a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration? (The GEO can provide this information to the Boards.)
  - i. In Fall 18 (for Spring 19) - 6 approved, 1 withdrawn, 1 exemption denied
  - ii. In Spring (for Fall 19) - 12 approved, 1 withdrawn, 0 denied
- 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)? (GEO can provide these numbers as well.)
  - i. 17 proposals went through negotiations. 14 were approved. 2 were withdrawn, and 1 was 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?
  - i. No procedures changed. However, the board created a team drive to hold HAP working and archive files such as meeting notes, annual reports, editable versions of HAP-related documents, etc.
  - ii. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
    - Yes. A note about applying diacritics consistently was added to the instructor-based proposal form. We included this note because we found that many proposals were inconsistently applying diacritics. Revisions were also made to clarify instructions in the annotated bibliography section. No changes were made to the course-based proposal form.
    - The Board revised the language in the two Focus Exemption documents—(1) Focus Exemption Information and Application; (2) Focus Exemption Hallmarks—and submitted them to the GEO for review and approval since some of the changes made were not directly related to the HAP sections of the those documents, but rather to some general areas of the documents to provide students with stronger directions on how to fill out the application. The Board revised these two documents after we had to review a Focus Exemption application in Fall 2018. In our review process, we found the application submitted by the student was inadequate in helping the Board understand how their experience met the hallmarks of the HAP Focus designation. We decided to

revise the Focus Exemption application to make sure that it clearly states the purpose of the HAP Focus Hallmarks and clearly instructs the students to write their compelling argument in a way that demonstrates how they have met those hallmarks.

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.
  - a. Information not gathered.
4. What efforts were made in the area of faculty development? (e.g., describe type of workshops presented, explain networking/recruitment efforts, summarize the materials posted on GenEd website, list system meetings attended) 9-2 2018-19.
  - a. The chair and vice-chairs attended the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 HAP System-wide meetings.
  - b. No workshops were presented. No efforts were made to network and recruit. No materials were posted on the GenEd website.
  - c. The Board met with the new assessment coordinator for the GEO and the GEO director to discuss future assessment plans for the HAP Focus designation. Based on the preliminary discussions, the assessment may require networking and presenting workshops to faculty to recruit them to participate in assessing the HAP focus designation of their courses.
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.)
    - i. No end-of-semester survey was used.
  - b. How effective were the Hallmarks in designating courses that meet the spirit of the Foundations or Focus area?
    - i. Unable to answer since no assessment data is collected.
6. What are the Board's current concerns and issues?
  - a. Our current concerns and issues are the lack of assessment/assessment data of the HAP focus designation and the need to have a system and central place to manage the working and archival files of the HAP board.
7. What are the Board's future priorities and goals?
  - a. Our future priorities and goals are to develop an assessment plan in collaboration with and direction from the GEO assessment coordinator.
  - b. Finalize the explanatory notes in collaboration with the HAP Systemwide Board.

---

## Oral Communication Focus Board

---

Reporting Period: AY 2018-19

Prepared by: Andy Reilly

Board members: Andy Reilly (chair), Eve Millett (co-chair) Jaymian Urashima, Joel Moffett, Leilani Dawson, Garrett Apuzen-Ito (GEC liaison)

### 1. Policies and Hallmarks

Issues included the use of visual aids to meet OLO4. Some visual aids seem unnecessary or not aligned with the oral activity. Future boards should pay attention to the wording, which implies that if a visual aid is not appropriate or aligned with the oral activity, then it should not be included as an oral activity. In addition, OLO4 may not be needed for every assignment, therefore this should be addressed/discussed by the GEC.

In the case of a course with variable credits, future boards should request that syllabi address all the variations of meeting the hallmarks per credit variation (e.g., what is required for a 1 credit course, for a 2 credit course, etc.)

### 2. Proposal Review

The instructions for developing a proposal should require that each syllabus includes a statement that the course is designated as oral focus and therefore will address the hallmarks. A future board can develop the specific statement.

The most common issue is the grade percentage to meet Hallmark 1 (e.g., 40% for a 3 credit class). Many of the assignments reviewed were not oral activities, or assignments had multiple components (e.g., part written, part oral) that in total added to 40% but when parsed out by oral activities only was less than 40%. For clarity, each assignment should be parsed out by percentage that contributes to the hallmark. It would also help to add a statement to the proposal or in an "explanatory notes and helpful tips" section: "Note: Be sure the portions/percentages of each class activity/assignment towards the final course grade sum to 100%, be consistent between the focus proposal and the syllabus, and meet the minimum required percentage for the focus designation."

It would also be beneficial to add a checklist to the end of each focus proposal so that each applicant can check off the requirements: e.g., complete form A, complete form B, include the course syllabus, the course syllabus clearly describes how the course meets the focus hallmarks, portions/percentages of each class activity/assignments equals 40% for a 3 credit class, etc.

Changes to the form were discussed and provided to the GEC in preparation for the new electronic system. The board is in favor of using the O chart developed by previous O Boards.

3. Current Status of Offerings

<b>O Board data for annual report AY 2018-19</b>					
as of 4/24/19					
O Focus proposals reviewed in:	Total number reviewed	Number approved	Number denied	Number withdrawn	Number requiring follow-up
Fall 2018	60	56	1	3	12
Spring 2019	46	46	0	0	22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>
Outcome of negotiations (those requiring follow-up)					
O Focus proposals reviewed in:	Number requiring follow-up	Number of proposals revised and approved	Number of proposals revised but not approved	Number of approvals withdrawn	
Fall 2018	12	9	1	2	
Spring 2019	22	22	0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	

4. What efforts were made in the area of faculty development?

Yao Zhang Hill from the UHM Assessment Office proposed the idea of developing workshops and continuing faculty-lead meetings the O-board. While the board liked the idea, the board members did not have the time to develop and curate workshops and meetings. This may be something for future boards to consider.

5. Assessment

It appears that the Learning Objectives and "Explanatory Notes and Helpful Tips" are closer to the spirit of the OC Focus than the OC Hallmarks.

## 6. Board's Current Concerns and Issues

There was discussion about the distribution of requirements between oral and written communication in Gen Ed. It was noted that writing has a foundations requirement as well as five required classes in the W Focus, whereas oral communication requires only one focus class. The board discussed possibly bringing the two into closer balance (e.g., 4 classes in W and 2 in O, or adding a Foundations class in oral communication).

The reason to consider doing this would be to strike a balance more in-line with the needs expressed by employers (evidence provided by Jaymi Urashima, Communicology Department, but more exploration is needed), and allow students to develop more mature oral communication skills. Also, the O Board is seeing more O classes satisfying the requirements by students making online video presentations. We recognized that this a world trend that is likely to grow, and thus online video production should be valued as O communication, but we also felt that adding a second O class would provide an avenue for (all) UHM students to gain practice speaking to and engaging with a live audience.

In addition, there was discussion consistency in the preparation of some faculty to teach and deliver communication courses. These discussions were preceded by poorly-written applications and subsequent emails and phone communication. While this may not be the purview of the O board, it should be a topic of discussion for the GEC on how to ensure quality teaching in focus classes.

## 7. Future Priorities and Goals

The Board is looking forward to helping implement the upcoming change from paper-based submissions to electronic submissions.

---

## Writing Focus Board

---

Reporting Period: AY 2018-19

Prepared by: James Potemra, Chair and Lisa Fujikawa

Board members: Christine Beaulé (General Education Office Director, ex officio), Curt Daehler, Daphne Desser (Rhetoric & Composition Director, ex officio), Lisa Fujikawa (GEO liaison), Kenton Harsch (English Language Institute Director, ex officio), Ruth Hsu, Jacqueline Ng-Osorio, Andrew Nguyen, James Potemra, Sandra Schwartz (on Study Abroad in Spring 2019), Grayden Solman, Halina Zaleski (General Education Committee liaison)

### 1. Regarding Policies and Hallmarks:

- a. Did the board make any policy recommendations this year? If so, what was the rationale for those recommendations?
  - i. The W Board, via working with various faculty members who submit proposals, was very much in favor of the resolution to have a single, course-based proposal.
  - ii. Chair and Vice Chair. The W Board worked for the first time with a Chair and Vice Chair who were elected by the Board. (Previously, the MWP Director served as the Chair.) While this did not seem to hinder any of the Board functions, it did not really provide any real benefit. As in past years, the Board relied heavily on the General Education Office (GEO) for help in calling for and running the meetings.
- b. If applicable, share any issues raised at the System level and whether there has been any resolution to those issues.

At the annual Systemwide meeting of UH Composition Directors, articulation of introductory composition courses from non-UH-System institutions in Hawai'i was discussed, with the campuses resolving to work toward standardizing the UH equivalencies.
- c. What observations can the board share as to whether there are any problems with how the Hallmarks are being interpreted or applied?

The Board did not see any issues with the Hallmarks. However, it was noted that matching the Hallmarks as discussed in the proposal to the actual syllabus was sometimes difficult.
- d. Does the board have any recommendations regarding Hallmark revisions?

No.
- e. Are there any concerns or issues that the board has identified but not been able to address?

The W Board discussed two concerns during the past year. First was the issue of multiple designations for a single class. Some Board members wondered how effective the instruction on writing, for example, would be if the class also had an oral (and/or other) designations. This was particularly questionable when attributing the grading

percentages (e.g., W getting 40% and O another 40%, and how to tell these were independent). Second, some on the Board questioned the degree to which classes offered outside the traditional writing disciplines were effective at teaching this aspect. For example, some schools (e.g., Engineering) do not teach writing per se, but they do teach domain-specific written communication. It was argued in these cases that the W Board should focus on the proposal for the class and whether or not the proposer satisfactorily met all the criteria. It was not the purview of the W Board to evaluate the ability of the individual instructors.

## 2. Regarding Proposal Review:

- a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration this academic year?

The W Board reviewed a total of 256 proposals in AY19. They approved 249 proposals, had 4 withdrawn, and denied 3 because they did not meet the Hallmarks, even after negotiation with the instructors.

- b. To date, how many courses are offered in this designation? How many students were enrolled?

Approximately 1,350 W sections were/are being offered in Spring, Summer, and Fall 2019, which amounts to over 24,000 seats. Over 15,000 of those seats have been filled, with more expected after new/transfer students finish registering for Fall 2019.

- c. How many proposals required revision? What was the outcome of negotiations engaged in this year (i.e., number of proposals revised and approved, number of proposals revised and not approved, number of proposals withdrawn)?

In AY19, 107 proposals required some sort of follow-up with the instructor. All but a handful of these "negotiations" resulted in approval of the proposal.

- d. Did the board establish or change any procedures that may help future boards?

Course-based proposals were again reviewed by 5 voting members of the W board in a rotation of assignments among those members, in order to meet a request made by the GEC. That procedure, implemented in the Spring 2018 semester, seems to be working well, although it is somewhat labor intensive for the GEO liaison, who needs to equitably assign proposals to each Board member and then remind them which proposals to review.

- e. Does the board have any recommendations regarding the proposal form or proposal review process? Include the rationale for these proposed revisions.

- i. The W Board would like to see the return of the summary table (exists for course-based but removed for instructor-based). This table allows for a quick overview of the proposed class and WI metrics. In addition, the Board would like to encourage proposers to include where in the proposal each Hallmark is addressed and/or have the proposer highlight that information in the syllabus.

- ii. A consistent shortcoming in proposals and syllabi is the lack of detail as to how students will receive feedback. The Board suggested words be added to the proposal form reminding faculty that the students do not see the actual proposal but only the syllabus.
- iii. The Board noticed a fair bit of discrepancy between syllabi, with some schools including statements about various resources available to students. It was suggested that W syllabi include a statement about such resources available to help students with their writing.

3. Regarding Faculty Development:

- a. Describe any workshops conducted, networking and/or community-building efforts made, and resources accrued to promote best practices.  
The Board did not conduct any workshops but did work with individual faculty as needed to help them understand the Focus designation process and the W Hallmarks. The Board also identified strong proposals that might be used as exemplars on the new GenEd website.

4. Regarding Assessment:

- a. What efforts were made this year to assess the effectiveness of the requirement and/or any WASC core competencies?  
Assessment efforts this year were more overarching and focused on developing a comprehensive multi-year assessment plan for the GenEd Program as a whole. The plan was approved by the GEC this semester, with hopes of beginning implementation in the Fall.
- b. What observations can the board share as to how departments and instructors are assessing whether Gen Ed Hallmarks and learning objectives are being met?  
This assessment is largely happening within departments and individual courses, and the W Board recognizes the need for more programmatic assessment of specific learning objectives and writing skills. The hope is that this need will be addressed with the new assessment plan.