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The GEC discussed assessment issues in many meetings and in an assessment retreat in December 2002. General topics discussed include the following:
- WASC requirements for meeting its educational effectiveness standards
- Responsibilities of the GEC, GenEd boards, administration, and academic departments regarding assessment
- General assessment issues: what to assess, who to assess, when to assess
- Development of an assessment plan
- General principles of program assessment
- Issues pertaining to individual GenEd areas

As of January 2004, no plan of action has been approved. No outcomes assessment of Focus, Diversification, or Foundations has started.

Outline of Summary

| 1. WASC | What does WASC require? |
| 2. Responsibilities of units/offices/committees | Who should be responsible for GenEd assessment? |
| 3. Responsibilities related to the creation of learning outcomes | Who should create the learning outcomes? |
| 4. General issues | What are general issues related to assessment? |
| 5. Development of a GenEd assessment plan | What should the assessment plan be like? |
| 6. Focus of assessment projects | What & who should be assessed? |
| 7. Assessment workshops | How can workshops help with assessment efforts? |
| 8. Funding | Who will pay for the cost of assessment? |

| 9. Discussions related to specific steps in the assessment process | A. Determine learning objectives/outcomes  
B. Determine how to measure  
C. Determine how to use assessment results |

| 10. Discussions related to specific GenEd areas | A. Diversification  
Responsibility: hallmarks & learning outcomes; assessment; proposals; S03 pilot project  
B. Foundations  
C. Focus  
Renewal issues and options |
1. WASC
What does WASC require?

-WASC mandates an assessment of the major and general education. (3/7/02)
-UH needs to present WASC with a comprehensive, multi-year plan that reflects our knowledge of assessment. (9/11/02)
-WASC looks for output-oriented objectives: what students are expected to be able to do or demonstrate. (9/18/02)
-WASC states that learning outcomes should be in the course syllabus. (12/4/02)
-WASC will require adherence to the new standards in 2008. The 2003 WASC visit is under the old standards, but we will need to show that we are preparing a plan to meet the new standards. (10/23/02)

2. Responsibilities of units/offices/committees
Who should be responsible for GenEd assessment?

-GEC subcommittee (4/18/02)
-GEC works with Center for Teaching Excellence to assess. (3/7/02)
-GEC works with administration to assess. (8/20/02)
-Boards have primary responsibility to assess. (GenEd Program doc)
-Departments have primary responsibility: GenEd assessment piggybacks on departmental assessment of the major; e.g., Portfolio in a major would include data useful to a Focus board. (10/16/02)
-Assessment will occur at the department level and at the college level. College-level assessments will involve departments in the college. (10/6/02)
-If departments are responsible for assessment (create questions and compile answers), they may not succeed without guidance and support. (12/4/02)
-Rely on campus assessment specialists; e.g., K. Minke, K. Tokuno, M. Lai, to brief the GEC on assessment tools. (9/11/02) (10/16/02)
-Advocate for an assistant vice president for assessment (need a systemic approach to assessment). (3/14/02)

-Need an office to gather data so that it is done routinely. (10/16/02)
-Need institutional research office staff at UHM to help. (9/18/02)
-Need to decide what the GEC’s responsibilities are and what can be delegated to the academic departments. (10/23/02)

3. Responsibilities related to the creation of learning outcomes
Who should create the learning outcomes?

-GEC is responsible for developing learning objectives (2/7/02) (3/7/02) (8/28/02)
-GEC should provide guidelines to the Boards for their work on learning outcomes. (9/18/02) (10/16/02)
-Faculty must determine learning objectives. (3/14/02)
-Boards are responsible for developing learning objectives. (10/9/02)
-W Board created its own mission statement, goals, and learning outcomes. (12/4/02)
4. General issues
What are general issues related to assessment?

- GEC and board chairs discuss assessment. (10/26/01)
- Does the faculty understand and accept GenEd assessment of their courses? (9/18/02)
- Need to assess how GenEd is working in relation to other courses and for the campus as a whole. (10/16/02)
- GenEd assessment & program assessment have different objectives. At what point should there be intersection? (4/25/02)
- GEO should assist in reviewing existing best practices at other campuses, Research I universities in particular. (10/23/02)
- Instructors will tolerate additional paperwork for assessment. (11/27/02)
- What is the goal of general education? How can these objectives be quantified & measured? (2/7/02)

5. Development of a GenEd assessment plan
What should the assessment plan be like?

- Hire a consultant to develop an assessment plan: particular areas to be assessed and the timeframe.
- Have one campus-wide plan? (10/16/02)
- Assessment is a multi-year project. (9/11/02)

6. Focus of assessment projects
What & who should be assessed?

- Assess students’ course-taking patterns. (10/23/02)
- Assess students’ cumulative experiences (e.g., after four years). (3/7/02)
- Sample populations: do not assess every course every semester; do not assess every student. (3/7/02)
  (4/25/03)
- Assess “native” UHM students separately from transfer students.
- Compare students under previous GenEd to those under the current GenEd. (10/16/02)
- Need to assess the collective value of all the courses in a category. (4/18/02)

7. Assessment workshops
How can workshops help with assessment efforts?

- The Administration wants to organize workshops on assessment; continue by drawing from expertise on campus to address different assessment methodologies and GenEd assessment. (9/18/02)
- Need workshops so that there is a foregrounding of outcomes to strive for. (10/23/02)
- Have workshops for the Boards and the GEC coordinated by Administration.
- Invite faculty so that there’s agreement on learning objectives.

8. Funding
Who will pay for the cost of assessment?

- The 2002 VCAA Assessment Fund Committee will give GenEd assessment proposals priority, but call for RFP is campus wide. (3/14/02)
  - RFP should really go to the GEC and its Boards; should not be a campuswide call for proposals; shouldn’t have so many units doing their own thing. (3/14/02)
- Administration has funds available if the GEC has tangible proposals. (9/11/02)
9. Discussions related to specific steps in the assessment process

A. Determine learning objectives/outcomes
- Look at the hallmarks and determine learning outcomes; (10/2/02)
  - Learning outcomes are knowledge or behaviors students should acquire; no one class needs to address all the outcomes. (9/18/02)
- Measure whether the course met the Focus requirements and what the student got from the course. (10/2/02)

B. Determine how to measure
- Use existing data to validate outcomes; e.g., Does writing come to fruition in the major? Do students fulfill the W requirement in their major? (10/16/02)
- Ask departments to explain how their courses fulfill the GenEd requirements. (4/18/02)
- Ask instructors what portion of the course relates to Focus, what part of student work reflects hallmarks. (11/27/02)
- Ask Focus/Foundations instructors how they are assessing their students and use their data. (10/23/02)
  - Most instructors monitor what they are doing in class but their means of data collection might be too informal. Data may exist but needs to be brought together in a meaningful way. (10/6/02)
- Collect syllabi each semester. (12/4/02)
- Consider analytic modes of particular fields. (3/7/02)
- Use embedded exam questions across all sections of a course (not a separate assessment tool). (10/16/02)
- Use portfolios that students keep; faculty panels review them. (3/7/02)
- Use standardized tests. (3/7/02)
  - Difficult to locate suitable ready-made tests. (10/16/02)
- Use a single culminating exam with a couple of instruments instead of multiple tests. (10/16/02)
- Ask instructors to make assessment part of the course design. (10/23/02)
- Assessment needs to be done across departments. (9/18/02)

- The GEC should keep it simple and anonymous; do a pilot study and review the data. Faculty could be asked the questions suggested by Sophian: (12/4/02)
  - Which student work corresponds to hallmarks you’re trying to meet?
  - Which hallmarks were met more fully than others? (First 2 questions would help in assessing hallmarks.)
  - What learning outcomes are derived from your course?

C. Determine how to use assessment results
- How will the UH ensure that the faculty monitor and change courses based on assessment? (4/18/02)

10. Discussions related to specific GenEd areas

A. Diversification
Responsibility
- Assign members to assessment subcommittees. (9/18/02)
- Adopt an assessment plan; form a subcommittee to gather information. (12/13/02)

Hallmarks & learning outcomes
- Faculty teaching Diversification courses need to know the area’s hallmarks. (12/4/02)
- How effective are the hallmarks for Diversification courses? To do assessment, we need to consider what the GEC needs to know, what course instructors need to know, and what the department needs to know now, so that assessment of outcomes can occur later. (12/4/02)
- Options considered to develop learning outcomes: (12/13/02)
- Interview instructors teaching Diversification courses, followed by written survey;
- Send or email written questionnaires to instructors;
- Use focus groups of instructors to gather information;
- Analyze written documents and make sure assessment goals match the Strategic Plan, GenEd Plan, and Hallmarks.

J. Oka draft of Diversification-SS: Learning Outcomes for the Social Sciences and Proposed Timeline for GE Diversification Assessment (10/9/02)

Focus of assessment
- Test by area (e.g., physical sciences), rather than by individual courses. (12/11/02)
- Decide whether Diversification should be assessed at the global level or course level. What works at one level might not apply at the other. (10/23/02)
- Test representative samples of students/classes. (12/11/02)
- Half of UHM graduates are transfer students so their Diversification-course experience might have been elsewhere. How will this affect assessment? (10/16/02)

Methods to measure effectiveness
- Have the Center for Teaching Excellence distribute a mid-semester survey to those teaching Diversification courses. This would bring the hallmarks to the attention of the instructors. (12/4/02)
- Use CAFÉ: e.g., 5-10 questions for the DS area.
- CAFÉ can provide useful formative data. It is the most generally used end-of-semester evaluation on campus. Funding would probably have to be provided for the compiling of composite data.
- Is it possible to find out how many DS courses use CAFÉ?

Proposals
- Run pilot projects. (12/11/02)
- “A Draft 4-Year Plan and 12-Year Cycle,” was proposed by Hilgers and Stitt-Bergh at 12/13/02 Retreat. A 4-year plan is consistent with WASC requirements. The GEC has done front-end (pre-) assessment; we need post-course/program assessment.

- Pilot project in spring 03
- Assessment subcommittee (Hensley, Sophian, Stegenga) collected data in Spring 03. Twelve faculty members teaching Diversification Social Sciences courses were randomly selected; 11 were interviewed. The data has not yet been analyzed but the interaction resulted in positive feedback from the participants.

B. Foundations
- Faculty teaching Foundations courses need to know the area’s hallmarks. (12/4/02)
- Students need to be aware of the methodologies being modeled by the teacher. (12/4/02)
- Need to determine how to assess for designation renewal (12/4/02)
- Collect preliminary data that will determine how to proceed. (12/4/02)
- Use existing data to provide assessment data (11/27/02)
- Send a form at the beginning of the semester that will have to be completed by the end of the term. (12/4/02)
- Ask for an assessment after two years, or for syllabi every semester. (12/4/02)

C. Focus
- Boards decide how to assess their Focus area. (8/27/03)
- Boards have assessment responsibility for courses that have been approved. (4/25/02)
- How many assessments will a student be confronted with if a course has multiple Focus designations? (4/25/02)
Renewal issues—general
-Renewal should be based on “assessment.” (8/27/03)
-Have Hallmarks embedded in learning outcomes and then measuring outcomes could give Boards
information that points out where help is needed; e.g., revising hallmarks. (8/27/03)
-Determine what assessment will take place for renewal. (8/27/03)
-Need to have a plan by January 2004 for Fall 04 Focus renewals. (8/27/03)
-Liaisons should get feedback from their Boards about renewal options. (8/27/03)
-GEO Advisory Board will be asked to devise a process for working toward a fair approach to Focus-
designation renewals. (9/24/03)
-Should there be a uniform policy or should each Board decide on its own assessment criteria? (8/27/03)

Options for Focus renewal requirements
-Focus boards should develop Focus goals and ask faculty to include the goals in their syllabus (this
would help satisfy WASC requirements—but it is not assessment; makes good pedagogical sense;
students would know course expectations.) (9/24/03)
-Instructor self-assessment is a possible assessment method. (8/27/03)
-Instructor submits syllabus and highlights how the hallmarks are being met. (9/24/03)
-Require an evaluation at the end of the semester.
-Require instructors to submit Focus materials from their classes (would not deny renewal based on
materials but would allow for retraining in the Focus area).
-Whatever form the renewal assessment takes, instructors need to be notified as early as possible so that
they can do whatever is needed to comply. (8/27/03)
-To renew the W Focus, an instructor must submit a syllabus showing the hallmarks being applied.
(8/27/03)
-The H Board has students in H classes complete a survey each semester. The surveys will play a role in
renewal considerations for the H designation. (10/2/02)