The committee continues to discuss issues of implementation and strategy. We discussed the possibility of some sort of visualization of how students would acquire the ILOs and university and department requirements in some sort of gaming scenario that might make it fun and interactive. Can we do something that is active and fun? This type of thing might need to begin with STAR but move outward.

We continued to discuss the pieces of the ILO puzzle that have been or are being addressed by other committees and task forces. For example, the task force regarding general education pathways has been trying to make explicit the pathways students take through the degree options based upon what is already implicitly there.

Another report we need to integrate into our findings is the E5.209 report that looked at the arts and science to determine duplications with general education requirements.

We discussed the goal of building the 4-year experience with identifying a first year coherent experience for students that can help them move through the first year and be set up for the second year and moving into the major. Create a coherent pathway of what students should have and that you can complete everything in four years.

We discussed the fact we should map programs; LLL has already done this. We are using the LLL model to map Social Sciences.

Dawn has already taken the ILOs and looked at WASC’s 5 pillars and went to look at a variety of University documents and applied the ILOs to the text from these sources. Based upon this assessment, 100% of ILOs are covered in the general education program. Then the question is how many things happen in the first year and how many over the 4 years. Writing intensive happens over time, but many appear in a single year, but these are not heavily concentrated in a single year. Next she is going to map general education via the program sheets. Courses had to demonstrate they are meeting the hallmarks to get the designation. “E” courses embody most of what is in the ILOs.

Thus, it is the committee’s assessment, that at a minimum the ILOs are met by general education at a general level. The next step is how the majors address it and what is being accomplished in the majors. We should offer a mapping of this evidence as one of the outcomes of our committee.

We are anticipating that WASC will require standards of performance. Thus, once we have mapped the ILOs we will need to set standards of performance for them. So, for example, how do we measure 2a – thinking and communicating critically. English 100 – Information literacy via the library will help expose students to this and they will get critical thinking skills completing their 120 credits. However, it is very likely we need more sophisticated skills in the major. Thus, it may be acceptable if all university students understand Hawaiian culture and history at the 100 level and of course we expose students to this, but we most likely want to see some of the ILOs assessed at a more advanced level than this.
• Kimi shared the ILO mapping for LLL. It would be good to have this done for all the colleges.
• We also must keep in mind the issue of the integrity, value, and meaning of the degree.
• We ended by deciding to map some things and begin to get the word out about the process. LLL is mapped and we can do political science. Let's be able to say – in general the average student will experience all of these ILOs. We can jump into beginning to collect evidence to see how well students are doing things.
• We will need to get on the Deans and Director's agenda.
• Dawn will share her work with the committee.
• We will continue to map the process more formally. Also, create a spreadsheet of committees and groups working on different facets of the ILOs.