

## Minutes for the 2/17/2012 Faculty Congress Meeting

3:00pm

K124

**Members Present:** Julie Adrian, Jonathan Awaya, Jim Beets, Todd Belt, Emmeline dePillis, Kanoe Elvema, Kekoa Harman, Aaron Jacobs, Yiquing Li, Eileen Lovell, Seri Luangphinit, Sarah Marusek, Fiona McCormack, Mark Panek, Cheryl Ramos, Amy Saxton, Michael Shintaku, Kathleen Stacey, Norm Stahl

**Others Present:** Marcia Sakai, Don Straney

**Members Absent:** Drew Martin,

3:05: Chair Jim Beets convened the meeting.

### I. Approval of minutes from January Meeting

**Motion** to approve as amended: Norm Stahl, seconded by Mike Shintaku, passed unanimously.

### II. Chair's Report

- a. Professional Development Fund: both proposals submitted by Congress have been accepted—the statistics workshop, and the writing assistance overload (description appended below).
- b. Congress is planning a 2-hour faculty forum for sometime in April. Jim Beets asked that members solicit ideas for the forum. Two tentative ideas for the form's focus are related to active and engaged learning techniques (Congress is considering an outside speaker), and developing grant applications. Jim noted that we are trying to give the faculty what they asked for in the Fall survey. He also underscored what he envisioned as the interactive round-table nature of the event.
- c. Jim noted that last year's faculty survey clearly asked for a faculty lounge. He announced that the Faculty and Staff Lanai, part of the library lanai, will be open after spring break. He solicited further input on the lanai's design should anyone have concerns.
- d. Luoluo Hong has taken the responsibility to host a repository for spouses/partners/family members so their resumes can be accessed by potential employers. This comes in response to several requests from faculty—especially junior faculty.
- e. The Chancellor indicated in Monday's meeting with the Executive Committee that the faculty 'Ohana list will be revived, and maintained and monitored here on campus.
- f. Julie Adrian has compiled the numerical data on how representation for each college has been affected by last year's motion to include Instructors for representation on Congress, and will share that data. Julie asked for clarification on whether "junior specialists" and non-tenure-track assistant professors would be included. They will.

- g. Jim circulated a draft of guidelines on evaluating instructors for contract renewal. He assigned HOMEWORK to review the draft and share it with our constituents, as Congress will vote on whether or not to approve/amend the draft next meeting. Cheryl requested an electronic copy, and Jim agreed to circulate one.
- h. Jim noted the gift of a box of Redbooks from the AAUP. After a brief overview on the value of the book as a guide for faculty governance, he invited faculty to sign out the seven copies and return them next meeting so that other members could familiarize themselves with the value and roles of faculty in administering the university.
- i.

### III. Committee Reports:

**Assessment:** Seri Luangphinit presented in detail the results of her attendance, along with Todd Belt and Mark Panek, at the AACU conference (report appended below). Seri then reported on the Honolulu WASC retreat and asked some of the participants to share their experiences. Johnathan Awaya and Fioana McCormack said they were pleased with what they learned, but wondered where the time would come from to implement assessment. Mark Panek echoed the retreat's message that assessment should be an incremental project, and that it involved "sampling" the work of a small number of students to gauge a program's effectiveness rather than delving through the work of everyone, and that hiring yet another administrator to perform what should be a faculty responsibility was less preferable than controlling the process ourselves. Todd Belt announced the impending visit of Jill Ferguson from WASC, and invited everyone to attend her presentations on 2/27. Todd then emphasized that assessment should be seen as something that should help us and help our teaching rather than as some kind of burden.

**Academic Policy:** Aaron Jacobs discussed three agenda items his committee is addressing. He expects to have a revised T and P document at the March meeting. The committee also discussed the issue of students repeating courses they've already passed in order to boost their GPAs. 20% of students in F2011 were doing so. The committee is examining this practice. The committee is also looking at the APC flowchart in conjunction with the Graduate Council, and hopes to bring more details to the March meeting.

#### **Admission/EMIT:**

Jim Beets noted that the Executive Committee discussed the idea of reinstating the Admissions Committee and redefining its roll, and perhaps renaming it a "Student Success" committee.

**Budget:** Norm Stahl deferred to Marcia Sakai and her scheduled presentation later in the meeting.

**Curriculum Review Committee:** Mike Shintaku indicated that Pila Wilson met with the committee regarding perceived overlap with many of the certificate programs. He and April Scazzola are examining the idea

of limiting the amount of overlap a student could have with a major, or a minor, or other certificate programs. Ed Fisher and John Pezzuto also discussed their proposed Doctor of Physical Therapy program with the committee. Some concerns were raised, but most of the committee members are now okay with the program. Mike doesn't think the committee can approve the DPT without looking at and approving the courses first. Jim Beets suggested raising this issue in the next Executive Committee meeting.

**General Education:** Todd Belt reported the results of the modeling of the GE supply and demand he ran with Brendan Hennessey. He explained that the number of currently offered GE courses matches up well with demand. He said that thanks to Elizabeth Stacey's work as the prior GE chair, the one place where a backlog might occur—GCC—is soon coming online with more GE courses. He also provided another reminder for everyone to attend Jill Ferguson's 2/27 visit, and to bring a friend, emphasizing that we should come up with our own assessment tool so it isn't done for us.

#### IV. Graduate Council Report:

Aaron Jacobs reported that the GC has been working with the APC on the flowcharts for policy modifications and hopes to have results at the March meeting. The GC is also drafting guidelines for provisional acceptees into graduate programs—students who are accepted with GPAs between 2.7 and 3.0. They have sent these guidelines forward to the VCAA for review.

#### V. Research Council: Jim Beets had no new business to report.

#### VI. Budget Information Session Sponsored by Congress: Marcia Sakai

Marcia recognized Norm Stahl, Brian Bays, and Norman Arancon for their help on the long-range budget committee that helped lead to her power point presentation, available here:

<http://lrnpc.uhh.hawaii.edu/documents/FinancialManagementBudget101021712.pdf>

Em dePillis and Mark Panek both wanted to know how much of the athletics budget is "restricted" funding, and how much is not. Marcia said she would find out and let Congress know.

#### VII. Other Business

Mark Panek and Todd Belt offered to postpone their other business listed on the agenda until the March Congress meeting.

Jim Beets asked for nominations for a new Congress Vice Chair. Mark Panek nominated Julie Adrian.

**Motion** by Norm Stahl to close nominations was seconded by Todd Belt and passed unanimously.

Julie Adrian was elected as Vice Chair by a unanimous vote.

**Motion** to adjourn by Norm Stahl was seconded by Kathleen Stacey and passed unanimously.

5:12: meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Panek  
Congress Secretary

## **Appendix A:**

### **Professional Development Fund Project Proposal: Enhancing Delivery of Writing Assignments**

**To: Professional Development Committee,  
From: Faculty Congress Executive Committee  
Re: Proposal for Professional Development Fund Project**

Purpose: The proposed project aims directly at UHH's writing crisis in a practical way that incentivizes faculty to make use of UHH's underused Writing in the Disciplines specialist, Dr. Matt Haslam. Specifically, we are hoping that overload pay ranging from one-to-three credits will encourage faculty to take the first step towards engaging in a type of pedagogical reform that may seem overwhelming in the context of all they are currently being asked to do, but that is in fact a simple process when done with semester-long assistance and mentoring from someone with expertise in the kind of "write-to-learn" techniques that promote student engagement and retention.

Our proposal comes in part as a result of a faculty survey conducted by the Executive Committee requesting feedback for ideas on how the FSDF could be used. Among other questions, the Executive Committee's survey asked, "If you suggested TEACHING as a priority for Faculty Development Fund programs, which of the following areas would be helpful (check all that apply)." This question generated the following response rates in the areas where Dr. Haslam's assistance would be most relevant:

- Effective 'actively engaged learning' techniques: 63.9%
- Effective in-class group work 42.6%
- Teaching General Education courses with writing requirements 27.8%
- Learning Assessment within courses 47.2%
- Learning Assessment within departments 38.9%

While workshops on Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing Intensive are routinely offered on campus, the above concerns persist at least in part because the initial act of integrating writing into one's classroom can mean a move far out of one's comfort zone—an act often so intimidating that many of us walk out of such workshops and then do not follow through on their suggestions. Four years ago UHH hired a Writing in the Disciplines specialist with a proven record of helping faculty overcome such fears by working closely with faculty on identifying where write-to-learn activities can take the place of lectures, how to link writing assignments to a course's overall goals, and how to link writing activities within a department's sequence of courses. To date, the Faculty Development fund represents the best opportunity to encourage many faculty to finally take advantage of what Dr. Haslam has to offer.

Faculty who apply to work with Dr. Haslam will be accountable for earning their overloads. More than likely, an "internship" model will be drawn up, where the participating faculty

member would submit a portfolio of their progress at the end of the semester, along with a report from Dr. Haslam, that expresses some commitment to continued use of the techniques through which they have been mentored. Given the main goals of the proposal, some combination of GE and Assessment Committee members would evaluate the portfolios on a pass/fail basis. Other evaluation criteria will be discussed with potential awardees.

Since Dr. Haslam is already being paid to engage in activities such as these, none of the FSDF would be needed to pay him. Given the parameters of his unique duties, he would be able to mentor between 3 and perhaps 10 faculty members, depending upon which of the options (detailed below) interested faculty choose. Under such a scenario, the budget we are requesting from the FSDF would be the equivalent of a 9-credit overload, or around \$15,000.

## **Requirements for Overload Pay from the Professional Development Fund**

### **1-Credit Option: Developing Writing Assignments for GE Courses**

With help from the writing & learning consultant, the faculty member will do the following:

- Develop appropriate writing assignment(s) that take the place of lectures
- Identify evaluation/grading criteria, and potentially develop an easy-to-use rubric
- Learn how to quickly and effectively respond to the student work
- Read a set of papers along with the writing consultant
- Evaluate the assignment and determine what changes could/should be made for the next time the course is taught
- Submit a report to X committee reflecting on and evaluating the work done
- Commit to using the assignment in future semesters

### **2-Credit Option: Course Redesign**

With help from the writing & learning consultant, the faculty member will do the following:

#### Prior to the Semester in Question

- Evaluate the course: conduct an initial needs assessment
- Identify ways to replace lectures with other active/engaged learning activities in the course, including using effective in-class group work
- Make substantive changes to course assignments, use of in-class time, and means of evaluating students

#### During the Semester

- Evaluate the changes made by means of in-class observation, assessment of student work, and interviews with students conducted by the writing and learning consultant

#### At the End of the Semester

- Identify what changes could/should be made for the next time the course is taught, as well as how similar changes could be made in other courses
- Submit a report to X committee reflecting and evaluating the work done

### **3-Credit Option: Course Redesign with the Development of a Significant Writing Component**

With help from the writing & learning consultant, the faculty member will meet all of the requirements for the 2-credit course overload as well as develop a significant writing component for the course as follows:

- Develop appropriate writing assignment(s)
- Identify evaluation/grading criteria, and potentially develop an easy-to-use rubric
- Learn how to quickly and effectively respond to the student work
- Read a set of papers along with the writing consultant
- Evaluate the assignment and determine what changes could/should be made for the next time the course is taught

## **Appendix B: Assessment Chair's Report**

TO: UHH Faculty Congress

FROM: Seri Luangphinit  
Chair, Assessment Support Committee

CC: Don Straney, Chancellor  
Kenith Simmons, Interim VCAA  
April Komenaka, Accreditation Liaison Officer  
Jim Beets, Chair, Faculty Congress

RE: Report of the Assessment Support Committee

DATE: February 17, 2012

As Chair of the Assessment Support Committee and as the lead in two important initiatives, I hereby submit the following report on the important information gleaned from the recent 98<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). Information and progress resulting from the Assessment 101 Workshop and 2-day Program Review Retreat of WASC in February will be reported at a later time.

My personal observations are highlighted in blue to help the reader differentiate between objective reporting and my own personal evaluation of the information gleaned. Action items that are the result of this conference are highlighted in red.

### **AAC&U**

The Chairs of Assessment and General Education, along with the Congress Secretary, were sent to the AAC&U. Due to the stacking of important sessions at the same time, we duly split our times. This report details the sessions the Chair of Assessment attended.

1. Roundtable Action Dialogues: Civic Learning for a Diverse and Global Age

The discussion centered around the 2012 report by the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement—*A Crucible Moment, College Learning & Democracy's Future*. The report includes a Foreword by Martha Kanter, Under Secretary of the US Department of Education, and Eduardo Ochoa, Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education of the US Department of Education.

Of particular note is what the report calls “A Framework for Twenty-First Century Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement,” which gives an overarching and detailed description of four key areas—Knowledge, Skills, Values, and Collective Action:

#### CIVIC ETHOS governing campus life

The infusion of democratic values into the customs and habits of everyday practices, structures, and interactions; the defining character of the institution and those in it that emphasizes open-mindedness, civility, the worth of each person, ethical behaviors, and concern for the well-being of others; a spirit of public-mindedness that influences the goals of the institution and its engagement with local and global communities.

#### CIVIC LITERACY as a goal for every student

The cultivation of foundational knowledge about fundamental principles and debates about democracy expressed over time, both within the United States and in other countries; familiarity with several key historical struggles, campaigns, and social movements undertaken to achieve the full promise of democracy; the ability to think critically about complex issues and to seek and evaluate information about issues that have public consequences.

#### CIVIC INQUIRY integrated within the majors and general education

The practice of inquiring about the civic dimensions and public consequences of a subject of study; the exploration of the impact of choices on different constituencies and entities, including the planet; the deliberate consideration of differing points of views; the ability to describe and analyze civic intellectual debates within one’s major or areas of study.

#### CIVIC ACTION as lifelong practice

The capacity and commitment both to participate constructively with diverse others and to work collectively to address common problems; the practice of working in a pluralistic society and world to improve the quality of people’s lives and the sustainability of the planet; the ability to analyze systems in order to plan and engage in public action; the moral and political courage to take risks to achieve a greater public good. (p. 15)

The report can be accessed at [http://www.civiclearning.org/SupportDocs/Crucible\\_508F.pdf](http://www.civiclearning.org/SupportDocs/Crucible_508F.pdf).

From an assessment standpoint, the conflation of multiculturalism as a realm of study versus multiculturalism as values fully embraced by students and faculty is problematic. The simple study of African American history does not automatically guarantee empathy nor do indirect assessments (which seem to be the predominant method of “testing” student values such as open-mindedness and respect) are not always valid. As it stands, only the CIRP and NSSE provide some data on these outcomes, but “multiple measures are needed to capture students’ ability to demonstrate civic competencies” (Finley, p.3).

More troubling is the call by the report for institutions to “practice civic inquiry across all fields,” specifically, the report details the practice of civic inquiry across \*ALL\* fields of study and gives a sample institutional outcome: “Define within departments, programs,

and disciplines the public purposes of their respective fields, the civic inquiries most urgent to explore, and the best way to infuse civic learning outcomes progressively across the major” (p. 32). This suggests that the emphasis may translate into pressures placed on whole departments to demonstrate such competencies at graduation.

## 2. Defining the Public Purposes of Faculty Scholarship and Teaching

Due to the increased scrutiny of universities as educators of “citizens,” the one uptick to this momentum towards civic engagement is the rethinking of faculty publications. Given the pressure on faculty to publish in peer-reviewed journal articles, very little faculty research actually has any direct impact in the communities we serve, which the panelists observed as the fundamental obstacle we need to overcome if we want to ensure that universities become places of civic engagement.

These questions were posed at the forum: (1) What is public scholarship? (2) How do we promote and reward it? (3) What individuals and groups need to be talking about or working on promotion policies for engaged faculty members?

The debate soon centered on the “value” of a peer-reviewed article on alcohol consumption during pregnancy versus a community pamphlet that informs the public on the dangers of drinking while being pregnant. For someone in a academic discipline of nursing, more emphasis may be given for the first while the second would be totally dismissed, and yet the public engagement is far more apparent in the latter. This contradiction is what lies at the heart of the current disconnect in theory and practice of civic engagement in higher education.

## 3. Reclaiming Democracy: Facing the Consequences of Contingent Employment in Higher Education

This all-day “summit” was hosted by the New Faculty Majority Foundation along with the AAC&U.

The summit opened with remarks by Gary Rhodes, Professor of Higher Education (University of Arizona) and the Director for the Center for the Future in Higher Education. He made note of Vice President Biden’s comments on January 13 at a Pennsylvania high school, where he was purported to have said that one of the problems leading to the increasing cost of education is due to “Salaries for college professors [which] have escalated” because there is “a lot of competition for the finest professors. They all want the Nobel Laureates” (from the article “Faculty Groups Try To Educate Biden on Salaries” at <http://insidehighered.com>). He is also alleged to have said that the average pay of \$100,000 for faculty is “gouging” the system.

The New Faculty majority, a lobbying group that has been formed to tackle issues of contingency faculty, wanted to make clear at the symposium that this myth has been the most problematic challenge in terms of really scrutinizing the cost of education, because that myth overlooks the reality that “Adjunct, contingent faculty members now make up over 1 million of the 1.5 million people teaching in American colleges and universities” (“Among the Majority” at <http://insidehighered.com>). In fact, Gary Rhoades, from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona, noted at this summit that under 30% of faculty nation-wide are tenured; full-time non-tenurable faculty make up around 19%.

The fact that instructors, adjuncts and graduate teaching assistants account for the bulk of teaching in lower-level General Education, where essential key skills are taught (but is also the time when many students also fail or drop out) underscores the further irony

that such faculty often do not have offices, have no voice in faculty governance, are not consulted in curricular or pedagogical issues, are given little if no recourse to professional development, may often teach at several institutions, and on average make less than \$25,000 nation-wide. So while the AAC&U and many college administrators have been promoting civic engagement and the values of “respect for freedom and human dignity, empathy, open-mindedness, tolerance, justice, equality, ethical integrity, an responsibility to the larger good,” the challenge is to reform universities so the “business” of exploitation and labor hierarchy gives way to an actual model of the very democracy we want our students to learn and embrace.

#### 4. Mission-Defined Assessment: Using Institutional Identity to Shape Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes And Decision-Making

The following are notes taken from the ACAD Workshop on Developing Assessment vis-à-vis Strategic Planning. The paid workshop was advertised as a hands-on session that would allow participants to develop an actual assessment plan. Unfortunately, this turned out to be one of the biggest disappointments of the conference as there was no actual work facilitated. However, the following constitutes the information from the PowerPoint shown to the audience, which does provide some useful contexts for why assessment needs to align with strategic planning and two case studies that provide insight into how other campuses undertake this process:

##### **Why Focus on Mission-Based Assessment?**

- Resource challenge. We are asked to do more with less. What programs should be supported with these fewer resources?
- Cost challenge. We are asked to explain why students should pay what they are for their education.
- Problem. These constraints require institutions to decide what is most important concerning these first two questions.
- Solution. Mission-statements articulate the highest ideals for graduates. They serve as tools to evaluate what fits in mission and thus the institution.

##### **Benefits**

- By highlighting mission-based assessment, provides a principled foundation for planning
- Fosters dialogues that enhance core educational principles
- Helps institutions to emphasize its uniqueness and distinctiveness (history, commitments, etc.)

##### **Challenges**

- Evokes very strong feeling and beliefs about how the institution operates now and in the future
- Time is required for a stable consensus to emerge and for priorities to appear (to guide planning)

- Explicit comparisons between like and peer institutions will also occur (dangers of over-homogenization)

### **Purpose of this workshop**

- Explore how institutional identity (based on a college's mission) can guide decisions about resources and educating students
- Promote assessment as a means of defining and facilitating institutional priorities
- Encourage dialogues about explicitly using college mission statement.

### **Mission-Defined Assessment**

- Institutional identity = mission-based foundation of aspirations for graduates
- Assessment = mission-defined tool for evaluating effectiveness and continually striving for better expression of institutional identity
- In order for assessment to effectively inform strategic planning decisions and communication, four principles should be followed:

#### **GOALS FOR INSTITUTIONS:**

1. Resist the test or hoop version
  - Instead, build a healthy culture of assessment that focuses on commitment to student learning.
  - Goal = enable faculty and staff to fully own assessment initiatives as a means of fulfilling institutional mission
  - Keep an eye on the whole (there are always going to be nay-sayers), but the change in culture can take place around them.
2. Coordinate academic and student affairs goals (academic learning and student development need to be complementary and coordinated)
  - Address student learning holistically and not in a compartmentalized manner
  - Tensions will rise between these two entities
3. Aggregate general education, academic program and co-curricular domains of student learning.
  - All domains of student learning need to intersect with each other
  - Integrate GE, academic major/minor, and co-curricular assessment domains together into a coherent, multi-layer whole focused on institutional student learning
  - Requires attention to multiple domains that may be driven by different motivations
4. Communicating with internal and external audience
  - Ultimate goal should be clear articulation of institution's priorities and how those priorities are achieved

- Goal = provide a clear and consistent message to external audiences (i.e. potential students, parents, alumni, employers) and internal members
- Needs legwork (networking) especially to internal audiences which may not be well informed about these processes.

### **Case Study (Macalester College)**

Data points generally reported are (1) retention rates, (2) graduation rates, (3) student credit hours, (4) demographics, (5) etc. But these data points are not enough to answer how well the college is doing with regard to its mission statement.

They barely passed accreditation in 2006. In response to this, a committee was formed to do assessment for the sake of accreditation. In 2008, the entire committee resigned.

Incremental steps:

1. Department assessment of the major (getting department chairs to dig up their old plans and start writing up action plans—then get them to start converting their peers)
2. Assessment of general education delegated to the general education committee
3. Development of student learning committee to look holistically at overall institutional assessment
4. Don't take on everything...so assessment incrementally (i.e. one skill per year)
5. Continually resists the "test" or "hoop" view of assessment
6. Coordinate academic and student affairs goals
7. Aggregating general education, academic program, and co-curricular domains of student learning
8. Started to regularly communicate with internal and external audiences (everything needs to be transparent and presented in a meaningful way)

## Case Study (Westminster College)

Mission Statement: It shall be the mission of Westminster College to educate and inspire all its students through a distinctive liberal arts curriculum and a dynamic developmental experience; to challenge them to be critically aware, life-long learners and leaders of character, committed to the values of integrity, fairness, respect and responsibility; and to prepare them for lives of success, significance and service.

Assessment Tools:

IDEA survey and Individual courses

NSSE

CLA

Educational Benchmarking (EBI)

Student Satisfaction Survey

Columns Concert Survey/Essay

Departmental Assessment

Program Reviews

Alumni and Employer Surveys

Placement Rates

From an assessment standpoint, this mismatch between the concepts of civic engagement or ethical reasoning (i.e. “leaders of character” and the tool highlighted to assess it (the CLA) is what I, personally, feel is a totally inappropriate usage of the standardized test. I raised this issue with the panel, along with the problem that testing juniors with the CLA does not provide evidence that their degree actually adds substantial value to a student’s sense of ethics or civic engagement.

### A Look at UHH

During the break-out sessions, the UHH contingency decided to form our own group to tackle the task for which we were sent: to begin mapping assessment to our Strategic Plan. This is needed in order that we have measurable and measurement systems in place to help us determine how well we are (or are not) meeting what we say in that plan.

A perusal of the Strategic Plan (which does not include actual institutional learning outcomes) revealed ten (10) imbedded goals that we (collectively) need to demonstrate success in meeting our strategic plan. These ten were broken into three categories of assessment:

## Existing Raw Data

1. Significantly increase the number of Native Hawaiian graduates (25%)
2. Students will have opportunities to engage with faculty in research

## Directly Measurable

3. Students will demonstrate **innovation**
4. Students will demonstrate **creativity**
5. Students will demonstrate critical thinking
6. Student will cultivate and demonstrate a **foundational understanding of Hawai'i's unique heritage from an indigenous base known for its history of embracing diversity**

## Indirectly Measurable

7. Every student will have opportunities for applied learning that **result in civic engagement**
8. Students will **contribute positively** to their communities
9. Students demonstrate **multicultural fluency** by effectively interacting and communicating with others
10. Student will develop and articulate an awareness of self and others

These “new” outcomes will be vetted with the team that is going to the WASC Program Review Retreat and per consultation with WASC mentors, we will propose a means of integrating these appropriately into Program Review and General Education Assessment.

## Action Items needed for us at UHH:

All but items 5 and 10 are currently not included in our current GE learning outcomes nor are they indicators that are asked for from departments and programs.

1. Alignment needed between strategic plan, program review, General Education, and WASC/Lumina.
2. Descriptors (criteria) developed with faculty input for the red skills identified above (Survey Monkey). These descriptors currently do not exist in the current General

Education list of skills and/or the rubrics that have already been developed.

3. Given proposed changes to WASC accreditation and the LUMINA DQP, a smaller sub-committee will weigh how these changes may (or may not) inform the ongoing revision of Program Review Guidelines.

## Appendix C: EMIT/Admissions Report (submitted by Julie Adrian)

EMIT report\_ February

### Pre-builts update:

- Note that we are trying to create cohort effects for these freshmen, so having them

enrolled in a freshmen-only section is beneficial

- Keeping in line with UH System's upcoming push to encourage students to take 15

credit hours each semester, we will use the first four courses for "cohort effect" and

advisors should encourage students to use the 5th course to explore interests and

various academic disciplines

- Suggestion was made to cycle the courses used to build into pre-builts,

e.g., use each course once every two years to make sure every academic major gets

some exposure in freshmen schedules; however, this will create some "churn" in course scheduling so we have to be aware of capacity issues

- As Admissions Office is building the schedules, they are communicating with the

Division Chairs/Associate Dean in CAS and the deans in the other colleges about anticipated capacity issues, etc. - we will continue this practice going forward

- **As a reminder, only about half of all entering freshmen will get ENG 100 and their**

**MATH in the Fall semester; then for Spring, only those students who did not get**

**ENG 100 and their MATH course in the Fall will have anything built**

- Future agenda item: several departments are finding they do not have the right

number of faculty or right "mix" of faculty to be able to offer the courses needed for

their majors to graduate in four years; proposal floating around is to set admissions criteria for people to declare some of these majors so that demand falls within existing capacity

**CCECS update:**

- Note that with the current scheduling, while convenient for faculty, it has created major problems for Student Affairs team members, who are constantly manually instituting processes on a case-by-base basis.
- Should we only offer one session?
- And why do we go out to 10 weeks? Why not 8 weeks?
- Are some courses inappropriate to offer during the summer? We should analyze failure rates as well as academic performance in the next course in the series for some of the gateway courses - what is suitability for remediation and preparation courses in the Summer Session?

**Question from Chancellor:**

In response to initiatives taking place at other campuses, Chancellor Straney asked us to review the question, "Should we offer a four-year degree guarantee?" and provide him with our recommendation...

- The idea is that from time of matriculation, assuming students fulfill their obligations like going to advising, if students do not receive their degree in four years, then the courses they must take to graduate will be free
- There appeared to be consensus that this is a wonderful idea, but we are not at the moment sufficiently resourced to implement this
- This would also require a level of curriculum planning and management that we

currently do not have the capacity to execute with the possible exception of the Natural Sciences Division departments and CoBE

**Admissions & Recruitment Biennial Plan Update:**

- Activities were adjusted to reflect new campus strategic plan

**Update on Fall 2012 Freshmen Guaranteed Academic Schedule implementations**

- Here is a running count of schedule templates that have been received from the academic departments

We have templates from Art and Japanese Studies from Humanities Division

All of Social Sciences Division has responded except Sociology (they have responded that they are working on it) and History  
From Natural Sciences, still need math, chemistry, geology, computer science  
CoBE has submitted needed templates

Nothing has been received yet from CAFNRM or CHL

Advising Center has provided info for GEN/UNDL students

- As a reminder, EMIT reached consensus that if a department does not respond, Jim will consult with division chairs to develop the template

**ENG 100 placement**

- Plan to handle placement for ENG 100 the same way again for Fall 2012 - using SAT and ACT scores