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 2022 to facilitate drafting of the 2021-22 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   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?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, 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 2020-21

Prepared by:  Jonathan Pettit, Chair

Committee Members: The Chair thanks committee members and the GEO office for their outstanding service this year. These people include: Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Christine Beaule, Shana Brown, Matt Eng, Lisa Fujikawa, Betsy Gilliland, Cari Gochenouer, Kaylie Keim, Vicky Keough, Laura Lyons, Kalikoaloha Martin, Mike Nassir, Mandy Westfall-Senda, and Ryan Yamaguchi. The chair also thanks our SEC liaison, Christine Sorensen Irvine, who has worked tirelessly on behalf of GEC. Finally, the chair would like to offer a special thank you to Ron Cambra who retired from the GEC this spring after decades of tireless support for General Education at UH-Mānoa.

The General Education Committee met on January 7 and 21, February 4 and 18, March 4 and 25, April 15 and 29, & May 6 of this year. During the Spring 2021 semester, the committee addressed the following issues and items:

Issue(s) Completed:

January 7, 2021
Ended Staff-based Proposals
Staff-based proposals were focus proposals a department used to apply for a focus designation for a lecturer or other faculty member who is unknown or has yet to be approved at the time of application. Due to the changes in course-based proposals, which can now be made from the outset rather than requiring at least two iterations of individual faculty approvals beforehand, the GEC decided that the staff-based proposals were not needed and could be submitted as course-based proposals. The GEC unanimously voted to end staff-based proposals.

March 8, 2021
Signed a Memorandum of Understanding between SEC, GEC, GEO, and OVCAA
Three years ago, the GEC and SEC started talks on drafting a new MOU. In August 2020, the SEC sent GEC a proposed revised version of a MOU. The GEC submitted a draft approved by all parties except the SEC in late January. This version was approved and signed by the SEC in February. The new MOU will be included in the General Education Handbook for 2021–22.

April 11, 2021
Drafted a New Governance Doc that was Reviewed by and Re-submitted to the SEC
The governance document for the General Education program is over two decades old. There are many discrepancies in the way that committees and boards are represented, and the General Education Office, the hub of Gen Ed activity at UH-Mānoa, is not even mentioned in the old document. This past semester, the GEC circulated final drafts of the governance doc and had consultations with Boards such as Foundations and Writing about their membership and responsibilities. After the GEC chair and GEO director met for a consultation with the SEC, the
GEC submitted its final version on April 11.

April 29, 2021
*Updated Thematic Pathways for General Education Approved by GEC*

In light of the external report on General Education, which pointed out that students saw their GE requirements as disconnected from their purposes in attending college, the GEC held extensive discussion and development in 2019–20 of Thematic Pathways in General Education (TPGE). The initiative passed in May 2020, but the SEC was concerned that its organization might create undue burdens on faculty members. This past spring, the GEC invited Makena Coffman, Director of the Institute for Sustainability and Resilience, to consult us on the application process of TPGE. The GEC chair and the GEO director also met with the SEC to discuss ways to simplify the TPGE creation process. This led to further discussion and revisions of TPGE; a revised application process was approved by the GEC on April 29, 2021.

May 6, 2021
*Limited Individual-based Proposals*

The GEC voted to limit individual course-based proposals to directed research or directed study and special topics courses. The GEO will notify departments of the change later this summer, and the changes will go into effect for the Fall of 2022 proposal review cycle.

May 15, 2021
*Drafted Six Working Group Reports on Key Competencies*

The GEC also spent time this semester to consider the external report’s call for large-scale curricular reform to allow for greater synthesis and coherence across the entire Gen Ed program at UH-Mānoa. This past semester, the GEC formed two Curriculum Working Groups to brainstorm approaches to two alternative models of Gen Ed curricula. Work began in January and February to select a list of key competencies that were limited or nonexistent in our current curriculum. Over the course of the semester, each working group researched, discussed, and wrote about three competencies for a total of six reports: information and digital literacy, place-based learning, critical thinking & logical/ethical reasoning, civic & community engagement, global citizenship & cultural competencies, and college & life skills. The reports identify what aspects of the competency exist in our present curriculum, what other peer institutions are doing with that competency, and what other information would be useful for making decisions about this competency for revising general education at UH-Mānoa. The reports are being finalized and will be submitted to the GEO in mid-May. These will be shared with participants in the General Education Summer Institute.

**Issue(s) Under Review:**

May 6, 2021
*issuing a report on Hawaiian/Second Language (H/SL) Policy*

The Curriculum Working Group produced a report on the H/SL policy at UH-Mānoa. This report identified the need for clearly defined learning objectives and an application process for these substitutions. The GEC Chair, vice-chair, and GEO Director met with representatives from the Council of Academic Advisors and discussed transferring management of the “culture substitution list” currently in use for the H/SL requirement to the GEC. We expect to form a working group in Fall 2021 to consider possible learning objectives that these courses must meet.
May 7, 2021

Reviewing CAB’s Amendments to Bylaws

The GEC has worked in the past two months with members of CFS and CEE to review and suggest revision to the MFS bylaws. Representatives of all three committees met with representatives from CAB on May 7 to discuss revising the language in the bylaws specifically around continuing committee membership and governance. This revised wording will be introduced in the May 12 MFS meeting.

May 10, 2021

Preparing Three-year Progress Report to the Provost and the SEC

The GEC is required to send the Provost a 3-year report on General Education at UH-Mānoa. This report has been drafted and reviewed by the GEC. By the end of May, the GEC will finalize the report and send it to the Provost and the SEC.

Proposal Reviews by General Education Boards

Contemporary Ethical Issues Focus Board (E) -- Rayna Fujii, Seungoh Paek, Gregory Ravizza (Vice Chair), Karen Selph, Megan Terawaki (Chair), Matt Eng (GEC Liaison), and Vicky Keough (GEO Liaison)

Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Board (H) -- Konia Freitas, Patricia Halagao (Vice-Chair), Keahiahi Long (Chair), James Viernes, Kawēlau Wright, Kaliko Martin (GEC Liaison), Christine Beaule (GEO Liaison)

Oral Communication Board (O) -- Dustin Crowther, Leilani Dawson (Co-Chair), Amy McKee, Jamie Simpson Steele, Jaymian Urashima (Co-Chair), Garrett Apuzen-Ito (GEC Liaison), Cari Gochenouer & Vicky Keough (GEO Liaisons)

Writing Focus Board (W) -- Sarah Allen (Rhetoric & Composition Director, ex officio and regular member), Christine Beaule (General Education Office Director, ex officio), Shana Brown (General Education Committee liaison), Curt Daehler, Clare Fujioka-Sok, David Gustavsen, Kenton Harsch (English Language Institute Director, ex officio), Peter Hoffenberg, Ji Young Kim, Bob Lipske, Lisa Fujikawa (GEO liaison)

Foundations Board (F) -- Baoyan Cheng, Monica LaBriola (Co-Chair), Ramdas Lamb, Sarah Post (Co-Chair), Lauren Prepose-Forsen, Dawn Sueoka, Diana Thompson, Mandy Westfall-Senda (GEC Liaison), Cari Gochenouer & Christine Beaule (GEO Liaisons)

Diversification Board -- John Gagnon (Vice Chair), Shannon Johnson (Chair), Peiling Kao, Jayme Scally, Philip von Doetinchem (Fall 2020), Howard Shen (Spring 2021), Michael Nassir (GEC Liaison), Cari Gochenouer & Lisa Fujikawa (GEO Liaisons)

For total proposals reviewed, see next page.
## Focus Board Review, #21 (Proposals and Focus Exemptions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor-based proposals for F21</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>STAR-based proposals for F21</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Course-based proposals for F21</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Focus Exemption</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Grand TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- For E, the 27 instructor-based proposals for F21 include 4 that were reviewed for F20.
- For H, the 7 STAR-based proposals for F21 include 1 that was reviewed for F20, and the 16 COURSE-based proposals for F21 include 3 that were reviewed for F20.
- The above also does not include 3 instructor-based proposals still pending decision as of 03/04/21.

## GECC Review, #21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewed in F20</th>
<th>Rejected in F20</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Foundations & Diversification Review, #21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewed for</th>
<th>Projects/Other forms reviewed in F20</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Transfer credit forms reviewed in F20</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Grand TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- 03/09 - Total does NOT include 1 PR that is still pending decision (and is on the "active" sheet) as of today.
- 04/28 - 04 numbers do NOT include the 4 PCES still pending on the "active" sheet as of today.
Foundations Board

Reporting Period: AY 2020-21

Prepared by: Monica LaBriola & Sarah Post

Committee members: Monica LaBriola (co-chair), Sarah Post (co-chair), Baoyan Cheng, Ramdas Lamb, Lauren Prepose-Forsen, Dawn Sueoka, Diana Thompson, Mandy Westfall-Senda (GEC Liaison), Cari Gochenouer (GEO Liaison)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?

   - A policy/procedural decision was made in conversation and cooperation with the western civilization working group. The group brought it to the attention of the Board that the UHM western civilizations proration policy has been applied unevenly. We held several meetings with the group and others (e.g., History department undergraduate advisor, campus advisors, admissions) to come to an agreement about how to more fairly and consistently apply the western civilization proration policy. We decided that, moving forward, the History undergraduate advisors (and others, as appropriate) will flag all western-civilization-proration-eligible courses when conducting TCEs. These will then be sent to the Foundations Board for final approval, and for Foundations Board advisor members to determine student eligibility. More about this policy and resulting procedures can be found at following links:

     Memorandum of Agreement among the UH Gen Ed Office, Office of Admissions, Foundations Board, Council of Academic Advisors, and History Department: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1pl9NVnmNpg3mmn6fAEuaWHYvff5OWQn/view

     Policy Implementation Guidelines: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1dxWemQELaKqViHzqA5vQzS4dfDgkJOk7J/view

     Western Civ Process Map: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1dBYetwGa1oDGNk36j3CBiozJuvpxb8p/view

   - The GEO also decided that the "western civilization" proration will be broadened to include "world civilizations" beginning in Fall 2021. The Foundations Board will need to work next AY to get procedures in place to review such courses for FG proration. The Board will also need to work to get firmer procedures in place for potential western civilization prorations courses that come to the Board from advisors outside of the History department.

   - GEO, Foundations Board, and academic advisor members will keep track of decisions about course and student eligibility for proration on additional tab on Foundations TCE review sheet.
b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
-None.

c. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how Hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting Hallmarks?
- This year, the Board decided to be more lenient in reviewing TCEs with regard to the following Hallmarks:
1. **FG Hallmark 2&5**: Whereas we would certainly require UHM Foundations courses to have an Oceania element, we decided to be more flexible in applying this standard to TCEs. The reasoning here is that most universities on the continent will not include this; all transfer students will get some Oceania component through the HAP; and if we are accepting western civilization courses as an FG proration, it would be unfair to deny courses that are much more global in scope than a western civilization course only because they don't include Oceania.
2. **FQ**: The Board also decided to approve general statistics classes for FQ TCE. We have been receiving many similar TCEs for introductory statistics courses. Some were approved but some were not, usually based on lack of information in the syllabi. If UHM had an introductory course in statistics, as the other campuses do, most of these courses would transfer in as credit for this course and would receive an FQ designation. So, we decided to award all introductory statistics courses, with an emphasis on real world applications, an FQ designation.

2. Proposal Review
a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Evals (TCEs)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Does not include 1 TCE/Foundations proration request that is pending decision as of 05/03/21.

Out of the 9 proposals that were reviewed for AY21:
Approved = 9
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.)
- Out of a total of 9 proposals that were reviewed, 4 required negotiation. All 4 proposals that required negotiation ended with approval from the Board.
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?
   - The Board started taking meeting minutes, which was not practiced the year before. Meeting minutes can be found at: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o653rRMDwJK3lj9884PAB8UdkaZjil_qpaUEqVuq9Q/edit#heading=h.lesiilm4iigs

d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
   - No.

3. What is the current status of offerings (e.g., courses and number offered, number of students enrolled)?
   - These data will be provided in the Gen Ed Handbook at the end of the academic year by the General Education Office.

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)
   - Spring 2021: The Board held a CTE workshop titled "Navigating Hawaii-Pacific Hallmarks, Resources, Learning Outcomes in Foundations Courses." The workshop addressed the Hawaii and Oceania components of the following FG Hallmarks:
     a. Hallmark #2: Analyze the development of human societies and their cultural traditions through time in different regions (including Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, and Oceania) and using multiple perspectives.
     b. Hallmark #5: Include at least one component on Hawaiian, Pacific, or Asian societies and their cultural traditions.

The Foundations Board described the criteria that the Board considers when deciding whether a course receives an "FG" designation or not, and what a successful proposal includes. A panel of faculty members who currently teach FG designated courses in different departments discussed how their courses meet this hallmark, particularly assignments and resources from their courses that align with this hallmark, emphasizing Hawaii and the Pacific Islands. Additionally, online resources shared through the General Education website will provide examples of and advice for incorporating components on Hawaiian, Pacific, or Asian societies that meet the expectations of the Foundations Board. The faculty panel included:
   - Jonathan Pettit, Religion (REL 170, Religion and the Environment; FGB designation)
   - Seth Quintus, Anthropology (ANTH 151, Emerging Humanity; FGA designation)
5. Assessment
   a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Foundations or Focus area’s student learning outcomes?
      - We have made it a point of emphasis this year to require course renewals to include previous assessment results. This has had a mixed success, due to faculty turn-over some of the previous results were lost. We have worked with departments to ensure continuity of the data.
   
   b. What type of feedback has the Board given to help faculty reflect on the Hallmarks of the Foundations or Focus areas?
      - We have worked with faculty to develop more explicit assessment plans and encouraged them to align assignments with particular Hallmarks and focus their assessment on one Hallmark at a time.
   
   c. How have past General Education area assessment results been used or plan to be used by the Board?
      - Given how much time and effort the Board put into discussions surrounding western civilization proration this AY, we did not really get to focus much on assessment plans. Perhaps this is a point of focus for AY2021-2022.

6. What are the Board’s current concerns and issues?
   - The Board needs further clarification on the exact procedures regarding western civilization proration in terms of course eligibility and student eligibility. More specifically in terms of the role of the advisors on the Board regarding determination of student eligibility, when and how to conduct an eligibility review, where the information will be housed, who will notify them when a student eligibility review is required for a course, etc. Should it be assumed that the advisors automatically also do a student eligibility review for each proration course that comes through? What if the student is not already in STAR? What about students who come later for the same course? How will they be asked to conduct the eligibility review in those cases?

      - The Board is also aware that the western civilization proration review process will become clearer as it conducts more reviews of these courses.

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
   - Establish clear review procedures for western civilization proration course and student eligibility review. Once these are in place following a few rounds of review, the Board may need to work with the western civilization working group to revise the MOU and PIG slightly.
   - Establish clear review procedures for western civilization proration requests that do not come to the Board via the History department academic advisor (e.g., “Humanities” courses).
   - Establish clear review procedures for world civilizations proration requests starting AY 2020-2021.
Diversification Board

Reporting Period:  AY 2020-21

Prepared by:  Shannon Johnson

Board Members:  John Gagnon (Vice Chair), Shannon Johnson (Chair), Peiling Kao, Jayme Scally, Philip von Doetinchem (Fall 2020), Michael Nassir (GEC Liaison), Cari Gochenouer/Lisa Fujikawa (GEO Liaison), Howard Shen (Spring 2021)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
      ● The Diversification Board did not make any formal policy recommendations or decision in AY 2020-2021.
   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
      ● N/A. Hallmarks must be changed at the System level.
   c. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how Hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting Hallmarks?
      ● The Explanatory Notes are helpful in interpreting the Hallmarks. Having individuals who served on the Diversification Subcommittee talk through distinguishing factors for each designation and share their experiences regarding challenging or murky course reviews was helpful in onboarding the new members. While keeping in mind key elements of the Explanatory Notes, the Board established broad yet measurable SLOs for each Diversification designation, which may help provide additional guidance and clarification of the Hallmarks.

2. Proposal Review
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration? (The GEO can provide this information to the Boards.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals (UHM forms)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Evals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>121*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include 4 TCEs that are pending decision as of 4/28/21

Out of the 40 proposals (UHM forms) that were reviewed for AY21:
   Approved = 34
   Denied = 1
   Withdrawn = 5
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.)
   ● Of the 40 UHM forms received, five proposals were negotiated with the instructors. Of those, all five were withdrawn. A sixth UHM form was outright denied the requested Diversification designation. Note that transfer credit evaluations are NOT negotiated.

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?
   ● Following the transition from a subcommittee to a Board in Spring 2020, no additional changes were made this academic year. Having served on the subcommittee and the Board, I can honestly say that the structure and slightly larger size of the group is very helpful in ensuring that the Board runs smoothly and that there is sufficiently diverse expertise to review the broad diversification designations. The biggest challenge for this Board is keeping in mind that the same course content can be taught from different pedagogical frameworks that might warrant a different Diversification designation (e.g., DH versus DS).

d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
   No.

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.
   ● These data will be provided in the Gen Ed Handbook at the end of the academic year by the General Education Office.

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)
   ● N/A

5. Assessment
   a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Foundations or Focus area’s student learning outcomes?
      ● The Board finalized broad yet measurable SLOs for each of the seven Diversification designations, which were approved by the GEC. These SLOs will provide more guidance in designing courses to meet the designations, to evaluate a course request for a given designation, and to assess those courses.
   b. What type of feedback has the Board given to help faculty reflect on the Hallmarks of the Foundations or Focus areas?
      ● Proposals being negotiated typically involve one of two issues. The first issue is asking the faculty to help the Board better understand their pedagogical approach in how they help students learn – are they teaching from a humanities or a social sciences perspective or how much of a science course focuses on biological versus physical science. The second issue usually involves needing more details about assignments that were not included in the syllabus or on their UHM form, which would allow the Board to determine how the course meets certain aspects of the Hallmarks, such as methodological inquiry. The Hallmarks along with the Explanatory Notes and the newly established Student Learning Outcomes are regularly referenced in discussions with faculty regarding Diversification designations.
c. How have past General Education area assessment results been used or plan to be used by the Board?

- Diversification designations have not been assessed, and courses are not submitted for renewal of their assigned designations. The original designations were assigned in circa 2001 by members of the GEC who reviewed the Catalog course descriptions when the current General Education requirements went into effect. Members of the GEC reviewed Catalog course descriptions again in 2006-2008, reaching out to academic departments to discuss adding, changing, or removing designations as appropriate via the appropriate UHM forms. Previously assigned Diversification designations have not been formally reviewed since 2006-2008. This year the Diversification Board began an intentional, iterative 5-year review plan of Catalog course descriptions, dividing the academic colleges and their departments across the first four years, holding the fifth year in reserve if needed. This year we reviewed course descriptions for the College of Arts, Languages, and Letters; Hawai‘inuiakea School of Hawaiian Knowledge; School of Architecture; and Thompson School of Social Work and Public Health.

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

- The current Board has briefly discussed – and tabled for later discussion or deeper exploration – the lens through which we consider a course for a particular Div designation. One area for further discussion is how we define “practice”, especially in the context of art/music, for DA designation. For the DY lab designation, our discussions have been around whether learning to use a tool (e.g., GIS systems) should count compared to true scientific methods (e.g., physics lab). Somewhat related to this have been our discussions as to whether or not Upper Division courses should receive Div designations. General Education traditionally focuses on lower division knowledge, but we are seeing UHM forms for 400-level courses requesting Div designations when they have prerequisites that already include the requested Div designation. We acknowledge that there are students who need Upper Division (UD) credits to graduate and are still missing some GenEd Diversification requirements, and the current model allows them to meet multiple graduation requirements with one course. We have taken a stronger stance in setting the bar higher for UD courses to receive a Div designation looking for a deeper integration of the Hallmarks (e.g., hands-on methodology rather than learning basic information about different types of methodological research). Finally, in reviewing Transfer Credit Evaluations (TCEs), we are seeing a trend in courses from other institutions that are broader Natural Sciences (~50/50 DB and DP) and are interdisciplinary (covering humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences), so they do not meet the 2/3 requirement of our Div designations. When we see transferred courses like these that do not align with our GenEd designations, we try to be as lenient as possible, but we are limited in how lenient we can be without more clearly articulated guidelines. These concerns and issues might be worth considering as GEC reviews the current GenEd requirements and considers making changes.

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

- The Board will continue with the review of courses as part of the 5-year renewal plan.
Contemporary Ethical Issues Board

Reporting Period: AY 2020-21

Prepared by: Contemporary Ethical Issues Focus Board

Board members: Rayna Fujii, Seungoh Paek, Gregory Ravizza (Vice Chair), Karen Selph, Megan Terawaki (Chair), Matt Eng (GEC Liaison), and Vicky Keough (GEO Liaison)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
      i. If the syllabus is unannotated, the entire proposal will be returned without review. This was to ensure that a quality proposal was submitted, as an unannotated syllabus indicates that instructions were not followed.
      ii. If the syllabus only identifies Hallmarks 1-4, then it will be returned to identify Hallmarks instead of Learning Objectives. Without an explicit list of Hallmarks included on the proposal form, many instructors confused the ELOs with the E Hallmarks and inappropriately marked their syllabi.
      iii. Courses that are topic-based must submit Instructor-Based Proposal Forms, due to the variations in topics for a singularly numbered course.
      iv. The Board continues to reach out to encourage eligible courses to submit future proposals for course-based approval rather than renewing instructor-based proposals.
   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
      i. 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?
      i. This academic year, instructors were required to annotate their syllabus to notate how the Hallmarks were being met in the course. They were directed to the General Education Office website to view the Hallmarks. However, it was apparent that some instructors confused the Hallmarks with the Learning Outcomes.
         1. To address this issue, the Proposal Form next year will explicitly state the Hallmarks and Learning Objectives.
      ii. The proposal question regarding assessment often resulted in subpar answers that focused on what students were being graded on, rather than how they would be assessed.
         1. When Board members followed up with instructors and provided the AAC&U VALUE Rubric, instructors took the opportunity to amend the rubric to their course’s assignments.
2. Proposal Review
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration? (The GEO can provide this information to the Boards.)
      i. Reviewed in Fall 2020: 32
         1. Approved: 17
         2. Approved with revisions: 12
         3. Denied: 0
         4. Withdrawn: 3
      ii. Reviewed in Spring 2021: 30 (excludes Disqualified proposals)
         1. Approved: 6
         2. Approved with revisions: 22
         3. Denied: 0
         4. Withdrawn: 2
         5. Disqualified: 3 (courses below 300-level; not included in Review count)
   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. In Fall, almost half of the instructors were contacted. In spring, it was more than two-thirds.
      ii. Overall, proposals were approved with revisions. Those that were withdrawn were proposals in which the instructor did not have time to revise.
   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. This Board took the hard stance of not reviewing proposals that were incomplete (e.g., unannotated syllabi). As such, no time was spent reviewing and discussing proposals until they met submission standards.
   d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
      i. Changes were made to the previous year's proposal. The motivation for making these changes is to reduce the return/revision rate on E focus proposals (see #2 above). Changes were made to Questions 2, 4, 6 and 7. The rationales for making specific changes are outlined below.
         1. Q2. We have asked that focus hallmarks be explicitly listed rather than being revealed by a "hot link". The intent behind this change was to help instructors avoid confusion between focus hallmarks and focus learning objectives.
         2. Q4. This question now asks for a description of contemporary ethical issues rather than a list. The intent behind this change is to discourage faculty from writing proposals which include lists of topics that had no obvious ethical connection without specialized knowledge of the course content.
         3. Q6. This question has been revised to require faculty to explain how they will assess their students’ basic competencies in each Learning Objective based upon the class assignments that incorporate ethics content. In addition, this question has been modified to require that instructor(s) to submit copies of assessment tools they plan to use to
indicate levels of ethical reasoning competency. The intent behind both of these changes is to emphasize the distinction between assessment and grading, and to compel instructors to explain their assessment plans, not just their grading plans.

4. Q7. This question has been modified to require instructors to comment on moderation of online discussion, rather than only asking about facilitation of discussion. The intent behind this change is to compel instructors to anticipate and plan responses to student-to-student online exchanges that may be inappropriate or counterproductive with regard to the course objectives.

3. What is the current status of offerings (e.g., courses and number offered, number of students enrolled)? Contact GEO, gener@hawaii.edu, if you would like to include data.
   a. These data will be provided in the Gen Ed Handbook at the end of the academic year by the General Education Office.

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. N/A

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 form was used.
      ii. See #2d regarding changes to the form proposed for next academic year.
   b. How effective were the Hallmarks in designating courses that meet the spirit of the Foundations or Focus area?
      i. Once properly identified on the syllabi, it was easy for the Board (and hopefully the instructors as well) to notate how the course met the E Hallmarks. The identification of Hallmark E4 was especially helpful in quantifying the percentage of ethics content in the course.

6. What are the Board’s current concerns and issues?
   a. Revising the form for next academic year to be more explicit in identifying the E Hallmarks and explaining assessment.
   b. Preparing for the E Board’s turn in assessment.

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
   b. Brainstorm ideas for website resources and sample proposal responses
   c. Prepare for assessment
Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Issues Focus Board

Reporting Period: AY 2020-21

Prepared by: Keahiahi Long

Board Members: Antoinette Konia Freitas, Patricia Halagao (Vice Chair), Keahiahi Long (Chair), James Viernes and Michelle Kawēlau Wright

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?
      
      For the last 2-3 years, the HAP Board has asked instructors to address Hallmark 4 via a course activity where students engage with Indigenous Hawai‘i, Asian, and/or Pacific communities directly, appropriately, and in ways that support the well-being of those communities. Often, such activities are framed as "Community Engagement" activities, where students perform service work, attend community events, develop materials (e.g. curriculum, social media campaigns) for the communities to use beyond the course, etc.

      Aligning Board expectations with proposer expectations for how to address this Hallmark has been difficult, especially given the pandemic and lack of opportunities for in-person activities. The Board continues to seek ways to mitigate any discrepancies in interpretations of this Hallmark.

2. Proposal Review
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?
      
      Approved = 9
      Denied = 2
      Withdrawn = 4
      Total number of proposals reviewed = 15.
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.)

Out of 15 proposals that were reviewed, 13 fell short of the Board’s expectations and required negotiation. Of these, 7 were approved, 2 were denied, and 4 were withdrawn.

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?

The Board did not make changes to our operating procedures this year.

d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.

As of 4/30/21, the Board did not make any changes to the proposal form. However, the Board is considering changing the language and format of some of the proposal form questions to better clarify and articulate Board expectations. For example, Q1 could be broken up into separate subparts so that instructors distinctly address each of the 4 Hallmarks. If the Board does decide to implement such changes this academic year, we will do so before the end of Summer 2021.

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.

These data will be provided in the Gen Ed Handbook at the end of the academic year by the General Education Office.

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)

This year, to support the efforts of the UHM HAP Assessment Project, the HAP Board hosted "A HAP State of Mind" series in partnership with the Center for Teaching Excellence. The series aimed to support faculty at UHM in developing and proposing HAP focus courses, which are intended to center the perspectives of Indigenous Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific peoples. The series consisted of (3) workshops:

1. He Mookuahau Ko Ka ‘Āina: Our Genealogy of Place, a Starting Point for Developing Hawai’i, Asia & Pacific Courses
   a. November 20, 2020, 11:30a-12:45p
   b. Presented by Dr. Konia Freitas and Dr. Maya Saffery
2. Hulihia: Turning Towards Each Other, Conceptualizing and Designing Hawaiian, Asian & Pacific Courses
   a. February 9, 2021, 12:00p-1:15p
   b. Presented by Dr. Patricia Espiritu Halagao and Cheryl Kauhane Lupenui
3. Making it HAPpen! Examples of Model HAP Designation Proposals
   a. April 22, 2021, 12:00p-1:15p
   b. Presented by Katherine Achacoso and Dr. Derek Taira

As for the GenEd website, both Katherine Achacoso and Derek Taira have agreed to share their syllabi and HAP Focus designation proposal materials on the website. These examples will guide future HAP focus proposers.

5. Assessment

a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Foundations or Focus areas' student learning outcomes?

   As mentioned in Question 4, the Board hosted a 3-part series called "A HAP State of Mind" to support the assessment efforts of the HAP Focus student learning outcomes. HAP Board members also attended and participated in the HAP Assessment Project faculty learning community meetings this year.

b. What type of feedback has the Board given to help faculty reflect on the Hallmarks of the Foundations or Focus areas?

   Typically, Board feedback to proposers includes:
   1. To better address Hallmark 4, consider adding (or building upon existing) activities where students can engage with Indigenous Hawai‘i, Asian, and/or Pacific communities directly, appropriately, and in ways that support the well-being of those communities. Activities can include a community service project, attending community events, interviewing community members, creating materials (e.g. curriculum, social media campaign) that support the goals of those communities beyond the duration of the course, etc.
   2. To better address Hallmark 2, include additional resources created by Indigenous HAP communities, and/or additional resources that significantly promote the values and worldviews of Indigenous HAP communities. Visit the UHM GenEd website for a starting list of suggested resources.

c. How have past General Education area assessment results been used or plan to be used by the Board?

   N/A

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

   As discussed in Question 1c, the Board is considering how Hallmark 4 is addressed in HAP courses. The Board will continue to investigate and think through how to better align proposer expectations with Board expectations for how this Hallmark is addressed.
Additionally, as discussed in Question 1d, the Board is considering making changes to the proposal form to better clarify and articulate Board expectations. Surprisingly, there were several proposals this year that did not include appropriate annotations to the syllabus and/or bibliography; this is an issue the Board wants to mitigate.

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

Given the quality of the CTE workshops for the "A HAP State of Mind" series, the Board is encouraged to continue hosting such workshops in future academic years. Also, the Board will continue to build out the HAP Resources pages on the GenEd website so that instructors have good information to refer to when developing their proposals. Additionally, the Board will continue to discuss possible changes to the proposal form so that Board expectations are articulated clearly and accurately. Finally, the Board will continue to support the HAP Assessment Project.
Oral Communication Focus Board

Reporting Period: AY 2020-21

Prepared by: Leilani Dawson

Board members: Dustin Crowther, Leilani Dawson (Co-Chair), Amy McKee, Cari Gochenouer & Vicky Keough (GEO Liaisons), Jamie Simpson Steele, Jaymian Urashima (Co-Chair), Garrett Apuzen-Ito (GEC Liaison)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?

   The enrollment cap for courses requesting an OC Focus designation is now set at 20 by default; instructors (and/or departmental Focus Coordinators for course-based applications) must specifically request to raise it by specifying in the application how instructors will provide feedback for students. To ensure all students receive sufficient feedback without an overload of work for instructors, courses with a 30 enrollment cap must provide feedback to students primarily in groups of 3 or more (rather than individually or in pairs).

   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.

   We made one revision to OC Hallmark 1 for courses with 4+ credits. The current wording is (as of April 2021):
   “O1. Each student will conduct or participate in a minimum of three oral communication assignments or a comparable amount of oral communication activity during the class. In addition, at least 40% of the final grade for a 3-credit course will be a function of the student’s oral communication activities (30% for a 4-credit course; 60% for a 2-credit course; 100% for a 1-credit course).”

   The new wording (to be implemented for Fall 2021 applications) will be:
   “O1. Each student will conduct or participate in a minimum of three oral communication assignments or a comparable amount of oral communication activity during the class. In addition, at least 40% of the final grade for a 3-credit course will be a function of the student’s oral communication activities (60% for a 2-credit course; 100% for a 1-credit course).”

   We are trying to uphold the quality of OC courses, especially since students are only required to take one during their academic journey. If classes only have 30% of the activities be a function of OC activities, students may not be receiving enough training, practice, and feedback on their OC skills. Moreover, STAR and the current grading system do not allow a separation of course grades from Focus designations. Thus, if a course attributes less than 40% for OC
activities and a student does not complete most or all of the OC activities and still passes the course, they would receive the OC credit without sufficiently practicing their OC skills. By increasing the percentage to 40%, it ensures that students in these courses still need to complete some of their OC work to pass and receive their OC credit. Lastly, by standardizing the requirement of 40% for all courses with three or more credits, we can eliminate some of the confusion for the requirements from OC instructors and Focus Coordinators.

c. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how the Hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting Hallmarks?

OC Hallmark 1: The first issue we faced is how the current Board interprets/decides what constitutes “three oral communication assignments or a comparable amount of activity.” The Board decided that if there are only two assignments listed in the application, but one of them is conducted multiple times throughout the semester, we would count that as a “comparable” amount of activity.

OC Hallmark 3: The second issue we faced was the current Board’s stance on peer feedback (in addition to feedback from the instructor). The Board decided that instructor feedback is necessary for assignments. While it can be paired with peer feedback or self-evaluations, instructors should provide feedback in some capacity. If peer feedback is utilized, the Board would like to see how the instructor will ensure quality feedback to help students improve. This can include providing information about how students will be trained to do peer feedback and what rubric will be used by students.

OC Hallmark 4: The last main issue is how the current Board decides whether a course is eligible for a raised enrollment cap. The majority (over half) of the feedback provided to students by the instructor on their OC assignments needs to be group feedback (i.e. given to at least three or more students at a time) to increase the enrollment cap. If exactly half of the feedback will be provided in groups and the other half is given to individuals or pairs of students, the Board will decide whether it should be approved or not based on the weight each assignment holds.

2. Proposal review
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?
      • Approved = 60
      • Denied = 0
      • Withdrawn = 1*
      • Total number of proposals reviewed = 61
*The "withdrawn" proposal was actually undergoing negotiations, but due to a number of circumstances, the GEO decided to allow the existing O approval to continue until it expires in SS23.
b. How many instructors were contacted because their proposal fell short of the Board’s expectations? What was the result of the negotiation (i.e., number of proposals revised and approved or denied)?

Out of a total of 61 proposals that were reviewed, 39 were negotiated. Of the 39, 38 were approved, and 1 was "withdrawn." (See asterisked note above for #2a.)

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?

With assistance from the General Education Office, the Board has become more attentive to the course description revisions that are required for Course-based Focus application proposals. Specifically, revised descriptions are now all checked to ensure they meet the word count limit and appropriately mention oral communication.

When instructors and/or Focus Coordinators are requesting a new additional Focus and we are reviewing for a pre-existing OC designation, we now treat the application proposal as a renewal if the OC designation would be extended after approval.

The Board is creating a document to keep track of any unusual and rare proposal nuances that we come across. This will help future Boards understand what decisions were made in the past.

d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include the rationale for the changes.

We are changing the wording of OC question 1d to specify that we want to know which OC learning objectives (OLOs) each OC assignment supports, not which course or program learning objectives each supports. We would like to know how instructors are meeting the OLOs in their courses to warrant having an OC designation. However, there seemed to be some confusion with our current application, where they assume we are asking for their course and/or program LOs. Thus, clarification of the wording on our current form will allow us to gather the information we need.

In partnership with the W Focus Board, we are adding a new table that will gather required information for joint O/W Focus requests in one place. When the Board receives applications with a request for both W and O Focus designations, there has been some confusion about what percent of the course is attributed to W and what percent is attributed to O separately. For example, some syllabi will have an assignment with both oral and written components, but just give the overall percentage (e.g., 20% of the final grade) rather than the separate percentages (e.g. 15% for oral, 5% for written). Additionally, the W Board has faced issues with not knowing the page counts for these types of assignments.
We receive a number of applications that require additional contact with instructors and/or Focus Coordinators to gather this information. The O and W Boards hope that this chart will make providing the required information easier and thus lessen the amount of back-and-forth communication between the Boards and with those applying for Focus designations.

We are making plans to bring back the O Chart to the application for the next round of applications. The chart was originally removed from the application in anticipation of an online Focus form, which would not have been able to keep the chart format. However, since plans to go online are now uncertain, the Board has been informed that they can bring back the chart. The board found it was faster and easier to review applications when we received the information about courses in a chart format than in the current format. Moreover, we believe that we receive fewer errors or missing pieces of information when we have the course information in the form of a chart.

3. What is the current status of offerings (e.g. courses and number offered, number of students enrolled)?

These data will be provided in the Gen Ed Handbook at the end of the academic year by the General Education Office.

4. What efforts were made in the area of faculty development? (e.g. describe any workshops presented, explain networking/recruiting efforts, summarize the materials posted on the GenEd website, list system meetings attended).

"Teaching OC Skills in Online Courses," July 20th, 2020

Workshop Description:

This workshop is for any faculty member interested in teaching Oral Communication skills or who is wondering how to pivot teaching Oral Communication to an online environment. A panel of UH Manoa faculty will share a variety of strategies for incorporating Oral Communication in online courses and following their presentation, there will be ample time for Q & A!

More specifically, this workshop will:
- Explore tools for online Oral Communication assignments
- Discuss feedback in online Oral Communication courses
- Discuss assessment of Oral Communication skills in online courses
- Share Oral Communication related resources available on UH websites

This event is presented by the Oral Communication Focus Board and the General Education Office (GEO). GEO works in conjunction with the Board to provide workshops and resources for faculty who either plan to or currently teach an Oral Communication designated course.

Presented by:
- Christine D. Beaule, General Education Office & Department of Languages and Literatures of Europe and the Americas (Spanish)
"Oral Communication Assignment Charrette,” September 9, 2020
Workshop Description:
Do you want to improve the design of your oral communication assignment to maximize student learning in this new virtual environment? Come to this highly interactive workshop to learn oral communication assignment design principles and strategies. Receive constructive feedback from your peers and experts in oral communication instruction and research. Walk away from the workshop with concrete plans to enhance your assignments that lead to deep learning and development in students.

After a brief introduction of the assessment principles and tools, participants will join small group breakout rooms to share and receive peer feedback through a structured discussion, facilitated by experienced oral communication instructors and experts. Our expert team includes Drs. Amy Hubbard, Soo Shin, Jaymian Urashima from Communicology Department, Jenifer Winter from Communication Department, and Dr. Laura Armer, Director of College of Social Sciences Online Programs. Participants will also have an opportunity to share their insights as a group at the end of the workshop.

Workshop registrants are asked to:

● Respond to a short survey before the workshop for the facilitators to arrange breakout rooms.
● Prepare one assignment to share with colleagues during the workshop. It can be a link to a shareable document or you can share your screen during the small group discussion.

This workshop is co-sponsored by the Assessment and Curriculum Support Center, General Education Office, Oral Communication Board and Center for Teaching Excellence.

"Rubric Development for Promoting Oral Communication in the Classroom,” January 29th, 2021
Workshop Description:
Amongst its many duties, the Oral Communication (OC) Board determines whether submitted UH Manoa course proposals meet the requirements to receive an "O" designation, meaning that undergraduate students who enroll in approved courses are able to attain the necessary oral focus credits for graduation.

When applying for an "O" designation, instructors are required to submit a rubric to be used to assess students' oral abilities during class. This workshop addresses three key topics regarding rubric development:

- We describe the criteria that the OC Board consider when deciding whether a course receives an "O" designation or not, and why we require the submission of a rubric;
- We define rubric, and introduce resources readily available through a range of UH Manoa sources, including 'how to' guidelines and sample rubrics;

- With the help of UH Manoa faculty, we provide examples of and advice for developing discipline- or activity-specific rubrics that still meet the expectations of the OC Board.

Presenters will include members of the UH Manoa OC Board, as well as UH Manoa faculty who have experience utilizing oral performance rubrics across a range of disciplines and for different oral activities (e.g., solo and group presentation, teaching demonstration).

Finally, although it is not live on the website at the moment, the OC Board has created a Google Drive folder that includes good examples of past applications. These materials have been shared with instructors that request samples and extra help on navigating our application.

5. Assessment
   a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Focus area’s student learning outcomes?

      The OC Board is planning to support the upcoming assessment of the Oral Communication Focus. The preparations for the assessment effort were expected to begin in the upcoming academic year, but have been delayed since other General Education assessment areas were moved in front of the OC Focus assessment.

   b. What type of feedback has the Board been given to help faculty reflect on the Hallmarks of the Focus area?

      The Board has noted that some OC Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes require more explanation and negotiation than others. In particular, we have needed to give instructors and Focus coordinators more feedback on Hallmarks O1 and O4 (regarding OC course percentage totals and the enrollment cap determination, respectively) than on the other OC Hallmarks. Similarly, the Board has needed to give faculty more feedback on the 1st, 4th, and 7th Explanatory Notes bullets (i.e. regarding attendance/participation, rubrics, and OC course percentage totals, respectively) than on the others.

   c. How have past OC Focus assessment results been used or plan to be used by the Board?

      Last academic year the Board began advocating for a second OC course requirement based on the OC Focus assessment results. While plans to gather data in support of those efforts were delayed due to the pandemic, it remains on our agenda (also see response to question 7). Additionally, the Board has used the OC Focus assessment results to help identify topics to develop workshops around.
6. What are the Board’s current concerns and Issues?

Credit / Non Credit courses: We have received a couple of application requests for CR/NC courses. Because there are no grades associated with these courses, it can be difficult to assess whether at least 40% of the course will be related to meeting the OLOs.

Peer feedback: We are starting to receive more applications that mention the use of peer feedback in their courses. The board has discussed our expectations for this type of activity, depending on how it is being used.

When added as part of the OC grade and percentage total, the board would like to see how students will be trained to provide feedback to other students and how the peer feedback will be assessed by instructors. If peer feedback acts as an OC assignment, it should still help students achieve the OLOs and instructors should still provide students with guidance. The peer feedback assignment would need to be delivered orally, as they would in other oral assignments. Additionally, the board would want to know how instructors would provide training and/or instructor feedback on their peer feedback assignment.

When added as part of the feedback students will receive for assignments, the board is concerned about the quality of feedback students receive for their assignments. The board is concerned when applications indicate that only peer feedback will be provided, without any feedback from instructors. In this case, the board is concerned that students will not receive adequate feedback and that this will affect students’ ability to improve their OC skills. The board would like instructors to provide information on how students would be trained to give adequate feedback to each other. Additionally, the board would prefer that both instructor and peer feedback be provided for assignments, rather than peer feedback alone.

More nuanced distinctions between OC requirements for in-person/hybrid courses, synchronous online courses, and asynchronous online courses: Our current explanatory note for online courses require that students get at least some practice with “real-time” / “live” video communication, where recordings of students are one-shot takes with both audio and visual components. However, this statement is geared more toward asynchronous courses or courses that require recording outside of class. For synchronous courses that have presentations in class, the presentations would likely already be real-time, live presentations. However, it is not always clear in applications whether an online course is synchronous or asynchronous, and/or what type of presentations will be conducted. For example, a hybrid or synchronous course may require some presentations to be pre-recorded to save in-class time for other activities.

Rubrics (& other resources) for non-presentation-based OC assignments: Instructions are starting to use a variety of OC assignments, which is encouraged by the Board. However, to ensure the OLOs are being assessed, the Board requests that rubrics be provided for these assignments. This also helps the Board to ensure that there is
consistency between the activities and the assessment. At times, we have concerns when instructors are using the VALUE rubric, which is a presentation-based rubric, for other types of assignments, like performance-based activities. In these cases, the activity does not match what will be assessed. The Board would also like to be able to provide more resources for instructors who utilize non-presentation-based OC assignments.

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

As briefly mentioned above (question 5c), the OC Board remains interested in gathering data and conducting research in support of a second OC course requirement. Ideally, the data gathered will also help identify what a second OC requirement should look like, i.e., whether it should be for a second upper-level OC Focus course, a lower-division OC Focus credit (as the W Focus has), or an OC Foundations course.

Furthermore, the Board would like to continue building more resources in the General Education website, including adding more samples of rubrics and applications, samples of W/O dual-foci applications, and other resources.

Finally, while the GenEd Summer Institute has not yet begun its work, the OC Board presumes that we will want to adjust our future priorities and goals based on the Summer Institute’s recommendations.
Writing Focus Board

Reporting Period: AY 2020-2021

Prepared by: Sarah Allen, Chair

Board members: Sarah Allen (Rhetoric & Composition Director, ex officio and regular member), Christine Beaule (General Education Office Director, ex officio), Shana Brown (General Education Committee liaison), Curt Daehler, Lisa Fujikawa (GEO liaison), Clare Fujioka-Sok, David Gustavsen, Kenton Harsch (English Language Institute Director, ex officio), Peter Hoffenberg, Ji Young Kim, Bob Lipske

1. Regarding Policies and Hallmarks:

   1. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
      The Board has made one decision.
      i. The board voted to support moving the Foundations-Written Communication (FW) representative from the Foundations board to the W board, which should also necessitate the initial review of any FW proposals by the FW representative on the W board. If approved (as part of proposed revisions to the Gen Ed governance document), this move will centralize the responsibilities for all writing designated courses with a single board, creating the opportunity for the W board to explore and support possibilities for coherence across the FW and W courses offered at UHM.

   2. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
      None.

   3. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how Hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting Hallmarks?
      The Board has noted that writing for exams may count toward the word/page minimums so long as instructors provide opportunities for revision, thus adhering to the Hallmarks that insist on meaningful professor-student interaction for the development of students’ writing.

2. Proposal Review

   1. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration? (The GEO can provide this information to the Boards.) The W Board reviewed a total of 185 proposals in AY21. They approved all but 1 proposal, which was withdrawn. None were denied.

   2. 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.) In AY21, 32 proposals...
required some sort of follow-up with the instructor. Thirty-one of these “negotiations” resulted in approval of the proposal, and one was withdrawn.

3. 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? None. Focus Exemption Applications will be reviewed by the W Board Chair and will be brought to the board if discussion is needed.

4. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
   The W Board completed a revision of the proposal form in order to facilitate applicants’ responses. Changes are as follows:
   i. The W Board added multiple choice options under each of the Student Learning Outcomes questions to provide applicants with recognizable and board-approved options for how they might support the SLOs in a writing intensive course. The multiple choice options should also facilitate the application process, making the process quicker and answers clearer (for both parties—applicants and the board).
   ii. The W Board clarified the language for the item that asks for applicants to explain how they evaluate any group writing assignments to better ensure that applicants adhere to the word count minimums for a W course and that they think about the equitable distribution of labor for students.
   iii. The W Board clarified and reorganized the introductory language for the Writing Intensive section of the long form.
   iv. The W Board worked with the O Board to come up with a question to clearly identify the breakdown in grade percentage for assignments that have both an oral and a written component.

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. These data will be provided in the Gen Ed Handbook at the end of the academic year by the General Education Office.

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)
   The Board organized and facilitated two workshops in coordination with the Center for Teaching Excellence. One included a panel of faculty from across disciplines (the hard sciences to the social sciences to the humanities), who shared sample group writing assignments that they have successfully delivered in their own courses. Then, participants were moved into break out groups, which were led by panelists, in which they talked about group writing assignments that they would like to deliver in their own courses.
   The second workshop included a panel of students, again from across disciplines, who shared their experiences of and perspectives on group work in their courses. They also offered suggestions regarding best practices for the structuring and ongoing support of group work. Participants were then invited to ask questions of participants.
5. Regarding Assessment:
   a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Foundations or Focus area’s student learning outcomes?
   In accordance with the multi-year Gen Ed Program assessment plan, Gen Ed assessment efforts this year were focused on the Foundations-Global and Multicultural Perspectives and Hawaiian, Asian & Pacific Issues requirements. W assessment is projected to be the focus in several years, at which point the Board expects to be more actively involved.

   b. What type of feedback has the Board given to help faculty reflect on the Hallmarks of the Foundations or Focus areas?
   Board members provide individualized feedback to faculty in the course of proposal review. This feedback can vary considerably depending on a course’s particular structure and difficulties. Our members are committed to working with faculty to address challenges and ensure they understand and meet the hallmarks and SLOs for the W focus.

6. What are the Board’s current concerns and issues?
   i. The Board has found that instructors skip over some of the questions on the W form or don’t provide enough information in each. Our hope is that the changes to the proposal form will help with this.
   ii. The Board discussed whether to require submission of a revised syllabus if part of the Board members’ negotiation necessitated revision of the syllabus. Currently, there is no policy that Board members can reference when requesting an updated syllabus from instructors during and after negotiation. Such a policy can assist Board members in enforcing the practice to have W course syllabi clearly address how W Hallmarks and SLO’s for proposed courses are being met.

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
   i. A key priority for the Board moving forward is to work with the Gen Ed Office (GEO) to update and organize W resources for the Gen Ed website. The aim is to provide an organized and curated selection of resources geared towards specific instructor needs, instead of a simple collection of links to other resource pages (e.g., Purdue OWL). Work is ongoing to establish the most useful categorization and organization for these materials.
   ii. To continue to offer workshops that further support the development of more W courses and to provide ideas to incorporate writing into the classroom that supports the course goals. With the upcoming implementation of Course Program of Study (CPoS), it will be even more crucial for students to have access to W courses in their major and related field of study.
   iii. Future discussion with other Focus Boards to encourage proposals that cover more than one Focus designation.