ANNUAL REPORTS

Each May the chair of the GEC submits an annual report to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). Diversification, 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 to facilitate drafting of the 2022-23 reports can be found below.

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?

GEO will provide the data for questions 2a & b and question 3 (those in italics; please leave blank in your report).

2. Proposal Review
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?
   b. How many instructors were contacted because their proposal fell short of the Board’s expectations? What was the result of the negotiation (number revised and approved; number denied)?
   c. Changes in procedures: Did the Board establish or change any procedures that may help future Boards keep the business of the board running smoothly? What should future Boards beware of?
   d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.

3. GEO will provide data on the current status of offerings (e.g., courses and number offered, number of students enrolled).
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 Diversification, 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 Diversification, 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 2022-23

Prepared by:  Scott Rowland, Chair

Committee Members:  Jenny Brown, Matt Eng, Kahea Faria, Dan Harris-McCoy (Secretary), Keahiahi Long, Nadine Ortega (Vice Chair), Scott Rowland (Chair), Mandy Westfall-Senda, June Zhang, Christine Beaule, Paul McKimmey, Ryan Yamaguchi, Shana Brown (SEC liaison), Lisa Fujikawa (GEO liaison), Vicky Keough, and Rosalie Paradise

Forthcoming
Diversification Board

Reporting Period: AY 2022-23

Prepared by: Diversification Board

Board Members: Derek Furukawa (Chair), Camaron Miyamoto, Jesse Owens, Jonathan Young, Daniel Harris-McCoy (GEC Liaison), Rosalie Paradise (GEO Liaison)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
      • To continue to review existing Diversification courses if they are being brought forth for course changes

   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
      • No 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?
      • With the increased interdisciplinarity of courses, there are some prevalent areas where courses struggle to meet the ⅔ threshold, so close attention needs to be paid to specifics outlined in syllabi
        o DP vs DB (ie: environmental science)
        o DS vs DH (ie: xxx studies courses)
        o DH vs DA (ie: Music appreciation)
      • There should be a formal appeals process to follow in case folks disagree with a decision by the board (ie: decision to remove diversification designation) as well as a best practice for working with departments prior to the final decision to ensure sufficient due process for the review

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2022</th>
<th>Spring 2023</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals (UHM forms)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Evals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   o Reviewed in Fall 2022:
     • Approved: 134
     • Approved with revisions: 1 (TCE)
     • Denied: 6 (5 TCEs, 1 UHM)
     • 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)?
   • In Fall, out of 141 proposals, 1 instructor (0.7%) was contacted. In Spring, out of 88 proposals, 1 instructor (1%) was contacted.
   • Overall, 1 proposal was approved with revisions. There were 9 proposals denied and/or 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?
   • No.

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)
   • Build-A-Div Workshop held on October 6, 2023 via Zoom, coordinated with the Center for Teaching Excellence. Presented by Diversification Board members
     o Summary: Presentation focused on the hallmarks of the diversification categories, where areas of common overlap occur, and what should be focused on when proposing a course for Diversification to increase its chances of receiving the designation.

5. Assessment
   a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Foundations or Focus area’s student learning outcomes?
      • N/A
   
   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 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?
   • Currently, the Board is reviewing 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 Engineering, JABSOM, and College of Education.

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.
     o We have continued 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 UH and 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.
     o 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.
• Challenge of making a useful faculty oriented workshop that encompasses all of the Board’s areas of oversight. There are so many areas that fit into proposing and teaching a Div course, and each of the diversifications are so different it has been difficult to narrow down what exactly will be useful. Need more information from faculty in terms of needs for confidence in preparation for proposing a Div course.

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.
• Since assessment was conducted at the end of the year, the Board will discuss potential for further assessment.
• The Board will also discuss whether guidelines for dealing with multidisciplinary courses can be created to help guide these (primarily) transfer courses.
Contemporary Ethical Issues Board

Reporting Period: AY 2022-23

Prepared by: Contemporary Ethical Issues Board

Board members: Rayna Fujii (Co-chair), Seungoh Paek (Co-chair), Garrett Clanin, Atsushi Hasegawa, Eve Millett, 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?
      • This year we worked with a revised proposal form and added in a table for applicants to fill in with information regarding how they were addressing ELO in their courses through various instructional activities, assignments and assessments. IF applicants did not fill in the table or the information in their table was not reflected in their attached syllabus, the E board went back to the professor for clarification.
   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?
      • Similar to last year, this academic year we required professors 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 still confused the Hallmarks with the Learning Outcomes.
        o To address this issue, the Proposal Form was revised last to include a table this year for professors to describe how they were addressing the ELOs directly in class. However, the board still found that applications often did not have E hallmarks marked or they were marked incorrectly as ELOs. Moreover, we have also collaborated with professors who applied for E focus this year to provide exemplary syllabi for new applicants to review before they submit a proposal.
        • For question #3 on the proposal form, the E board is also checking that the ELOs described in the table are represented in the syllabus as well.

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 2022:
        o Approved: 10
        o Approved with revisions: 1
        o Denied: 0
        o Withdrawn: 0
      • Reviewed in Spring 2023:
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)?
   - In Fall, out of 10 proposals, 1 instructor (10%) was contacted. In Spring, out of 25 proposals, 5 instructors (20%) were contacted.
   - Overall, 6 proposals were approved with revisions. There were no proposals 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?
   - There were no major changes made to any Board procedures this year.

d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
   - This year we do not have any proposed changes to the questions in the proposal.
   - We are adding a link to resources to help future applicants.
   - We are modifying the E Focus submission Checklist: It currently asks that E hallmarks and ELOs be marked in the attached syllabus. We are planning to revise the language so that it is clearer to applicants that they need to mark both the E Hallmarks and the Ethical Learning Objectives (ELOs) in their master syllabus.

3. What is the current status of offerings (e.g., courses and number offered, number of students enrolled)? This semester (Spring 2023), 145 E Focus sections were offered, with 3,118 students enrolled. In Summer 2023, 65 E classes are currently available, with 786 students currently registered. For Fall 2023, 119 E sections have been scheduled thus far, with 2,150 students registered (not including incoming freshmen and transfers). [Note: Numbers include Outreach/Extension sections and may be somewhat inflated, as they are not adjusted for crosslistings, dual listings, and Here or There (HoT) sections.] More enrollment details will be provided in the 2023-24 Gen Ed Handbook, which will be published later this summer.

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 we spent time pulling exemplary proposals and creating a resource for future applicants. We also coached and supported professors via email when they were asked to submit clarifications or revision on their proposals.

5. Assessment
   a. Was an end-of-semester survey form used? No end-of-semester survey form was used.
      Were changes made to the form? List the changes made, if any, and rationale behind the change. What were the results? Please see question #2d for proposal form changes and rationale.
b. How effective were the Hallmarks in designating courses that meet the spirit of the Foundations or Focus area? 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. We have selected specific proposals submitted this year to show future applicants a variety of ways to effectively mark their syllabus with the E hallmarks.

6. What are the Board’s current concerns and issues? While there were a significantly fewer number of combative/rude emails sent to the board this year, we still did receive a couple that were unprofessional. We all did our best to still support these professors in understanding what edits needed to be made getting their revisions in for approval, but it is upsetting because the board correspondence has always been courteous, supportive and informative, never warranting any type of rude response.

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
   • Preparing for assessment year
   • Continuing to look for exemplary proposals and other supportive resources to help professors not only with their E focus proposals, but also their ethics instruction
Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Focus Board

Reporting Period: AY 2022-23

Prepared by: Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Board

Board Members: Konia Freitas (Co-Chair), Donna-Marie Palakiko (Co-Chair), U’ilani Chow-Rule, Joseph Foukona, Pia Arboleda, Kahea Faria (GEC liaison) and Christine Beaule (GEO liaison)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
      • No policy decisions made this year.
   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
      • No Hallmarks revisions made this year.
   c. Is there any information the Board could furnish future Boards about how Hallmarks were interpreted and applied? Were there problems with interpreting Hallmarks?
      • See #6 below.

2. Proposal Review
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?
      i. Reviewed in Fall 2022:
         • Approved: 1
         • Approved with revisions: 0
         • Denied: 0
         • Withdrawn: 0
      ii. Reviewed in Spring 2023:
         • Approved: 12
         • Approved with revisions: 1
         • 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.)
      i. In Fall, there was only 1 proposal, which was approved without negotiation. In Spring, out of 12 proposals, 1 instructor (8%) was contacted.
      ii. Overall, only 1 proposal required revisions before approval. There were no proposals 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?
   i. Generally, at the beginning of each new academic year, the Board should the General Education website and Laulima site
      • Review the Gen Ed website to locate and review all foundation, diversification and focus requirements, and the resources available to faculty including a review of the existing proposal support examples.
   ii. Locate and review the HAP Board Laulima site, especially the
      • HAP Board review sheet
      • HAP meeting agenda and notes
      • HAP Board shared drive especially the review instruction for HAP Board, Laulima
      HAP proposal review instructions F20, Draft negotiation emails, etc.

d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
   i. Possible changes are pending review in spring 2023

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. This semester (Spring 2023), 88 HAP Focus sections were offered, with 2,265 students enrolled. In Summer 2023, 41 HAP classes are currently available, with 440 students currently registered. For Fall 2023, 89 HAP sections have been scheduled, with 1,323 students registered thus far (not including incoming freshmen and transfers). [Note: Numbers include Outreach/Extension sections and may be somewhat inflated, as they are not adjusted for crosslistings, dual listings, and Here or There (HoT) sections.] More enrollment details will be provided in the 2023-24 Gen Ed Handbook, which will be published later this summer.

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. A professional development workshop was held in fall 2022, entitled “Learning from Experience: The Intersection of Health Sciences and Native Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues” through the Center for Teaching Excellence
   b. The previous year’s workshops provided a well rounded set of professional development content that addressed HAP applications.
      i. Several workshop recordings (from CTE) can be accessed and used as reference for faculty who may benefit from the information (see HAP Laulima site, HAP Board shared drive, workshops folder).

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?
      i. No there was no end of year survey
   b. How effective were the Hallmarks in designating courses that meet the spirit of the Foundations or Focus area?
      i. Generally, the HAP hallmarks continue to fulfill the goals of the Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific focus area.
6. What are the Board’s current concerns and issues?
   a. There may be opportunity for the Board to review the hallmarks and suggest changes in the coming year especially given the assessment redo.
      i. For example, the SLO and their application is important to the assessment process. The assessment process in turn can identify gaps in interpretations of the hallmarks and identify various ways to document/evidence student learning.
   b. Continue to request exemplary proposals that clarify for faculty how SLOs are applied in classes across disciplines.
   c. When reviewing applications, there was discussion about how programs can adequately address through course work, the intersection between Hawai‘i and Asia/Pacific. Also, how does this intersection relate to the broader goal of making UH Mānoa a Hawaiian place of learning.

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
   a. Redoing the assessment with an assignment that gives students the opportunity to demonstrate their learning in SLO #4.
   b. Ensuring that Hawaiian language is a part of the overall general education redesign, HAP Board comments January and October 2022.
   c. The HAP proposal will be reviewed by the Board at its April 2023 meeting, possible changes may be suggested.
1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
      • The OC Focus Board has not made any changes to our policies or to the OC Hallmarks so far this academic year (as of April 17th, 2023).

   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
      • (Same answer as above.) The OC Focus Board has not made any changes to our policies or to the OC Hallmarks so far this academic year (as of April 17th, 2023).

      Though no changes were made to the information included in our Explanatory Notes and Helpful Tips, notes were reordered for the purposes of highlighting key information that was sometimes omitted during the 2021-2022 academic year.

   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?
      • We here highlight Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes that elicited greater attention throughout the proposal review process throughout 2022-2023.
        o Hallmark O3 states “Each student will receive specific feedback, critiquing, and grading of the oral communication assignments or activities from the instructor”. We have seen an increase in the use of peer and self assessment practices in proposals, in lieu of instructor feedback. As a compromise, we have generally required proposals to either a) combine peer and self assessment with instructor feedback, or b) provide a detailed explanation on how students will be trained to provide peer and self feedback. We propose adding the following **Explanatory Note**:
          • “Instructor feedback is preferred and highly encouraged. While peer and/or self feedback is acceptable, training procedures for such types of feedback should be clearly described in the course syllabus.”

        • The second primary concern has been an increased use of “participation”, as an oral communication assignment. The current Explanatory Note reads “Simple class attendance does not constitute an oral communication activity and may not be counted toward the required percentage. If class participation is included in an oral activity, syllabi must include a description of how the quality and quantity of participation will be assessed”. Few applications provide enough information for the committee to determine how and to what extent participation is actually assessed,
nor the criteria for strong vs. weak performance in this regard. This has required substantial time on the part of committee members in clarifying our requirements to submitters. *We propose the following revisions:*

- We will seek permission from the instructors of previously accepted proposals with a strong participation component to include in our set of example proposals.
- We will revise the current **Explanatory Note** to read "Simple class attendance does not constitute an oral communication activity and will not be counted toward the required percentage. If class participation is included in an oral activity, syllabi must include a description of how the quality and quantity of participation will be assessed. This includes criteria that differentiates between high and low quality participation, and how students will receive feedback on their participation throughout the semester”.

- A third point of concern involves the required submission of an assessment tool, currently described in the **Explanatory Notes** as “Rubrics are required in addition to syllabi”. This request additionally appears on page 16 of the “Instructor-based Proposal Form”. For some proposals, the required rubric is not submitted. For others, the rubrics submitted are not applicable to the activities they are proposed to assess. *We propose that the Explanatory Note (and related text on page 16) be revised as follows:*
  - "Detailed evaluation criteria per oral communication activity should be included in each syllabus. This should make clear how feedback will be provided (e.g., checklist, holistic rubric, analytic rubric) and the foci of this feedback. This may be in the form of a descriptive summary or a fully developed rubric if available.”

- One additional concern was that proposals frequently differed between what was included in the proposal form and in the syllabus, which required committee members to request greater alignment between the two. *We propose to add the following clause to page 16 of the “Instructor-based Proposal Form”, which will align our form more closely with that of the W Board. This clause will go between "All information provided on this chart should also appear on your syllabus, which should be marked to expedite Board review” and "Please use as much space as needed to elaborate on your answers”, directly above the table to be completed.*
  - "The Board strongly recommends copying and pasting relevant sections from your syllabus into the chart.”

- A final point revolves around second/additional language courses. The oral needs of such courses differ quite markedly from non language courses, and thus have at times appeared to create confusion for submitters as they negotiate OC Focus Board requirements with those of developing learners's general oral proficiency in an additional/second language. *To help in this regard, we propose the following:*
  - to seek permission from the instructors of previously accepted language proposals that highlight ways in which instructors can meet our requirements while still providing the types of activities that meet the language development needs of learners.
2. Proposal review
   a. How many proposals were approved, denied, and withdrawn from consideration?
      i. Reviewed in Fall 2022:
         a. Approved: 8
            o 20 Max Enrollment: 8
            o 30 Max Enrollment: 0
         b. Approved with revisions: 7
         c. Denied: 0
         d. Withdrawn: 0
      ii. Reviewed in Spring 2023:
         a. Approved: 29
            o 20 Max Enrollment: 25
            o 30 Max Enrollment: 4
         b. Approved with revisions: 21
         c. Denied: 0
         d. 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 (i.e., number of proposals revised and approved or denied)?
      • In Fall, out of 8 proposals, 7 instructors (88%) were contacted. In Spring, out of 29 proposals, 21 instructors (72%) were contacted.
      • Overall, 28 proposals were approved with revisions. There were no proposals 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?
      • No explicit changes to procedures were made during the past academic year. Substantial revisions to board procedures (e.g., policies, hallmarks, procedures, applications) were made after 2020-2021 (during which the current chair served as a committee member). Current procedures follow those established at that time. Given the change from allowing course- and instructor-based proposals to (primarily) only course-based proposals, established procedures seemed to be the best path forward for the past year.
   d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include the rationale for the changes.
      • Yes. On page 16 of the “Instructor-based Proposal Form”, we added the following:
         o A link to board-approved sample proposals for the purposes of providing examples from which new proposals could be modeled.
         o An explicit statement mandating the following be included in all syllabuses: “Only students who satisfactorily complete the oral communication assignments will be allowed to pass the course with a “D” or better”.
      • On pages 17-19 of the same form, we added the following:
         o A clarification question regarding the intended student enrollment cap in the course (20 vs. 30). This was done primarily to ease the review process of the board, as the allowable enrollment is tied directly to the type of feedback provided to students.
3. What is the current status of offerings (e.g. courses and number offered, number of students enrolled)?
   • This semester (Spring 2023), 195 O Focus sections were offered, with 2,115 students enrolled. In Summer 2023, 62 O classes are currently available, with 526 students currently registered. For Fall 2023, 178 O sections have been scheduled thus far, with 1,579 students registered. [Note: Numbers include Outreach/Extension sections and may be somewhat inflated, as they are not adjusted for crosslistings, dual listings, and Here or There (HoT) sections.] More enrollment details will be provided in the 2023-24 Gen Ed Handbook, which will be published later this summer.

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).
   • In previous years, the O Board has offered workshops in collaboration with the Center for Teaching Excellence. However, on request from Christine Beaule, the time typically spent on workshop development was dedicated to brainstorming criteria for revised oral learning outcomes and hallmarks at both a foundations and focus level, should such criteria be necessary for a revised general education curriculum across the UH system. Though still works-in-progress, a set of proposed learning outcomes can be found here.

5. Assessment
   a. How has the Board contributed to the assessment efforts of the Focus area’s student learning outcomes?
      • Due to ongoing discussions regarding the development of a revised general education curriculum for the UH system, no particular assessments were carried out in reference to current O Focus student learning outcomes. However, as noted earlier, the O Board was requested to begin brainstorming criteria for Foundations- and Focus-level learning outcomes and hallmarks. Though still works-in-progress, a set of proposed learning outcomes can be found here.

   b. What type of feedback has the Board been given to help faculty reflect on the Hallmarks of the Focus area?
      • As outlined earlier in our report, certain explanatory notes required more committee member feedback than others. These included notes related to how ‘participation’ alone could not serve as an oral assignment, the need for at least a portion of points assigned to an oral assignment to be given for actual oral performance (vs. content included during performance), and the need to include appropriate assessment criteria. Our proposed solutions to these concerns are highlighted in our response to 1(c) above.

   c. How have past OC Focus assessment results been used or plan to be used by the Board?
      • Work on initiatives that arose out of the most recent general education area assessment have been subsumed within/superseded by ongoing, larger system-wide General Education Redesign work.
6. What are the Board’s current concerns and Issues?
   - Acknowledging that previous years have not been devoid of contentious interactions between board members and submitting instructors/programs, such contentious exchanges seemed to be more prevalent during the past year. These exchanges ranged from passive aggressive responses to revision requests to straight up criticism of the entire review procedure. As a board, which is mostly composed of junior faculty members working towards tenure, such exchanges are worrisome, and we would be open to hearing the extent to which other boards have had similar encounters, and of possible mitigation strategies that we might employ.

   • Recruitment to the O board proved challenging this past year. Two seats remained vacant until right before the start of fall semester 2022, with one seat filled through personal recruitment by the committee chair. With three seats to be vacated at the completion of spring 2023, there is some concern regarding the challenge of filling these seats.

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
   - The OC Focus Board looks forward to continued collaboration with the General Education Office and related committees in drafting revised SLOs and Hallmarks that differentiate between foundational and focus oral performance, should our services still be needed moving forward. If not, the board, as it has done in past years, will plan to collaborate with the Center for Teaching Excellence in presenting an oral communication-related workshop during the 2023-2024 academic year. As always, the board will look for ways in which we can revise and strengthen our current practices (including implementing the changes highlighted during this report).
Writing Focus Board

Reporting Period: AY 2022-2023

Prepared by: Writing Board

Board members: Sarah Allen (Chair, Fall 2022), Christopher Au, Clare Fujioka-Sok, Gary Glauberman, Peter Hoffenberg, Ji Young Kim (Chair, Spring 2023, Michelle Manes (Fall 2022)/Justin Walguarnery (Spring 2023), Christine Beaule (ex officio), Priscilla Faucette (ex officio), Scott Rowland (GEC liaison) and Lisa Fujikawa (GEO Liaison)

1. Policies and Hallmarks
   a. What policy decisions were made this year and what was the rationale for those decisions?
      • The W Board decided to formalize the process for making an over-enrollment exception. (A 20:1 student-to-teacher ratio should still be kept by using TAs/GAs or co-teaching.) Departments should submit a request via this Google form whenever an exception is desired. The W board produced guidelines to explain under what circumstances/conditions it is (or isn't) acceptable to have an enrollment greater than 20 in a W course. This information can be found in the W Explanatory Notes, both on the Gen Ed website and on the Focus forms.

   b. What, if any, Hallmark revisions were made? Provide the rationale for the revisions.
      • While no changes were made to the W Hallmarks, the following explanatory note revisions were made:
        o Fourth bullet (addition is in italics):
          The types of writing assigned will vary and may include formal and “informal” (writing that is not revised) writing. Depending on the course content, students may write analytic essays, critical reviews, journals, lab reports, research reports, reaction papers, etc. Note: In-class quizzes and in-class exams where students do not have the ability to make revisions do not count toward the W component of the course. Take-home exams may qualify if the quality of the writing is assessed.

          This modification was made to clarify when in-class quizzes and exams can and cannot count toward fulfillment of the W Hallmarks.

        o Addition of a fifth bullet: Each section of a W course has an enrollment cap of 20 students. Over-enrollment requests will only be considered in specific circumstances. Please see this Google Form for more details and to submit a request.

          This bullet was added to explain that over-enrollment exceptions are possible and to share the Google form by which to make the request.
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 modifications to the Explanatory Notes were made in an effort to help both proposers and W Board reviewers.

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 2022:
        o Approved: 45 (9 with revisions)
        o Denied: 0
        o Withdrawn: 0
      • Reviewed in Spring 2023:
        o Approved: 77 (12 with revisions)
        o Denied: 1
        o Withdrawn: 0
        o Still in review (An early submission for S24): 1

   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.)
      • In Fall, out of 45 proposals, 9 instructors (20%) were contacted. In Spring, out of 77 proposals, 13 instructors (17%) were contacted.
      • Overall, 21 proposals were approved with revisions. There was 1 proposal that was denied because the department didn’t clarify how the course would meet the W Hallmarks.

   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?
      • Because of the reduced number of W proposals that have been received the last few years, the Board agreed to have two (rather than just one) Board members review each proposal.

   d. Were there any changes to the proposal form? Include rationale for the changes.
      • As noted above, the W board decided to formalize the practice of allowing enrollment of more than 20 students when the instructor of record has the help of a TA, GA, or second instructor. (Note that the 20:1 student-to-teacher ratio should be kept by using TAs/GAs or co-teaching.) Departments should submit a request form for each semester the exception is requested. The W board also produced guidelines to explain under what circumstances/conditions it is (or isn’t) acceptable to have an enrollment greater than 20 in a W course.

   e. What is the current status of offerings (e.g., courses and number offered, number of students enrolled)?
      • Every year, well over 20,000 seats in WI classes are offered for Mānoa students. This semester (Spring 2023), 647 WI sections were offered. In Summer 2023, 226 WI classes are currently available. For Fall 2023, 693 WI sections have been scheduled
thus far. [Note: Numbers include Outreach/Extension sections and may be somewhat inflated, as they are not adjusted for crosslistings, dual listings, and Here or There (HoT) sections.]

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)
   • In Spring 2023, a faculty workshop, "New Perspectives on Plagiarism: A More Humane Approach to Teaching and Addressing Source Use," was provided on Tuesday, April 25, from 10:30-11:45 AM at CTE. There were two presenters: Kenton Harsch (retired ELI Director and Undergraduate Coordinator, Second Language Studies) and Betsy Gilliland (Associate Professor, Second Language Studies). The purpose of the workshop was to provide a brief overview of the complexities of defining plagiarism and then introduce a more humane approach to teaching and addressing source use (for more information, see https://www.ofdas.hawaii.edu/events/perspectivesplagiarism/).

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?

   In AY23, no W assessment projects were conducted. However, the Board put together draft Hallmarks and SLOs for the new FW, FW2, and W Focus requirements that were being proposed as part of the Summer 2022 redesign of UH General Education requirements. The draft Hallmarks and SLOs were presented and discussed at a meeting of the Systemwide Committee on Written Communication, where the group agreed on scaffolding W Hallmarks and SLOs and the importance of critical reading, information literacy, and taking a position in discourse.

6. What are the Board’s current concerns and issues?
   • N/A

7. What are the Board’s future priorities and goals?
   • The Board plans to develop an online “mini course” to provide TAs/GAs with training on teaching writing. Initial plans are to put the “less than one hour” course on Laulima and have a quiz at the end. The Gen Ed Office would assist with logistics, such as adding new TAs and GAs to the site each semester. Once created, the course will be the minimum training that would be required of TAs/GAs who are providing assistance to W Focus courses.