

Minutes: Congress Meeting October 21st K127

Members Present: Julie Adrian, Jin Awaya, Jim Beets, Todd Belt, Aaron Jacobs, Eileen Lovell, Bruce Mathews, Drew Martin, Sarah Marusek, Fiona McCormack, Mark Panek, Brian Perry, Hiapo Perreira, Amy Saxton, Norm Stahl, Kathleen Stacey

Members Absent: Emmeline dePillis, Kekoa Harman, Seri Luangphinit, Justin Pittullo, Mike Shintaku

Ex-officio Members Present: Kenny Simmons, Dan Brown, Hank Hennessey, Marcia Sakai

3:05 Meeting called to order by Chair, Bruce Matthews

I. Approval of minutes from September meeting

Motion to approve 9/23 meeting minutes made by Jim Beets, seconded by Julie Adrian.

Discussion: Bruce Mathews asked that the account of the Chancellor's "talk story" be revised to reflect the fact that Congress will recommend ideas for the \$100K faculty/staff development fund rather than decide how such money is allocated.

Bruce then addressed a prior request from Hank Hennessey to revise the account of the 9/23 Chair's Report from "A request he recently had to turn down that involved purchasing an iPad to offer as incentive for students to take an experimental test not supported by the Assessment Committee" to "A request he recently had to turn down that involved purchasing an iPad to offer as incentive for students to take a pilot of the CLA test not supported by the Assessment Committee."

Motion to approve minutes as amended passed unanimously.

II. Chair's report:

a. Faculty development fund:

Todd Belt was asked to briefly discuss a proposal in the works to provide overloads to faculty willing to work with Writing in the Disciplines Specialist Matt Haslam to enhance student exposure to writing in GE courses and other courses. Having gone through such a process himself, Todd said that with more types of writing delivering parts of the curricula in his classes, he finds himself having to do less work, and also finds his students much more engaged and better able to retain what they learn than in prior years when he required less writing. He explained that working with someone such as Matt Haslam over an extended period would be far more effective than

holding a workshop alone, as transition into this method of delivering course content requires continuous feedback and mentoring. He took pains to underscore the fact that requiring more writing from students did not equate with more work for the teacher. He also underscored the fact that faculty development in this area would not only impact GE; it would also generate data for assessment.

Bruce Mathews discussed the other proposal in the works: inviting data-based management specialist Helena Zaleski to campus for workshops. Bruce indicated that the Chancellor has expressed support for such a proposal.

Interim VCAA Kenny Simmons clarified the process for disbursement of the faculty/staff development fund: Congress will submit proposals to a committee that will then make recommendations to the Chancellor, who will ultimately decide which ideas to fund.

Todd Belt asked Congress members to be on the lookout for a survey soliciting feedback for other proposals.

- b. Bruce indicated that the planned discussion on “Creating a Culture of Engagement” would be postponed.

III. Committee Reports

Aaron Jacobs reported that the Academic Policy Committee met on Oct. 4. Each of the nine committee members has been asked to draft a statement of academic expectations. The APC will meet later to complete the draft. Jeanie Flood and Justin Pittullo have been added as members.

Julie Adrian has taken over as Chair of the Admissions Committee. She reported that global recruiters are working to increase global applications to generate global application fees. Brendon Hennessey reported to the AC that the retention rate has dropped by 2%, and that there has been a slight increase in STEM degrees. She also reported that there were problems with summer school retention rates, and with Humanities Division Chair David Miller’s waiver of the English Placement Exam having led to the misplacement of several students in ENG 100, five of whom paid for and failed the course.

Assessment Committee: Seri Luangphinith was absent due to her self-funded participation as a presenter at an assessment conference in the Philippines. She provided her report in the form of the detailed handout appended at the end of these minutes. Todd Belt pointed Congress to the last page of the report, where Seri discusses WASC, Lumina and reaccreditation, indicating that UHH is well positioned for the many of the things WASC will be looking for, such as emphasis on the totality of a student’s education rather than parts of it, emphasis on

teamwork for undergraduates, and demonstration of a movement from knowledge towards a skill. What we will have to do, he said, is figure out a way to assess this. Kenny Simmons added that we will be asked to find an “external benchmark” for review to measure writing and critical thinking.

Long Range Budget Planning Committee: Norm Stahl was unable to attend the last LRBPC meeting, but Marcia Sakai was. She explained that at the meeting she distributed copies of the long-range budget. In the meeting, Marcia asked the committee to focus on the strategic plan and its implementation. She hopes to work with the committee to construct a table that details all sources of funding that come into the university.

General Education: Todd Belt reminded everyone that new GE courses must also go through the CRC.

IV. Congress and Its Relation to the Senates

Jim Beets suggested that Congress could have a better, more open relationship with the senates. This could be done through invitations to senates to be invited to “talk story” similar to the informal gathering we had with the Chancellor to being the 9/23 meeting. We could invite the first senate for the November meeting. This would be an invitation of the entire senate—not just the senate chair. These visits could help illustrate the distinctions between the functions and responsibilities of the senates and the Congress in order to eliminate redundancies.

Concern arose about how this might make the senate president look bad. Jim clarified by explaining that it was meant to increase communication among all representatives from both bodies rather than have the senate president as the only one who interacts with Congress.

Jim also requested that committee chairs pass on the AAUP Redbook information to their committee members to help distinguish Congress responsibilities from senate responsibilities.

- V. **Motion:** Norm Stahl moved to temporarily waive the Congress attendance rule until January for Mike Shintaku, the CRC chair who teaches on Fridays at 3:00. Todd Belt seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VI. Second Reading and Vote on 9/23 Motion to Amend Bylaws.

Amy Saxton read the amendment aloud:

Motion to change the wording of the Faculty Congress Bylaws:

Current Language:

b. General Education Standing Committee

The Congress will appoint a General Education Standing Committee of no fewer than five ~~nor more than seven~~ faculty members (~~at last one of which shall come from each UH Hilo unit~~) and one student representative. The Congress will also appoint a faculty member to serve as Chair of this Committee. This committee shall be charged with advising the Congress on all matters relating to campus-wide General Education, developing policies and procedures for implementing and monitoring General Education, and undertaking regular assessments of the effectiveness of General Education at the University.”

Discussion:

Drew Martin indicated he could not support the amendment as written, arguing that the elimination of the language “from each UH Hilo unit” could stifle equal representation on standing committees. Mark Panek indicated that the amendment arose out of the Gen Ed chair’s trouble with finding the required number of willing participants from each unit for his committee, and that during the amendment’s first reading no one could even define what an academic “unit” was, and further that a unit’s democratic representation existed in its seat on the Congress, where s/he could vote for or against approval of standing committee membership. Bruce Mathews indicated that the section, prior to amendment, placed undue burden for service commitments upon small academic units.

Motion passed, 14 in favor, 1 opposed.

VII. Vote to Confirm New Members of Standing Committees

Todd Belt added a new student member to the GE committee.
The APC added Justin Pittullo and Jeanie Flood.

All new members were approved unanimously.

4:03: **Motion** to adjourn was made by Norm Stahl, seconded by Jim Beets, and passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Panek
Congress Secretary
October 21st, 2011

APPENDIX: Assessment Committee 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

RE: Report of the Assessment Support Committee

DATE: October 21, 2011

On behalf of the members of the Assessment Support Committee, I hereby submit the following report on the following activities that were done over Summer of 2010. This report documents the commendable work undertaken by faculty outside of their 9-month contracts and the level of assessment that is ideally advocated per accreditation standards.

E-Portfolio

Due to a cited lack of funds, the Chair of the Assessment Support Committee utilized mileage gained during her WASC training in California to meet with representatives from Kapi'olani Community College, who are developing a nationally cited e-portfolio. Keola Donaghy from Ka Haka 'Ula was also present for the June 13 meeting with Mary Hattori, Joy Shirokane and Karl Naito—the team leaders developing the software with Ikeyzo. While we were initially excited about the concept given our initial reviews of their platform back in October of 2010, the newest release seemed more geared towards trade and industry skills-based assessment that promoted a strict linear progression (scaffolding) of assignments and skills that may not be applicable for a four-year liberal arts environment (i.e. writing can sometimes falter in upper division courses when new concepts or harder readings are pursued). We gave feedback citing our concerns and we have since decided to evaluate other existing software (such as Turnitin.com) to see if an eportfolio function can be developed. Keola Donaghy is currently pursuing a viability study.

Mathematics

Dr. Mitchell Anderson took the lead to test-pilot the new GE Rubric for Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning. He worked with two of the Math Department's key instructors—Zorana Lazarevic and Diana Webb—who teach Math 104. In Math 104F, they assessed three problems that were imbedded on the last page of all of the final exams—problem 1 targeted calculation (column 2 of the GE rubric), problem 2 targeted analysis and visual representations of information (columns 1 & 3), and problem 3 targeted a slightly higher level of calculations (column 2). In Math 104G, two shared problems were likewise used—problem 1 targeted calculations and visual representations of data (columns 1 & 3) and problem 2 targeted all three areas of competencies.

The team decided to modify the rubric to a 5-point scale to give them more reliable data, which led one instructor to note “students could use a little more instruction on the second Math 104G problem.” Dr. Anderson's report shows that assessment in this context is the most meaningful to teachers—it provides them with the opportunity to see where improvement is needed. More importantly, the interactive work these three faculty members undertook facilitated a collaborative teaching environment that is

idealized by assessment experts like Driscoll and Wood (2007) who cite the enormous pedagogical benefits of “moving assessment from a private to a collaborative focus” (p. 38).

Apart from validating the efficacy of the rubric, the math assessment project also validated the success of the department in teaching the competencies identified by the rubric. For example, a review of the scoring of the Math 104F exams reveals that 78% of 70 students met or exceeded basic competency in their calculations for problem 1; 73% met competency of calculations for question 3.

Dr. Anderson gives the following breakdown of mean scores:

| | Math 104 70 exams | | | Math 104G 51 Exams | |
|---------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q1 | Q2 |
| Average | 2.71 | 3.38 | 2.81 | 2.39 | 1.92 |
| | Calculations | Analysis & Visual | Calculations | Calculations & Visual | All competencies |

Dr. Anderson’s report, the questions used on these exams, the scoring sheet, and *all* exams collected will be converted to a pdf and uploaded to the Assessment Support Committee website shortly.

Writing

The final report AY 2010-2011 of the Assessment Support Committee dated May 6, 2011 cited Fall 2010 data from freshman surveys in ENG 100 that revealed a large disparity in the perception of writing instruction on the part of these two student bodies. While the surveys indicate that many UHH students have had some exposure to writing, HAWCC students either are “turned off” to writing or have had little writing at all during their high school years. 39% of HAWCC ENG 100 students reported that their high school work was meaningless and/or had little to no benefit whereas another 23% expressed the learning of grammar. This was by far their most numerically significant responses to the survey question: What was your experience in terms of writing in High School? UHH’s ENG 100 students reported having done a substantial volume of writing (32%) and having had exposure to different forms/genres of writing (27%). This divergence translates to two completely different pools of students—HAWCC student who transfer in may have had little to no exposure to research and higher forms of writing prior to the 16 weeks they undertake ENG 100 and may also exhibit disengagement with writing in general.

Similar figures appear in the most recent aggregation of Spring 2011 survey data. 39% of HAWCC students reported writing as meaningless work or simply work for a grade. What was surprising were the results from the UHH data set: 29% reported learning different forms and genres of writing; however, the second most frequent response was that writing instruction appeared to have little or no benefit (meaningless work) at 19% of respondents. What was also surprising was the reduced pool of students of only 62, which reflected a drop in the enrollment of students in the course; many sections reported being under-enrolled. More worrisome is the fact that of the 62, 21 (or 34%) were upperclassmen. We should stress that it is unclear if this data reflects freshman population attrition or a delaying of the taking of the course. EMIT mechanism are in place for this academic year and will hopefully address this problem.

English 100 teachers at UHH are in the process of gathering samples of high school writing from all students in the current sections of the course. We will then assess the batch of samples for alignment with DOE standards and with our own GE learning outcomes. The Chair of Assessment has been asked to present these findings to the DOE for their November 29 statewide meeting of school representatives. That report will also be presented to Congress at the December 16 meeting.

Tables of Survey Results will be posted upon completion of Spring 2012—the tables will encompass AY 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, which will provide us a better picture of student attitudes and writing skills at the freshman level. This can then be used as a “benchmark” for future assessment.

In fact, the efforts of both the Math and English Departments have herein provided a sound basis for future assessment by which General Education can work towards scaffolding increasing skills from the 100- through the 400-levels.

Accreditation Planning

The Chair of Congress (Bruce Matthews), the Chair of General Education (Todd Belt), and the Chair of the Assessment Support Committee (Seri Luangphinit) met with other members of the Accreditation Steering Committee on October 13, 2011. At that time, the Accreditation Liaison (April Komenaka) released information concerning the revision of WASC accreditation standards. Of particular note were the following:

- An institution may identify institutionally-specific graduation outcomes to assess and all institutions will be required to assess five proficiencies in CFR 2.2 at graduation and externally benchmark at least two of them. [The proficiencies are the core competencies that have been listed in WASC Standard 2.2 since 2001: they are "college-level written and oral communication, college-level quantitative skills, information literacy, and the habit of critical analysis of data and argument." New: the focus on demonstrated competence at graduation.]
- The Commission sees value in exploring the Degree Qualifications Profile [DPQ] as a potential tool to define degree outcomes and seeks to engage a broad array of institutions in exploring its usefulness through a series of piloting activities. [UH Hilo has been invited to participate in a pilot, possibly in a learning community with other universities in the state of Hawaii.]

According to the working draft of *Situating WASC Accreditation in the 21st Century: Redesign for 2012 and Beyond*, “a set of California institutions and the University of Hawai‘i system have agreed to work with the DPG” (p. 18).

Per yesterday’s WASC forum that the Chair of Congress, the Chair of GE and the Chair of Assessment attended, those institutions are: University of California at Santa Cruz, University of La Verne, Ashford University, Hawai‘i Pacific University, National University, the University of San Diego and Brandman University

From an assessment standpoint, the fact that the core skills are already found within our new GE program validates the hard work of the faculty in past years to “get us out in front of the pack.” However, the more daunting challenge is: (1) to start **doing** actual assessment across the board in all GE certified classes, and (2) to pilot an alignment of our current assessment tools with the Lumina Degree Profile that was released by the AAC&U back in February of this year. The key skills of the Lumina are: **Specialized Knowledge** that are acquired in a specialized field of study; **Broad, Integrative Knowledge** that are acquired in general education fields; **Intellectual Skills**; **Applied Learning**; and **Civic Learning**. Of particular note is the cross-disciplinarity that is worded in a few of these categories. (The Chair of the Assessment Support Committee will give a more formal presentation of the Lumina as well as any pressing developments from the International Association of Educational Assessment Conference)

Given these developments and the new Strategic Plan, the Chair of the Assessment Support Committee recommends a revisiting of the Program Review guidelines. A revision of the document is also important given the many concerns expressed by Chairs over the incoherence of expectations worded within it.

However, such a revision should be undertaken by faculty who have the proper training to understand its function and how assessment serves as its core. This then begs the additional need for faculty to understand assessment and how it serves accreditation. According to one colleague: “I've been chatting with chairs and others in my building regarding many things, including assessment when it comes up, and it seems that many of our colleagues still don't really understand what it is, and, even worse, have a very negative view of it, perhaps with some reason, since I know it has been used in some parts of the country in ways for which it was never intended.”

To facilitate the necessary expertise, to overcome faculty anxiety, and to help demystify the process of accreditation, the Chair of Assessment Support and the Chair of General Education recommend sending key members of both committees to the upcoming WASC retreat on assessment and program review. While the Chair of the Assessment Support Committee will be one of the presenters at the first workshop, it is important that members of our faculty body have access to more than one pipeline of information. The Assessment 101 workshop on February 1 will primarily feature two noted specialists—Amy Driscoll and Mary Allen.

The Program Review Workshop takes place on February 2-3. We recommend that key senior members of committees and select department chairs to use the 2 days to develop a simplified and much more “user-friendly” document.

To ensure that participation guarantees actual implementation results, participants will be asked that they develop a tangible activity in their respective programs, units of divisions that they then report back to Congress. It therefore makes sense in the immediate- and long-term to send Chairs whose programs are slated for program review and whose help will be needed in facilitating collaborative assessment among their constituents in their departments to meaningfully engage a process that gauges student skills and documents areas needing improvement per the five (5) competencies identified by WASC.