



DIRECT LINE: (632) 928-5107  
VoIP TRUNKLINE 981-8500 LOCAL: 2583  
FAX:: (632) 928-5107  
E-MAIL: ovcaa@ovcaa.upd.edu.ph

**OFFICE OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR  
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

MEMORANDUM NO. OVCAA-BMP 15-099

TO : ALL DEANS, DIRECTORS, HEADS OF ACADEMIC UNITS  
  
FROM : BENITO M. PACHECO, Ph.D.   
Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
SUBJECT : UPD GE Conference 2015 Summary Report and  
Potential UC Resolutions at 23 November 2015 Special Meeting (TBC)  
DATE : 30 October 2015

---

As agreed upon during the UPD GE Conference 2015 held last 28-29 September, we are sending you the report on the key points discussed and agreements arrived at regarding the GE Program during the said event. The report is presented in two documents:

- 1) UPD GE Conference Summary Report – this document contains the highlights of the proceedings of the GE Conference. A full documentation of the conference proceedings is currently being prepared by the Office of the Director of Instruction (ODI).
- 2) Potential UC Resolutions at 23 November 2015 Special Meeting (TBC) – this document lists 18 agreements reached during the GE Conference that may comprise the set of resolutions regarding the GE Program that we will deliberate on and potentially approve during our special meeting of University Council on 23 November. (Please note that the special meeting was originally proposed for 9 November but we have postponed it to another Monday after the UPD ExeComm meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup>.) In addition to the 18 potential resolutions, the document also contains our suggested revisions or edits on the draft GE framework prepared by the UP GE Task Force, as well as a list of items that might be considered in line with the implementation of the new GE program.

We request the Departments, Institutes and Units to discuss the GE Conference report, especially the 18 potential resolutions, with your respective constituents. We will discuss and synthesize the feedback of the different Colleges or Units during the UPD ExeComm meeting on 9 November. Please prepare a short written report of the comments and recommendations of your College or Unit, which we will forward to the UPD GE Committee for their guidance in the preparation of the full conference report and the (re)drafting of the GE program resolutions.

Thank you very much.

cc:  
Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors  
Members-at-Large of the Executive Committee  
Members of the UPD GE Committee

## **U.P. DILIMAN GENERAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE 2015**

### **P O S T - C O N F E R E N C E   R E P O R T**

#### **I. EVENT SUMMARY**

Conference Name	U.P. Diliman General Education Conference 2015
Date	28-29 September 2015
Organizers	U.P. Diliman General Education Committee 2015 Dr. Benito M. Pacheco, VCAA, ex-officio Chair Dr. Violeda A. Umali, ODI Director, ex-officio Co-Chair Dr. Marilyn R. Canta, University Registrar, ex-officio Member-Secretary Dr. Aura C. Matias, Chair, UC CAPP Prof. Leonardo C. Rosete, Arts and Letters Cluster Chair Dr. Miguela M. Mena, Management and Economics Cluster Chair Dr. Mark Albert H. Zarco, Science and Technology Cluster Chair Dr. Grace H. Aguilung-Dalisay, Social Sciences and Law Cluster Chair Dr. Robin Daniel Z. Rivera, Representative, College of Arts and Letters Dr. Marian P. Roque, Representative, College of Science Dr. Aldrin P. Lee, Representative, College of Social Sciences & Philosophy
Venue	National Institute of Physics Auditorium National Science Complex, UP Diliman
Number of Delegates	233 faculty members registered for the Conference 76 from the Arts and Letters cluster 20 from the Management and Economics cluster 62 from the Science and Technology cluster 46 from other Social Sciences and Law cluster 29 from other CUs
Keynote Speaker	Prof. Michael L. Tan, PhD Chancellor, UP Diliman

#### **II. CONFERENCE OVERVIEW**

The UP Diliman General Education Conference serves as a major platform for discussing various concerns regarding the design, implementation, and evaluation of the framework, structure and curriculum of UP Diliman's General Education Program.

The 2015 GE Conference had two main objectives, namely:

1. To come up with a consolidated UP Diliman response to the proposed Framework for a Revised UP GE Program drafted by the UP GE Task Force; and
2. To draw up resolutions regarding UP Diliman's GE Program for presentation to the UP Diliman University Council.

Guided by the first objective, the Conference featured six plenary sessions: the first three tackled components of the GE Task Force's Proposed Framework for a Revised UP GE Program and the last three dealt with concerns that impact on the design and implementation of the GE curriculum. In line with the second objective, the Conference had eight workshops, each one dealing with a particular component of the GE framework. The first four workshops were held simultaneously on the first day of the Conference; the next four, on the second day. To facilitate workshop discussions, reference materials for the Conference were disseminated to the UPD faculty prior to the Conference, via the UPD website and emails to the deans/heads of academic units.

### III. CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

#### A. Keynote Speech of Chancellor Michael L. Tan: Major Takeaways

- The "keynote speech" is actually a context-setting for the GE curriculum that UPD will implement in the coming years.
- The UPCAT this year had a significantly fewer applicants than in previous years.
  - Previously, around 90,000 applicants took the UPCAT; this year, only 5,015 took the exam. Among them, 4,493 indicated Diliman as their first choice of campus.
  - Almost all applicants are from private schools; there were no applicants from science high schools.
  - Applicants' choice of degree program clustered around a few courses.
- Implications for the GE program:
  - Next academic year, the existing GE curriculum will still be implemented.
  - This "lag year" is also a good time to clear the backlog in GE course offerings.
  - Additionally, existing GE courses could be evaluated and new GE courses could be pilot-tested.

#### B. The Plenary Sessions

PRESENTATION 1— PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR A REVISED UP GE PROGRAM	
Resource Person	Dr. Patricia B. Arinto, Chair, UP GE Task Force
Abstract	This presentation gives the context and key aspects of the 2015 UP GE framework drafted by the UP GE Task Force, as well as updates on the Task Force's consultations with the different UP constituent units.
Major Takeaways	<p><i>Feedback from the constituent units</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the proposed GE philosophy, aims and objectives: a) clarify the ontological frame for the UP GE program, b) articulate better the marriage of specialization and interdisciplinarity, c) include ethnic rootedness/groundedness and gender sensitivity among GE student attributes, and d) affirm the importance of nationalism.</li> <li>• On the proposed thematic clustering/classification of courses: a) the university is structured along disciplinary domains, b) the GE courses cut across themes, and c) being interdisciplinary demands being grounded in the disciplines.</li> </ul>

---

PRESENTATION 1 – PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR A REVISED UP GE PROGRAM(cont'n.)

---

Major Takeaways	<p><i>Feedback from the constituent units (cont'n.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On interdisciplinarity: a) administrative issues regarding the offering of courses must be addressed, b) shifting from domain-based to interdisciplinary courses requires a major paradigm shift that academic units may or may not be prepared for.</li> <li>• On the mix of GE courses: a) it must be clarified from which pool of GE courses (System 11, current GE courses, etc.) should be considered when academic units decide on their recommended mix of GE courses, and b) guiding principles for selecting GE courses must be spelled out.</li> <li>• On program implementation: a) smaller CUs do not have facilities for large classes, b) administrative aspects of team teaching need to be worked out well, c) system for crediting of courses across CUs should be designed, and d) assessment of student learning should include entry-level knowledge and skills.</li> </ul>
-----------------	--

---

PRESENTATION 2 – REPORT ON THE JUNE 2015 CLUSTER WORKSHOPS ON GE

---

Resource Persons	<p>Prof. Leonardo C. Rosete, Arts and Letters Cluster Chair Dr. Miguela M. Mena, Management and Economics Cluster Chair Dr. Mark Albert H. Zarco, Science and Technology Cluster Chair Dr. Grace Aguilin-Dalisay, Social Sciences and Law Cluster Chair</p>
Abstract	<p>This presentation gives the highlights of the cluster workshops held in June 2015 to discuss the draft GE framework prepared by the UP GE Task Force.</p>
Major Takeaways	<p><i>Points of agreement among the four clusters</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to revise the present GE program given the national and international trends affecting the Philippine higher educational system.</li> <li>• The implementation of the K-to-12 program will bring about significant changes in the profile of students admitted to college – they are expected to be more intellectually and emotionally mature, and more heterogenous because they are taking different tracks and strands in senior high school, than the previous years' high school graduates.</li> <li>• GE program objectives should: a) develop a high level of competence in languages and literacies beyond the oral and written, b) be open to various modes of knowledge such as sensorial and embodied knowledges (<i>danas</i> and <i>damdam</i>), c) aim to produce students who are responsible, critical, creative, ethical, analytical, independent thinkers, aware of history, and capable of critical reflection, and d) develop a global citizen who has a strong sense of his/her identity as a Filipino.</li> <li>• The GE program should support specific learning outcomes such as lifelong learning and social awareness.</li> <li>• There should be domains or themes within the GE curriculum, as well as required and elective GE courses. Colleges should be given the latitude to prescribe the required and elective courses. Students should be able to take the GE courses at any year level and any sequence.</li> </ul>

---

---



---

PRESENTATION 3 – REPORT ON THE 24 AUGUST PRE-CONFERENCE SYMPOSIUM ON THE NUMBER OF GE UNITS

---



---

Resource Person	Dr. Violeda A. Umali, Director, Office of the Director of Instruction
-----------------	---

---



---

Abstract	This presentation gives a recap of the symposium held on 24 August 2015 to present and deliberate on the number of GE units that the UPD colleges/academic units recommend for their respective undergraduate degree programs.
----------	--

---



---

Major Takeaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sixteen (16) of the 19 colleges/units with undergraduate degree programs submitted recommendations on the number of GE units that undergraduate students should take.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Nine colleges/units had the same recommendation for all their degree programs.</li> <li>◦ The recommended number of units ranges from 18 to 45.</li> <li>◦ Eleven (11) colleges/units included courses from the proposed University Writing and Communication Program (UWCP).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Participants' recommendations:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The minimum number of GE units in each undergraduate degree program shall be 21.</li> <li>◦ The UWCP proposal shall be elaborated on by the College of Arts and Letters (CAL). The number of UWCP units to be included in, or to complement, the GE curriculum shall be decided upon by the colleges/academic units.</li> <li>◦ The specific courses that will make up the GE curriculum shall be tackled in future fora including the GE Conference.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-----------------	---

---



---

OPEN FORUM FOR PRESENTATIONS 1 – 3

---



---

Moderator	Dr. Elizabeth L. Enriquez, College of Mass Communication
-----------	--

---



---

Major Takeaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the shift to the “cafeteria” approach for choosing GE courses, it is difficult to go back to the old design wherein all UP students took the same set of GE courses. But Tatak UP remains as the spirit of the GE Program.</li> <li>• The program goals and objectives should guide all other decisions regarding the design and implementation of the GE curriculum.</li> <li>• Whether domain-based or theme-based, GE courses should develop scholarship and commitment to excellence.</li> <li>• Types of courses taken in senior high school and under the GE curriculum could overlap, but they are different in their approach/pedagogy.</li> <li>• The commonalities in the comments of the clusters about the proposed GE framework should be summarized.</li> <li>• Presentations about the UWCP proposal and the UP language policy should be held prior to the workshops.</li> </ul>
-----------------	---

---



---

---

---

PRESENTATION 4 – ANG PALISI SA WIKA NG UNIBERSIDAD NG PILIPINAS

---

---

Resource Person	Dr. Rommel B. Rodriguez, Director, UPD Sentro ng Wikang Filipino (SWF)
-----------------	--

---

---

Abstract	This presentation issues a reminder to UPD constituents about the university's policy on the use of Filipino as medium of instruction for teaching, whilst underscoring the practice that adoption of Filipino remains a voluntary decision of the faculty.
----------	---

---

---

Moderator	Dr. Grace Aguilung-Dalisay, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
-----------	---

---

---

Major Takeaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The implementation of the language policy is not the sole responsibility of the SWF; it is the responsibility of the whole university.</li> <li>• The implementation of the language policy has not cascaded to such things as the board exams and policy-making.</li> <li>• Filipino should not just be the medium of instruction; it should also be the medium of knowledge production (i.e., of research and other discourses).</li> <li>• The SWF should consider doing an assessment of the status and direction of the implementation of the language policy.</li> </ul>
-----------------	---

---

---

PRESENTATION 5 – PROPOSED NEW GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM  
WITH THE UNIVERSITY WRITING AND COMMUNICATION PROGRAM (UWCP)

---

---

Resource Person	Dr. Ruth Jordana L. Pison, College of Arts and Letters
-----------------	--

---

---

Moderator	Dr. Grace Aguilung-Dalisay, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
-----------	---

---

---

Abstract	The College of Arts and Letters presents the features of the UWCP as a component of CAL's proposed New GE Program (NGEP).
----------	---

---

---

Major Takeaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The UWCP is premised on the principle that letters are at the center of a liberal humanist education. Language is not a tool; language is critical and transformative.</li> <li>• The UWCP of 12 units is the core of CAL's proposed NGEP. The second layer consists of 12 units of disciplinary electives and the third layer consists of 9 units of interdisciplinary electives.</li> <li>• From the Open Forum             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The proposed UWCP courses seem to overlap with some courses already taught in some colleges/units.</li> <li>◦ Instead of having four disciplinary clusters, the existing three knowledge domains could be considered. This is because the field of Management and Economics is founded on sociological theories and thus is part of the social sciences and philosophy domain.</li> <li>◦ Similar to other proposals that include interdisciplinary courses, the UWCP also needs to look into the administrative issues that accompany the implementation of interdisciplinary initiatives.</li> <li>◦ It should be clarified what kind of English will be taught by the UWCP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-----------------	---

---

---

---

---

PRESENTATION 6 – ASSESSING THE FUTURE GE PROGRAM

---

---

Resource Person	Dr. Marian P. Roque, College of Science
-----------------	---

---

Moderator	Dr. Grace Aguilin-Dalisay, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
-----------	--

---

Abstract	The presentation is divided into two parts. The first part gives the highlights of past reviews of the UP/UPD GE program, while the second part lists some points for consideration in the design of an evaluation scheme for the new GE program.
----------	---

---

Major Takeaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Among the GE programs of UP, only the RGEP was systematically assessed.</li><li>• Recurring issues identified by the past reviews/assessment of the GE program include the: a) lack of systematic monitoring and evaluation of the GE program, b) lack of clarity in program standards, and c) backlogs in course offerings.</li><li>• Some questions that need to be addressed in designing the evaluation scheme for the new GE program are:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ How do we verify that the objectives of the GE program are met?</li><li>◦ What systems/protocols could be established – e.g., pretest, midterm assessment, exit exam?</li><li>◦ What kinds of exam could be given (quantitative, qualitative, etc.)?</li><li>◦ How do we assess the GE program from the point of view of students, teachers, and administrators?</li><li>◦ What new strategies for assessing GE courses and the GE program could we adopt?</li></ul></li><li>• From the Open Forum<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ How do we operationalize values that we want inculcated in our students via the GE program? How do we isolate the impact of GE education versus other courses and other experiences that a UP student goes through?</li><li>◦ A ‘think tank’ should be constituted to plan the assessment of the GE program.</li></ul></li></ul>
-----------------	--

---

---

## C. The Workshops

WORKSHOP 1 – GE CONTEXT, RATIONALE, AND PHILOSOPHY	
Presenter	Dr. Lynna Marie Y. Sycip, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
Facilitator	Dr. Ruth Jordana L. Pison, College of Arts and Letters
Key Points/ Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the points articulated in the proposed GE framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The workshop participants agree with the statements regarding the liberal education philosophy, types of students envisioned, and the values to be developed among students.</li> <li>However, we must recognize the need for continuous review of GE courses and the GE program itself to be responsive to national, international, global, and technological developments.</li> <li>We need to be aware of the threats to liberal education – i.e., the move towards neo-liberalism and globalization that tend to reduce education and students to commodities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>From the Open Forum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liberal education is the bedrock of UP's general education program.</li> <li>GE courses should develop higher-order skills (e.g., critical and creative thinking skills, and methods of inquiry skills).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
WORKSHOP 2 – GE OBJECTIVES, GE STUDENTS' ATTRIBUTES, AND KSAs (KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, ATTITUDES AND VALUES)	
Presenter	Prof. Felipe P. Jocano Jr., College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
Moderator	Dr. Ruth Jordana L. Pison, College of Arts and Letters
Key Points/ Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestions for the proposed GE framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add gender sensitivity, responsiveness, and empowerment to GE dispositional outcomes.</li> <li>Regarding GE students' attributes, nationalism should be rooted in local diversity so that it is more inclusive.</li> <li>Regarding KSAs, the following could be added: a) knowledge of technology, digital literacy skills, attitude and disposition towards innovation, b) <i>pakikipagkapwa-tao</i>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>From the Open Forum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concepts for further clarification include: a) global citizen, b) social justice, and c) liberal education in the humanist vs. the socialist perspective.</li> <li>The proposed GE framework needs to sharpen the analysis of the national context – i.e., have a clearer conceptual and operational/curricular articulation of what it means to be a Filipino, what it means to foster a commitment to service and social justice.</li> <li>The current matrix of attributes and KSAs is linear and seemingly sequential. Relationships among concepts and outcomes are not clearly shown.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



---

---

WORKSHOP 3 – GE CURRICULUM STRUCTURE: PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES AND TYPES OF COURSES TO BE TAKEN

---

Presenter Prof. Wilfredo M. Rada, College of Engineering

---

Moderator Dr. Ruth Jordana L. Pison, College of Arts and Letters

---

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Key Points/<br>Outputs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Interdisciplinary” courses have been operationalized in various ways in the university: a) a combination of many disciplines that are integrated, b) a course taught by one department but synthesizes ideas from various disciplines, c) a course grounded in one discipline but borrowing techniques, approaches, tools, etc. from other disciplines, d) subject matter determines if the course is interdisciplinary or not.</li> <li>• Points for consideration regarding the teaching of interdisciplinary cases: a) there should be a way of assessing if a course satisfies “interdisciplinarity”; b) the level of maturity of students is a factor in the effectiveness of an interdisciplinary course, c) the nature of the course determines the need for interdisciplinarity (not all courses should be interdisciplinary); and d) introducing major and minor degrees could foster interdisciplinary perspectives among students.</li> <li>• From the Open Forum:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Interdisciplinary is not the same as multidisciplinary. As an instruction design or approach, interdisciplinary is thematic, interactive and integrative, while multidisciplinary is sequential.</li> <li>◦ Interdisciplinarity should be approached in a way that does not undermine the integrity of the individual disciplines. Students must be grounded in their individual disciplines for them to fully appreciate and benefit from an interdisciplinary course.</li> <li>◦ The key constructs of “holistic learning” and “critical thinking” are not achieved by content alone; they are also dependent on pedagogical approaches that we use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|------------------------|--|
- 

---

---

WORKSHOP 4 – GE CURRICULUM STRUCTURE: NUMBER OF UNITS

---

Presenter Prof. John Michael G. Constantino, College of Engineering

---

Moderator Dr. Ruth Jordana L. Pison, College of Arts and Letters

---

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Key Points/<br>Outputs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Almost all colleges/units agree that 21 should be the minimum number of units in the GE curriculum.</li> <li>• All colleges/units agree that there should be a maximum number of GE units. While the workshop groups recommended not going beyond 45 units of GE, it was noted that majority of the colleges/units specified 33-36 units of GE as their maximum.</li> <li>• Most of the colleges/units agree that there should be required/core GE courses but there are no concrete recommendations as to what these courses are.</li> <li>• We must have a system for identifying the strand that students took in their senior high school.</li> </ul> |
|------------------------|--|
-

---

---

#### WORKSHOP 4 – GE CURRICULUM STRUCTURE: NUMBER OF UNITS (CONT’N.)

---

---

Key Points/  
Outputs  
(cont’n.)

- From the Open Forum:
    - It might be good to look at the GE curricula of other universities when we decide on our own GE curriculum’s structure.
    - The number of units should be gauged against GE program objectives and target attributes – will a particular number of units be sufficient to achieve those objectives, attributes, and KSAs?
    - There are also administrative issues to consider, such as when students shift from one course to another.
    - GE objectives and targets may also be achieved through non-GE courses. But GE should not be viewed separately from, or in competition with, specialist courses. A university education is a whole, and should always be approached as such.
- 
- 

#### WORKSHOP 5 – GE CURRICULUM STRUCTURE: ‘CANDIDATE’ COURSES

---

---

Presenter

Dr. Ma. Theresa T. Payongayong, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy

---

---

Key Points/  
Outputs

- The group does not agree with the proposed GE framework’s classification of GE courses according to themes. The group suggests shifting from themes to domains (Arts and Humanities; Math, Science and Technology; Social Sciences and Philosophy), as domain classifications already exist.
  - The UWCP is important but is not the core of the GE program. Not all courses in the UWCP need to be taken by all students. The courses may be offered as separate from, or parallel to, GE courses.
  - The recommended minimum of 21 GE units could be broken down into 12 units of required/core courses and 9 units of domain- or cluster-based courses (one course per domain/cluster outside of students’ own program cluster).
- 
- 

#### WORKSHOP 6 – GE IMPLEMENTATION: PROGRAM PLANNING AND COORDINATION

---

---

Presenters

Prof. Bernard N. Caslib Jr., College of Social Sciences and Philosophy  
Dr. Maria Christine M. Muyco, College of Music

---

---

Key Points/  
Outputs

- The UPCAT should have a measure of students’ proficiency regardless of their track in senior high school. Bridge/remedial courses may be provided as needed.
  - GE courses should not have prerequisites. But units offering GE courses may indicate if there is a preferred level of maturity/preparation for students who will enroll in a particular GE course.
  - Individual units/departments and the students should be given the option to decide on the sequence in which GE courses will be taken.
  - Current GE courses should be reviewed to determine if they are aligned with the goals and objectives of the new GE program.
  - The standard channels and procedures should be followed in evaluating GE curricular proposals.
  - The GE Center should take care of the administrative matters regarding the planning and coordination for the GE program.
- 
-

---

---

### WORKSHOP 7 – GE IMPLEMENTATION: COURSE DELIVERY

---

---

Presenter Dr. Flaudette May V. Datuin, College of Arts and Letters

---

- Key Points/  
Outputs
- The group agrees with the language policy but remains open to a bilingual teaching approach.
  - Both junior and senior faculty with appropriate background may teach GE courses, as each brings different experiences and perspectives into the teaching of the courses.
  - Team teaching and blended learning strategies should be incorporated in GE courses.
  - Review the system for assigning multipliers and overload credits for teaching GE courses. Likewise, the system for giving grants, awards, and promotion points for GE should be reviewed.
  - During the transition period, a comparative study of students who took the different GE programs could be undertaken. “Old” and “new” ways of teaching existing GE courses could be implemented side by side.
- 

---

---

### WORKSHOP 8 – ASSESSMENT OF GE COURSES AND THE GE PROGRAM

---

---

Presenter Dr. Jorge V. Tigno, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy

---

- Key Points/  
Outputs
- The objectives and outcomes of the proposed GE framework should be revisited to see if/how they lend themselves to evaluation.
  - It should be acknowledged that each GE course is but a component of a larger GE program, and that the GE program is but a component of UP education.
  - Evaluation must begin at the point of course conception.
  - Consider developing a set of GE “rider questions” in the SET.
  - Syllabus must include specific and measureable objectives.
  - Points for consideration:
    - When does UP education become evident?
    - Is the 3-out-of-5 formula for assessing GE course objectives sufficient? What if all courses in the student’s GE program target the same three objectives?
    - Is numerical grade necessary for GE courses?
    - What incentives could be offered to teachers of GE courses?
- 

---

---

### DISCUSSION: WORKSHOPS 5-8 OUTPUTS

---

---

Moderator Dr. Mark Albert H. Zarco, College of Engineering

---

- Key Points
- It was reiterated that UPD’s GE Center will be an administrative center.
  - The language policy will still be implemented on a voluntary basis.
  - It was reiterated that the choice of GE courses should be based on GE program objectives, student attributes, and KSAs.
-

---

---

RESOLUTIONS

---

---

Moderator      Prof. Leonardo C. Rosete, College of Fine Arts

---

---

- Key Points
- Given the scope of the framework and the amount of inputs collated prior to and during the Conference, it was decided that the GE Committee prepare a report on what have been discussed and agreed upon, and circulate the same to the Conference participants.
  - The chairs of the four academic clusters will work on the UPD document that will be submitted to the UPD ExeComm and the UP GE Task Force.
- 
- 

**D. Closing Remarks of Vice-Chancellor Benito M. Pacheco: Major Take-Aways**

- The composition and profile of the participants of this year's UPD GE Conference is noteworthy, and show how important the GE program is to all of us.
- We are optimistic that in the November UC meeting, we will be able to come up with decisions that would enable our degree programs to move forward with their curricular plans.
- In the next two years, we have the chance to pilot test our new GE courses.
- We have agreed on many things, and we shall await the cluster chairs to articulate those agreements in writing.

**IV. Conclusion: Major Agreements Reached during the Conference**

(please see matrix of UPD's comments on the proposed GE framework and the 18 "candidate resolutions" from the Conference)

## POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS AT 23 NOVEMBER 2015 SPECIAL MEETING

(with UP Diliman's Comments on the UP GE Task Force Draft Framework for a Revised UP GE Program)

FRAMEWORK COMPONENT	(A) FOR POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES	(B) FOR POTENTIAL EDITS OF THE TASK FORCE GE FRAMEWORK	(C) FOR POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS
<p><b>1.0 Context and Rationale</b></p> <p>In sum, the revision of the GE program has a broad context. As the writers of the 2010 GEP Review Final Report remind us, "UP has regularly revised its GE program in light of the changing contexts and conditions of the university and its experience in implementing the program." While the periods between earlier GE program reviews were relatively long, the gaps between program reviews in recent years have become shorter. In the 1990s, the GE program was reviewed in 1991, 1992, and 1995, with the reviews culminating in the adoption of the RGEP in 2001 (Re-examining UP's General Education Program Final Report, 2010). The RGEP itself was subjected to a systemwide review in 2009, only eight years since its adoption. And then in 2013, a mere four years later, the UP System proposed a new set of program revisions. The frequency of GE program reviews reflects the increasingly rapid pace of change. But it is the direction rather than the pace of curricular reform that is perhaps more noteworthy. Without exception, all attempts to revise the GE program are re-affirmations of the continuing relevance of liberal education as the core, or "heart" (Kintanar, 2001), of undergraduate education in UP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hybrid GE program might still be applicable even in the face of K-to-12. Check which existing GE courses could be upgraded in terms of content and pedagogical approach.</li> </ul>	<p>Sharpen the articulation of liberal education as bedrock of the GE Program. (Perhaps to revise the last sentence of the paragraph quoted – see leftmost column of this table – to include the phrase that "liberal education is the BEDROCK of UP's General Education program." )</p>	<p><b>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 1</b></p> <p>There is a need to revise the GE program given the national and international trends affecting the Philippine higher education system.</p>

FRAMEWORK COMPONENT	(A) FOR POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES	(B) FOR POTENTIAL EDITS OF THE TASK FORCE GE FRAMEWORK	(C) FOR POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS
<p><b>2.0 UP General Education Philosophy</b></p> <p>The liberal education insures a broader outlook on God, man, and events; skills [sic] the student to react properly to the promptings of truth and to the world; and develops in him acumen and quickness of mind, so that in the course of time he is able to learn thoroughly the particular practices of a certain professional or technical activity, because they are nothing more nor less than the specific utilization of general cultural attainment.... The primary aim of all education is to form the habit of thinking, of judging facts and circumstances in their proper light, of logically deducing inferences from them — and this aim cannot be attained save through the instrumentality of a liberal education. (Palma quoted in Doronila et al., 1993, pp. 136-137)</p> <p>[I]nstead of contrasting GE with specialist education and thinking of it as a corrective to specialism, it may be more appropriate to consider GE as a complement to and a co-requisite of specialist education. By helping to build foundational skills, GE courses can prepare students for the major courses.</p> <p>In basic education the approach is introductory and the aim, generally speaking, is to develop basic skills, such as comprehension and problem solving. In GE courses the approach is not remediation of the basic skills (cf. Tenmatay, 1960) but deepening the understanding of key ideas, theories, and paradigms in various disciplines, and the aim is development of higher-order cognitive skills, such as analysis, synthesis and integration, and problem formulation or articulation.</p>	<p>We should continuously review GE courses and the GE program itself to be responsive to national, international, global, and technological developments.</p>	<p>The AH Cluster finds the GE philosophy not (yet) clearly articulated in the draft document, and suggests the following as inputs:</p> <p>A GE Philosophy is an ethos characterized by the following basic principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GE is by nature a liberal education that need not be expressly utilitarian. It is non-specialist (i.e., it is holistic and integrative) and its value is not immediately obvious or particularly manifested in a set of measurable skills. At its best, it develops both critical and creative thinking and action.</li> <li>• The UPGEP develops ways of being and the embodiment of the loftiest principles at the core of a UP education. The Program, thus, by going beyond inculcating habits of thought and ways of perceiving, develops students who live the ideals of <i>pagiging makabayan</i> and <i>makatao</i>.</li> <li>• GE is a transformative education that potentially changes oneself, one's worldview, and one's world. A meaningful GEP encourages creative and constructive action that contributes to the improvement of the student's community, nation, and the world. This transformative nature of the GEP draws its strength from recognizing the Filipino student's cultural specificity at the same time as his/her shared humanity.</li> </ul>	<p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 2</p> <p>Liberal education is the bedrock of UP's General Education Program.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 3</p> <p>GE courses should develop higher-order skills (e.g., thinking skills (creative and critical), methods of inquiry skills).</p> <p>.....</p> <p>(Note: During the September 2015 GE Conference, there was no consensus regarding the relationship of GE with specialist education, and GE's role in the undergraduate curriculum.)</p>

FRAMEWORK COMPONENT	(A) FOR POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES	(B) FOR POTENTIAL EDITS OF THE TASK FORCE GE FRAMEWORK	(C) FOR POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS
<p><b>3.0 GE Program Objectives</b></p> <p>The UP GE program should aim to develop <i>leadership</i> characterized by integrity and honor, excellence in scholarship, and public service, the hallmarks of a UP education. To this end it shall provide students with a broad foundation of study that will: broaden intellectual and cultural horizons; hone critical and creative thinking; develop a passion for learning and scholarship; cultivate a high sense of intellectual and moral integrity; and foster a commitment to service and social justice.</p>	<p>Suggestions from the AH cluster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadening intellectual and cultural horizons should be realized by developing in the students a high level of competence in languages and literacies beyond the oral and written. Such expansion of horizons can only happen in a GEP that is open to various modes of knowledge such as sensorial and embodied knowledges or what we refer to as knowledges embedded in <i>danas</i> and <i>damdam</i>.</li> <li>• Honing critical thinking and nourishing creative knowledges should be complemented by a participative/reflexive practice. The GEP should cultivate in the students the ability to harness creative and artistic practices for the exploration of alternative forms of thinking and being.</li> <li>• Developing a passion for learning and scholarship should be done in a manner that leads to constructive and creative action. It is not enough that the GEP encourages students to have a high regard for scholarship. More important is the “living out” or <i>pagsasadiwa</i> of academic excellence characterized by the continuous pursuit of knowledge and an engaged practice of scholarship.</li> <li>• Intelligence, which is manifested in the student’s ability to think critically, is not confined to the mind. Likewise, ethics is not merely a cognitive function but an embodied philosophy. Thus, the GEP’s strong grounding on ethics must emphasize that ethical principles are “lived.”</li> <li>• Fostering a commitment to service and social justice should be grounded on the student’s strong sense of Filipino-ness but complemented by a strong understanding of a his/her position and location in the world.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed GE framework needs to sharpen the analysis of the national context – i.e., have a clearer conceptual and operational/curricular articulation of what it means to be a Filipino, and what it means to foster a commitment to service and social justice.</li> <li>• Add gender sensitivity, responsiveness, and empowerment to GE dispositional outcomes.</li> </ul>	<p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 4</p> <p>GE objectives and targets may also be achieved through non-GE courses. But GE should not be viewed separately from, or in competition with, specialist courses. A university education is a whole, and should always be approached as such.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>(Note: During the September 2015 GE Conference, it was noted that the following concepts need further clarification: a) global citizen, b) social justice, and c) liberal education in the humanist vs. the socialist perspective.)</p>

FRAMEWORK COMPONENT	(A) FOR POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES	(B) FOR POTENTIAL EDITS OF THE TASK FORCE GE FRAMEWORK	(C) FOR POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS
<p><b>3.0 GE Program Objectives (cont'n.)</b></p> <p>The envisioned GE student attributes of integrity and honor, scholarship, broad intellectual and cultural horizons, and nationalism and public service are the outcome of a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes or dispositions (KSAs).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current matrix of attributes and KSAs is linear and seemingly sequential. Relationships among concepts and outcomes are not clearly shown.</li> <li>• Add the following KSAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Knowledge of technology</li> <li>◦ Visual and digital literacy</li> <li>◦ Attitude and disposition towards innovation</li> <li>◦ Pakikipagkapwa-tao</li> <li>◦ Social skills and emotional maturity</li> <li>◦ Empathy and charisma</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Nationalism should be rooted in local diversity (i.e., recognizing the diversity of language groups and ethnicities).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.0 The GE Curriculum Structure</b></p> <p>An integrated curriculum consisting of a minimum of 21 units and a maximum of 36 units of interdisciplinary courses is proposed. Each CU shall determine the total number of GE courses at the CU level based on an analysis of undergraduate program needs and requirements, and select the GE courses to be taken by their students from the array of GE courses to be approved based on the principles and guidelines laid out in this framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The idea of “interdisciplinary” at program and course levels has to be clarified. One approach suggested during the UPD GE Conference 2015 is to consider a degree program as equivalent to a discipline. Thus, an interdisciplinary course is one that is enriched by content from different degree programs and such course is taught by faculty members coming from different degree programs.</li> <li>• a) There should be a way of assessing if a course satisfies “interdisciplinarity”; b) The level of maturity of students is a factor in the effectiveness of an interdisciplinary course, c) The nature of the course determines the need for interdisciplinarity; and d) Introducing major and minor degrees could foster interdisciplinary perspectives among students.</li> <li>• Interdisciplinarity should be approached in a way that does not undermine the integrity of the individual disciplines. Students must be grounded in their individual disciplines for them to fully appreciate and benefit from an interdisciplinary course.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all courses should be interdisciplinary.</li> <li>• The GE courses may come from the existing GE courses that may meet the GEP objectives, the System 11 courses, and other new courses that may be approved.</li> </ul>	<p><b>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 5</b> Not all courses should be interdisciplinary.</p> <p><b>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 6</b> The GE courses may come from the existing GE courses that may meet the GEP objectives, the System 11 courses, and other new courses that may be approved.</p> <hr/> <p>(Other points raised in the cluster workshops and the September 2015 GE conference: a) “Interdisciplinary” courses have been operationalized in various ways in the university: a) a combination of many disciplines that are integrated, b) a course taught by one department but synthesizes ideas from various disciplines, c) a course grounded in one discipline but borrowing techniques, approaches, tools, etc. from other disciplines, d) subject matter determines if the course is interdisciplinary or not; b) The key constructs of “holistic learning” and “critical thinking” are not achieved by content alone; they are also dependent on pedagogical approaches that we use.</p>



FRAMEWORK COMPONENT	(A) FOR POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES	(B) FOR POTENTIAL EDITS OF THE TASK FORCE GE FRAMEWORK	(C) FOR POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS
<p><b>4.0 The GE Curriculum Structure (cont'n.)</b></p> <p>To underscore the interdisciplinarity that distinguishes the GE program from specialist education, a thematic rather than domain-based classification of GE courses is proposed. Themes are interdisciplinary in character — i.e., they cut across disciplines, and different disciplines can and should contribute to the elucidation of each theme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We must have a system for identifying the strand that students took in their senior high school.</li> <li>• It might be good to look at the GE curricula of other universities when we decide on our own GE curriculum's structure.</li> <li>• The number of units should be gauged against GE program objectives and target attributes — will a particular number of units be sufficient to achieve those objectives, attributes, and KSAs?</li> <li>• There are also administrative issues to consider, such as when students shift from one course to another, or transfer from one CU to another.</li> <li>• On the UWCP The UWCP is important but is not the core of the GE program. Not all courses in the UWCP need to be taken by all students. The courses may be offered as separate from, or parallel to, GE courses.</li> </ul>	<p>On the number of GE units:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The minimum number of GE units should be 21.</li> <li>• There should be required (core) GE courses.</li> <li>• A maximum number of GE units could be set.</li> </ul> <p>On the thematic classification of courses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instead of themes, the existing three domains should still be used as system for classifying and/or characterizing courses.</li> </ul>	<p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 7</p> <p>The minimum number of units in the GE curriculum should be 21.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 8</p> <p>There should be core (prescribed) GE courses.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 9</p> <p>The existing system of classifying GE courses by domain (Arts and Humanities; Math, Science and Technology; Social Sciences and Philosophy) should still be used in the new GE program.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 10</p> <p>The decision to include University Writing and Communication Program (UWCP) courses and how to include them in undergraduate degree programs will be made in the proposals by the individual colleges and degree programs.</p>

FRAMEWORK COMPONENT	(A) FOR POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES	(B) FOR POTENTIAL EDITS OF THE TASK FORCE GE FRAMEWORK	(C) FOR POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS
<p><b>5.0 Pedagogical Principles</b></p> <p>The following principles derived from theory and research on what makes for effective teaching and learning in higher education, as well as from the University's long experience in the teaching of GE, are recommended to underpin the GE program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GE courses shall be interdisciplinary in pedagogy as well as in content.</li> <li>• GE courses shall be learning-centered, with a clear focus on learning outcomes and their alignment with teaching and learning activities and assessment of learning.</li> <li>• GE courses shall develop critical, creative, and reflective thinking skills through the appropriate use of learning resources and technologies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GE courses should not have prerequisites. But units offering GE courses may indicate if there is a preferred level of maturity/preparation for students who will enroll in a particular GE course.</li> <li>• Individual units/departments and the students should be given the option to decide on the sequence in which GE courses will be taken.</li> <li>• The group agrees with the language policy but remains open to a bilingual teaching approach.</li> <li>• Both junior and senior faculty may teach GE courses, as each brings different experiences and perspectives into the teaching of the courses.</li> <li>• Team teaching and blended learning strategies should be incorporated in GE courses.</li> </ul>	<p>See item 4.0 (GE Curriculum Structure) above re interdisciplinary courses.</p>	<p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 11 GE courses should not have prerequisites.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 12 Individual undergraduate programs will have their respective proposals on the sequence in which GE courses will be taken by students.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 13 The language policy will still be implemented on a voluntary basis.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 14 Both junior and senior faculty may teach GE courses so long as they have the necessary qualifications for teaching these courses.</p>
<p><b>6.0 Guidelines for Program Implementation</b></p> <p>The administration of the GE program is a collaborative effort of the faculty handling the GE courses, the CU GE Program Coordinators, the CU GE Councils or Committees, and the System GE Council. The CU GE Councils or Committees and the System GE Council shall be responsible for the policy-making aspects of program administration, and the GE faculty and GE Program Coordinators shall be responsible for program implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The UPCAT should have a measure of students' proficiency regardless of their track in senior high school. Bridge/remedial courses may be provided as needed.</li> <li>• Current GE courses should be reviewed to determine if they are aligned with the goals and objectives of the new GEP.</li> <li>• The standard channels and procedures should be followed in evaluating GE curricular proposals.</li> <li>• The GE Center should take care of the administrative matters regarding the planning and coordination for the GE program.</li> </ul>	<p>Add the GE Center among those in charge of program implementation.</p>	<p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 15</p> <p>Current GE courses will be reviewed to determine if they are aligned with the goals and objectives of the new GE program.</p>

FRAMEWORK COMPONENT	(A) POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES	(B) FOR POTENTIAL EDITS OF THE TASK FORCE GE FRAMEWORK	(C) FOR POTENTIAL UC RESOLUTIONS
7.0 Guidelines for Program Implementation (cont'n.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the system for assigning multipliers and overload credits for teaching GE courses, as well as the system for giving grants, awards, and promotion points for GE teaching.</li> <li>During the transition period, a comparative study of students who took the different GE programs could be undertaken. "Old" and "new" ways of teaching existing GE courses could be implemented side by side.</li> <li>Some questions that need to be addressed in designing the evaluation scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do we verify that the objectives of the GE program are met?</li> <li>What systems/protocols could be established – e.g., pretest, midterm assessment, exit exam?</li> <li>What kinds of exam could be given (quantitative, qualitative, etc.)?</li> <li>How do we assess the GE program from the point of view of students, teachers, and administrators?</li> <li>What new strategies for assessing GE courses and the GE program could we adopt?</li> <li>How do we operationalize values that we want inculcated in our students via the GE program? How do we isolate the impact of GE education versus other courses and other experiences that a UP student goes through?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A 'think tank' should be constituted to plan the assessment of the GE program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GE program should be assessed at the point of inception (pretest), during its implementation (formative assessment), and after the students have completed the program (exit exam).</li> <li>Assessment should be from the point of view of students, teachers, and administrators.</li> </ul>	<p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 16 The GE program should be evaluated at various points; there should be a baseline study (pretest), formative assessment, and exit exam for students who have completed the program.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 17 The assessment should consider the perspectives of students, teachers, and administrators.</p> <p>POTENTIAL RESOLUTION 18 A think tank will be constituted to plan the assessment of the GE program.</p>