

Report on the Review of Teaching and Learning in General Education conducted by the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning in November 2008

Contents

1. Introduction p. 2
2. Preamble p. 3

The outcomes of the review are reported under the following headings:

3. Overall discussion of key strengths and challenges. These are described as *commendations* (clear achievements), *affirmations* (planned future enhancements) and *recommendations* (areas that the Panel feels that the programme needs to explore in more detail). p. 5
4. Detailed feedback in each of the areas (a) to (g) listed, corresponding to the areas noted in section 7 of the 'Integrated framework for curriculum development and review. I. Undergraduate programmes'
 - (a) quality assurance; p. 6
 - (b) aims and desired learning outcomes; p. 7
 - (c) curriculum design and subject content; p. 8
 - (d) learning activities; p. 11
 - (e) assessment scheme; p. 13
 - (f) professional development of all teaching staff; and p. 13
 - (g) roadmaps/ action plans. p. 14
5. Concluding remarks p. 15

1. Introduction

Review Panel membership

Professor Lai Pan Chiu (Panel Chair, Member of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning, Associate Dean (Education) of the Faculty of Arts)

Professor Deborah Martinsen (Associate Dean, Center for the Core Curriculum, Columbia College, Columbia University, External Member)

Professor Cheng Shiu Yuen (Dean of Science, HKUST, External Member)

Professor Poon Wai Yin (Member of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning, Associate Dean (Education) of the Faculty of Science)

Professor Carmel McNaught (Panel Technical Secretary, Member of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning, Director of the Centre for Learning Enhancement And Research)

In attendance at the preliminary and concluding meetings

Ms Wong Kit May from the Academic and Quality Section was present at the preliminary and concluding meetings.

Meetings

The Review Panel preliminary meeting was held on 12 November 2008. On the same day, the Panel met first with three members of University General Education (UGE) management and four UGE teachers, and then with 12 representatives of College General Education (CGE) management and teachers. On 13 November 2008 the Panel met first with ten current undergraduate students from Years 2, 3, 4 and 5, and then with seven alumni. On 15 November 2008 a final Panel meeting took place to plan the final report.

All meetings were very cordial and highly interactive.

Aims of the review process

- to comment on the current curriculum structure and content for General Education (GE) against its stated objectives and mission;
- to assess the strengths and identify areas for improvement; and
- to advise the University on emerging trends and directions.

2. Preamble

One key challenge facing this review was articulating and clarifying the distinction between UGE and CGE. Some of the challenge was conceptual as it required the Panel to identify the distinctive but complementary roles of UGE and CGE; a number of comments throughout the report pertain to this challenge.

Some of the challenge resided in the terminology used during the review process. In the review meetings, a number of terms were used, including ‘whole-person learning’, ‘academic learning’, ‘experiential learning’, and ‘service learning’. These terms were used in somewhat different ways by different people with whom the Review Panel had discussions.

All parties agreed that ‘whole-person learning’ is the goal of a CUHK education. For most (if not all) parties this means engaging students’ minds as well as their hearts, their cognitive as well as their moral and emotive capacities. Many parties see ‘academic’ learning as the domain of UGE and ‘experiential’ and/or ‘service’ learning as the domain of CGE. In addition, many (but not all) parties associate ‘academic’ with cognitive/ rational activities, while they associate ‘experiential’ and/or ‘service’ with moral and pragmatic activities. In a general sense, service learning is regarded as that subset of experiential learning that has a strong association with provision of support to a specific community.

The CUHK Strategic Plan (2006, pp 13–14) has a comprehensive list of the expected CUHK graduate capabilities:

“The University expects that its graduates should have acquired an appreciation of the values of a broad range of intellectual disciplines as well as general knowledge, and within that wide spectrum, have gained a depth of knowledge within a specialty, not only as an end in itself but also as a vehicle for experience in serious study and enquiry. They should have a high level of bilingual proficiency in Chinese and English, and a basket of skills including numeracy, analytic skills and IT capability appropriate to the modern age, and above all the ability to continue with life-long learning and professional development – in this day and age, that ability will be far more important than factual knowledge acquired during university studies. They should have cultivated a habit of reading widely, learnt to be critical and independent; they should be effective in communication and working in a team. Our students are also expected to have a deep understanding of Chinese culture and with it a sense of national identity and pride; they should also have an appreciation of other cultures, and with that appreciation also a high degree of inter-cultural sensitivity, tolerance and a global perspective. They should have an attitude of compassion, honesty and integrity in relation to self, family and society, and the ability to contribute as citizens and leaders. They should have a sense of purpose, responsibility and commitment in life, a desire to serve, as well as taste in their pursuits.”

The Strategic Plan emphasizes the role of an “environment that allows young people to experience, to reflect and to come to their own values and convictions” (p. 14). This environment includes the formal academic discipline-based curriculum (symbolized by students’ major studies, and supported by language enhancement courses and activities). This formal curriculum is complemented and extended by an academic broadly-based programme of studies (symbolized by UGE), the nurturing environment of the Colleges (symbolized by CGE), and a range of other experiential and service learning opportunities.

This review of GE at CUHK encompasses only UGE and CGE. However, the interface with language studies and other experiential and service learning opportunities needs to be borne in mind.

It is not possible to define clear demarcations between areas of students' learning experiences. Nor would we want there to be clear boundaries because students learn at the interfaces between these areas. For example, in formal, text-based, academic courses, teachers want their students to develop academic skills – critical thinking, observation, analysis, argument, imaginative comparison, respect for ideas, nuances and differences, etc. These may be academic skills, but they are also fundamental to understanding events in the wider world. Learning how to read, think, listen, and look critically is vital to living and working in today's complex and changing world.

So, rather than viewing UGE and CGE as separate components of students' curriculum requirements here at CUHK, the Panel regards UGE and CGE as having a synergistic relationship, as both contributing to the educational aims and ideals of CUHK. This is complex and multi-faceted terrain and Panel members are aware that this review report is not an end in itself but rather a trigger for a series of ongoing discussions and collaborations.

The Panel was reminded of the words of Cardinal Newman who, when writing about the need for a complementary relationship between the University and Colleges, noted that “such a union, such salutary balance and mutual complement of opposite advantages, is of difficult and rare attainment”.

This review report is presented with the confidence that members of the CUHK community can take the challenge presented by Newman and continue to enhance the excellence already inherent in the CUHK GE programme.

Newman, J. H. (1909). Historical sketches. VOL. III. Section I. Rise and progress of universities. Retrieved January 5, 2009, from <http://www.newmanreader.org/works/historical/volume3/universities/chapter19.html>

3. Overall discussion of key strengths and challenges

Commendations

1. CUHK has a strong institutional commitment to GE. The existence of a Senate Committee on General Education (SCGE) and the establishment of a rigorous quality assurance (QA) system for UGE, executed by the SCGE Standing Committee, are evidence of this. Further evidence comes from the long and well established history of the Colleges and their role in the education of CUHK students.
2. The goals of GE are closely aligned with the graduate capabilities listed in the University's Strategic Plan and noted in the Preamble.
3. There is clear evidence that students attribute the acquisition of valued knowledge and the development of important skills to their engagement in GE courses. GE is thus a vital and important element of CUHK's overall educational provision at the undergraduate (Ug) level.

Affirmations

1. The overall model of GE at CUHK which involves contributions from both UGE and CGE is affirmed. As noted in the Preamble, this 'two-pronged' model is complex. However, the Panel wishes to clearly affirm the importance of both UGE and CGE.
2. In a university setting, formal academic courses may be considered as having higher status than experiential learning. The Panel believes that the balance between formal academic studies and learning that is more experiential in nature is essential to the success of GE at CUHK. So, the Panel particularly wishes to affirm the essential role that CGE plays in the induction of students to university academic life and to the broadening of their learning experiences during their Ug studies.

Recommendation

1. The QAC report (section 12.8) notes that QA mechanisms for CGE should be more explicit and expresses concern with the variability in the QA processes for CGE across the four Colleges. The Panel reiterates this concern. Many of the recommendations in this report are designed to bring greater coherence into CGE so that UGE and CGE complement each other in the most effective manner.

The report has been designed to be as practical as possible and has been written to include many suggestions. This does not imply that all the recommendations need to be enacted. Indeed, many of them are couched as suggestions for consideration. As stated in the Preamble, the Panel wishes to trigger and support exploration and discussion of new ideas, not to prescribe fixed solutions.

4a. Quality assurance

Commendations

1. For UGE, there is evidence of review of QA processes over time. This has resulted in a robust structure with multiple sources of feedback from across the University.
2. For both UGE and CGE there is substantial scrutiny of new course approvals and collection of course evaluation data.
3. For UGE the system of three-year reviews, based on evidence provided by archived course materials, is a serious and thorough process, leading to some courses being very substantially revised or withdrawn.
4. For UGE, there is close scrutiny of course and teaching evaluation (CTE) data and, where necessary, follow-up with departments. (see also 4f A2)
5. Existing research on class size, CTE score (as one measure of satisfaction), and students' perception of achievement of GE objectives is indicative of a scholarly approach to QA in UGE. Larger class sizes are associated with lower CTE scores and lower students' perception of achievement of GE objectives. These results warrant further investigation and should influence guidelines for future GE courses. (see also 4d R3)

Affirmations

1. It is clear that Colleges are aware of the need to strengthen their QA procedures and have firm intentions in this regard. The Assemblies of Fellows have a central role to play in enhancing the QA of CGE, partly through better coordination of documentation.
2. The four Colleges have unique histories and each has a unique character. However, all four Colleges have similar broad aims. Focusing on the synergies between the Colleges will allow good practices and innovative ideas to be disseminated. The regular meetings of staff from all four Colleges which have begun recently are useful experience-sharing occasions and should be continued.

Recommendations

1. All the GE courses are owned by the Office of University General Education (OUGE) or the relevant College. Departments are the providers. While the mechanisms of University funding are beyond the terms of this review, it is pertinent to note that an easily readable explanation of how resources flow to departments, OUGE, and Colleges for teaching credit-bearing courses could improve communication between all GE stakeholders. There is currently a sense of confusion and (probably) misinformation that is not helpful. This matter should be addressed by SCGE.
2. Assignment of teaching assistants (TAs) to GE courses varies across departments. Some departments assign the TAs they perceive to be the most fluent and experienced to major courses and assign other TAs to GE courses. Other departments assign the better TAs to GE courses because of the larger class sizes. Overall this variation has implications for the QA of GE courses. It is recommended that departments who use TAs in GE courses include an explanation of their scheme for training and ongoing support of TAs in their proposals for GE courses. Further, data on TA quality should be provided by all departments when their GE courses are reviewed.

3. There seems to be variation in practice across departments as to whether CGE is considered as a formal part of a teacher's teaching load, or whether it is 'free' as part of University service. SCGE should clarify the existing guidelines about this matter. As part of this clarification process, SCGE should track whether and in what way CGE has been considered as a formal part of any GE teacher's teaching load.
4. In order to ensure that sufficient resources are expended on GE courses, SCGE may wish to consider whether and how departments might report on funding received for GE courses.
5. Regarding QAC Affirmation no. 1 on plans to incorporate GE into the Integrated Framework, several factors need attention. Two of these factors are:
 - 1) GE courses will need to adopt the same format as course outlines in other university courses. This will also be required because of the online Course Outline Warehouse that has been commissioned by the University.
 - 2) The format of the CTE questionnaire. There is a working group of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning (SCTL) that is considering a model of 'core plus options' items for CTE questionnaires across the University.

4b. Aims and desired learning outcomes

Commendations

1. Both UGE and CGE have a clear and strong commitment to whole-person development of CUHK students and are demonstrably successful in their endeavours. (see also 3 C2&3)
2. CGE is also based on a commitment to ideals and unique spirit of each of the four Colleges. This allows students to develop a sense of belonging to a defined community within the larger CUHK organization.

Affirmations

1. The plans to further articulate and refine learning outcomes that is included in UGE's roadmap are affirmed. (see also 4g R1)
2. OUGE and the Colleges have begun the process of articulating the outcomes for UGE and CGE in a form where the role that each sector makes to students' overall development is explicitly stated. Clear role differentiation and synergy is needed. UGE supports students' development of a conceptual framework about a myriad of aspects related to whole-person development and lifelong learning. CGE consolidates and extends this framework through experiential learning and engagement in the College community. The two aspects of GE work together, each complementing and enhancing the other.

Recommendations

1. The process of, on the one hand, differentiating between the roles of UGE and CGE and, on the other hand, recognizing the synergies that exist between GE in each context have a number of consequences. The Panel feels that the main impact of an integrated model for GE at CUHK would be that each GE course needs to be carefully considered against

the mission and objectives of GE. For UGE, this occurs quite well during the three-year review cycle. However, the process for CGE is less well developed.

If the major learning outcomes of CGE focus on adaptation to university life (first year), integrative/ interdisciplinary learning (final-year projects), experiential learning and community engagement, then the nature of CGE courses should be in line with these goals. It may be wise for academic, discipline-based GE courses to be offered under the aegis of UGE. This could free up the administrative time of College staff to develop and teach more CGE courses closely allied to the goals of CGE. Existing CGE academic, discipline-based courses could be merged with UGE courses to form one register of discipline-based, credit-bearing courses, taught and graded in similar ways to other Ug courses. (see also 4c R3)

2. It will be interesting for the four Colleges to be involved in discussions about the five new Colleges. Articulation of each College's unique contribution to whole-person development for CUHK Ug students will support the development of a campus College network. To this end, it is recommended that regular forums about the development of CGE strategies for the five new colleges should begin. (see also 4g R2)

4c. Curriculum design and subject content

Commendation

1. The process used for the recognition for credit in UGE of courses studied while on exchange is sensible and provides incentives for students to go on exchange trips. The process adopted is flexible as it specifies Areas. This level of granularity enables the matching of courses with broadly similar content.

Affirmations

1. The plan for systematic comparison of assessment data and satisfaction in double-coded major-GE courses is affirmed. This complies with the QAC suggestion that this matter be reviewed (QAC report, section 12.6). The Panel did not hear the details of the research plan but wishes to affirm the commitment to ongoing indepth monitoring of the student learning experience.
2. There is recognition of the "conflict between major courses and GE" (often used quote). This tension is one recognized by teachers and students alike. There appears to be a resultant willingness to make changes that maximize the benefits students can obtain from their GE studies.
3. 'Wisdom in world civilization' (tentative title) is a significant curriculum development for UGE. It is wise that this course will be pilot-tested in the near future. However, the OUGE needs to consider other changes that might be appropriate for the four-year curriculum.
4. Students at CUHK have very tightly packed timetables. Issues of overlap and a lack of clarity therefore cause more dissatisfaction than they might otherwise do. For this reason, it is really important that the design of each GE course be considered against those of other courses to reduce redundancy and overlap. The existing work on registering exclusions is affirmed, though this is an area that will need ongoing attention.

5. While the structure of the four Areas is a sound one, GE may like to consider the development of more interdisciplinary courses. Such courses are popular with students and serve the purpose of broadening students understanding in a very relevant way. One student commented that such courses enable students to “analyze topics from a variety of perspectives”.

Recommendations

1. While the double-coding of GE and major courses was undertaken for sound pragmatic reasons which have augmented the range of GE offerings, the practice does appear to be problematic and should be reconsidered. It is very challenging for teachers to provide suitably challenging offerings for major students as well as providing a broadening course for students from a range of discipline areas. The result is that neither group of students has an optimal learning environment. Further, GE students understandably feel they are disadvantaged in assessment grades. While the Panel did hear comments about beneficial conversations across disciplines, the consensus view of students and alumni was that studying double-coded courses was often frustrating.

Further, the current practice of having separate course evaluations forms for major and GE students leads to the unsatisfactory situation where there is no active discussion between the department and the GE partner (UGE or CGE) about how best to reach an appropriate compromise between the competing educational demands.

The University is currently reviewing its policy in this area and is preparing guidelines for the use of shared learning activities across a number of courses (usually two). This means that the economies of shared classes can be used for all or part of courses which share some common content. However, each of the courses can have separate classes and almost certainly would have some tailoring of the assessment activities. The OUGE should consider whether it wishes to encourage courses which share some common content to form a shared ‘cluster’ and how such a mechanism could support the enhancement of GE course design.

2. All GE courses may need some review to ensure there is no overlap with the new 6-credit-point course ‘Wisdom in world civilization’ (tentative title), presented as two 3-credit-point courses, currently in pilot form, ‘Science in the classics: Exploring the universe and life’ and ‘Classics for today: In search of good life and society’. There is some urgency about this recommendation as the year 2012 is fast approaching.
3. As noted in 4b R1, it seems advantageous to refocus CGE so that it supports more experiential activities and courses. This may mean shifting all formal disciplinary/subject-knowledge-based ‘lecture-type’ CGE courses to the listings of UGE. This will widen the pool of students for any one course. CUHK Ug students would then have more choice in their UGE electives.

One result of a stronger focus on experiential learning is that the role of service learning could become a stronger feature of CGE. There are some excellent examples of community outreach and community support in various Colleges. (see also 4d R8)

4. Any merger of CGE academic courses with UGE courses to form one register should be done so as to eliminate overlap between courses and provide a balanced set of offerings

for all CUHK Ug students.

5. Colleges should review the rationale for College assemblies, explicitly aligned with the desired learning outcomes for CGE. The existence of assemblies per se does not necessarily engender College spirit. Some are memorable occasions and some are less engaging. For students who are not in residence, assemblies can help create a sense of belonging. Each College could set up a project to explore dimensions for effective assemblies. Pooling the findings of these projects across Colleges could lead to very fruitful discussions. One suggestion that came from students was that they might be allowed to organize assemblies, or at least a few of them. Student input to a college-controlled activity is quite different from college input into a student-controlled activity.
6. CGE will be clearly affected by the double cohort of first year students in 2012. The mechanism of handling CGE in 2012 needs careful attention. This is another reason why more coordination and collaboration between Colleges could be beneficial.
7. The Leadership Development Programme (LDP) is administered through the OUGE but is not part of UGE. This credit-bearing programme received warm commendation from students. There is scope for the Colleges to examine the design of the LDP and consider whether any elements could be integrated into the design of CGE.
8. The Panel heard a number of comments to the effect that Area A courses were too classical and that a greater emphasis on China in Asia, China in a global context, Chinese culture contrasted with Europe (as opposed to a generic 'west') would be more educational. The OUGE is invited to consider this feedback from students.
9. It may be useful for all GE staff to examine the relevant details of the new senior secondary curriculum to ensure that GE courses will be appropriate to the level of incoming students in 2012. Overlap between GE courses needs to be avoided but so does overlap between university courses and those that students will have studied at school. This may apply especially to Area A.
10. UGE should revisit the balance of courses between the four Areas A, B, C and D. There are many more Area C courses. While the number of students attending courses in each of the four Areas is fairly constant, students have a much wider choice of courses in Area C. This breadth of choice, coupled with smaller class sizes in Area C, does emphasize Area C over the other Areas. About half the courses in Area C are double-coded; however, as noted in 4c R1, the use of double-coded major-GE courses is problematic. The issue of balance and double-coding therefore needs to be examined concurrently.

4d. Learning activities

Commendations

1. Exchanges and trips organized by the Colleges were warmly commended by students and alumni who felt that these activities were a good instantiation of what Colleges stood for.
2. UGE has tackled the issue of medium of instruction well. There are English, Putonghua and Cantonese (EPC) options in each of the Areas A, B, C and D. The tension between teaching GE in Cantonese (noted in the Report of the Committee on Bilingualism, section 7.11 as “the use of Chinese for GE lectures is conducive to cultivating an awareness of cultural and personal identify among local students”) and providing for students who do not speak Cantonese is a difficult one. The OUGE is sensitive to its mission and to the needs of all CUHK students. (see also 4d R2)
3. Final-year projects/ senior seminars have an important role in CGE. While these are demanding, they enable students to apply aspects of university education and thus draw together a number of threads. Good use of eLearning to support organizational aspects of groups working together could add further value to this type of ‘capstone’ experience.

Affirmations

1. The plans for small class sizes and problem-oriented focus for the new Foundation GE course seem interesting and educationally sound.
2. The plan to introduce Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS) is strongly affirmed. International research is very positive about the potential for peer learning through PASS. The Panel is of the view that the development of a PASS model adapted for Hong Kong in general and CUHK in particular could make a significant difference to student learning.

Recommendations

1. Film-critique courses are very popular with students. While guidelines (Appendix 13 of the Self-Evaluation Document: Report to the Senate Committee on GE, First Round Internal Review of University General Education Courses (2005–2007), 9.1.2) suggest that films should not be shown during class time, there are pragmatic reasons why mass viewing of films might be appropriate. However, it is important that students who study film-critique courses have quite carefully defined reflective assessments that demonstrate critical evaluation of visual material. As such individual opinions have quite a heavy marking load, the use of pass–fail grading might be considered for such broadening courses. (see also 4d R6 and 4e R1)
2. With regard to the medium of instruction, students suggested a greater use of Putonghua to support their sense of identity with Chinese culture in a broad sense.
3. Students’ satisfaction with a formal GE course appears to be based on a number of aspects, such as the following:
 - * teaching style;
 - * the amount of in-class interaction (the more the better);
 - * class size (the smaller the better);
 - * opportunities for discussion of the content (the more the better);

* the number of readings; students favour less reading, though on probing this seems to mean clarity about the expected reading load and the selection of genuinely relevant readings;

* explicit unpacking of the readings; an example given was peer review of summaries of readings; and

* assessment tasks which are engaging; examples given by students were projects and developing games.

Some guidelines for GE course design would be beneficial. In particular, these guidelines should address strategies for interactive teaching in classes with sizes greater than 50. (For 2007–08, the average class size for Areas A, B and D was close to 60.)

4. GE courses potentially play a role in supporting the development of students' reading and critical thinking skills. The guidelines suggested for the design of GE courses could include practical strategies for supporting reading, searching for additional information, and critical evaluation of text and visual material.
5. There are a number of team-taught CGE courses where the teachers do not meet before the course begins. The guidelines for GE course design suggested above should include some principles for the implementation of the course design when team-teaching is involved.
6. SCGE may wish to explore whether funding could be used to encourage the adoption of these guidelines by having differential allocation of resources depending on different levels of interactivity (class size, no. of TAs, nature of assessment). For example, more resources might be allocated to more labour-intensive, interactive teaching and assessment. Such allocation would favor quality (in terms of students' experience) over quantity (the number of students in a classroom).
7. eLearning. Opportunities for the use of blended learning are being explored across the University and the University is developing an eLearning Strategy. The guidelines for GE courses could be supplemented with examples of good practice for the use of eLearning in GE courses.
8. There are aspects of the Leadership Development Programme (LDP) that Colleges might like to examine as they design learning activities. Aspects of the LDP might be integrated into service learning. This is an example of using existing models when brainstorming new possibilities.
9. Promotional activities. A number of GE activities received high praise. However, several students and alumni noted that the promotion and advertisement of these activities could have been more effective. Examples included high-profile speakers, the mechanisms for courses experienced while on exchange to be counted as credit for GE, and the LDP (though this last item is not strictly within GE).

4e. Assessment scheme

Affirmations

1. The new online course outline system is an excellent innovation. It should enable OUGE to monitor assessment strategies more easily.
2. It is clear that there is a variety of assessment strategies being used in GE, While there was no evidence presented about the alignments of assessments with desired learning outcomes, this is an area that GE intends to explore. As GE courses are often regarded as isolated units, the notion of alignment between overall GE outcomes and assessment strategies requires discussion and reflection between GE teachers and GE management.

Recommendations

1. There are several issues associated with grading that need to be considered for GE. If there is a clear distinction between CGE and UGE, then it may be appropriate for CGE courses (which are more experiential in nature) to have a pass–fail (perhaps with distinction) rather than more detailed grading. In some instances students might be able to decide for themselves whether a course is taken at a pass–fail level, or whether it is considered as contributing to the students' Grade Point Average (GPA). This is a complex area and it is recommended that the OUGE and the Colleges together set up a project to investigate matters associated with grading.

4f. Professional development of all teaching staff

Commendation

1. UGE is commended for the introduction of the Exemplary Teaching Award in General Education. This is a fine scheme to highlight the importance of high quality teaching in General Education and showcase effective practice.

Affirmations

1. There are some ongoing UGE initiatives in professional development and experience-sharing that should continue. There is the potential for these experience-sharing sessions to become more focused in order to allow department teachers and GE teachers, OUGE staff and College staff to engage in active debates about a number of the issues outlined in this report.
2. For UGE, there is close scrutiny of CTE data and, where necessary, follow-up with departments. This can result in useful professional development for CUHK teachers. Seeing a clear link between the monitoring of teaching quality and the provision of professional development is good practice. (see also 4a C4)

Recommendations

1. Staff development issues relating to the teaching quality for the instructors who will be engaged for the new 6-credit-point course need to be considered in detail.
2. The role of GE coordinators in departments could be enhanced, for example by regular attendance at the experience-sharing sessions. It is further suggested that there be a formal programme of seminars across all the Areas A to D. These seminars could be conducted by the GE award-winning teachers. This is in line with the QAC report

Affirmation no. 8 about strengthening the role of award-winning teachers at CUHK.

4g. Roadmaps/ action plans

Affirmations

1. GE plans for the future are presented in the self-evaluation document – Appendix 17 for UGE and Appendix 18 for the individual Colleges. The willingness of OUGE and the Colleges to engage in review and refinement of their GE offerings is clear.
2. For UGE the proposed roadmap is a five-stage process of refining and reviewing UGE courses. This is a considered and scholarly plan but is based on the existing arrangements for UGE. Once the SCGE has considered the recommendations of this review and used them to offer some fresh directions to UGE, then it should not be difficult to reformulate the UGE roadmap.

Recommendations

1. The existing four Colleges have produced four separate action plans. It would be useful if the discussions that follow from this review report resulted in a coherent model for CGE that is then customized within the ethos and character of each College. The resulting action plans or roadmaps would then have a synergy that might be helpful.
2. Given the forthcoming establishment of the five new Colleges, there is some urgency about the recommendations of this report that pertain to the relationship between UGE and CGE, and to the articulation of renewed CGE offerings. The SCGE should take the initiative in coordinating the efforts of the existing Colleges in refining their CGE offerings. The new CGE programmes of the four existing Colleges can then provide guidance to the new Colleges in the establishment of their CGE offerings. (see also 4b R2)

5. Concluding remarks

The Review Panel saw evidence of sound teaching and learning and wishes to congratulate members of SCGE, the staff in OUGE and the Colleges, and many teachers in departments across all faculties of CUHK on the strong role that GE plays in the education of Ug students at CUHK. The continued development and growth of GE is due to the commitment and expertise of a large number of members of the CUHK community.

Students enjoy GE courses and feel that they are gaining valuable knowledge and skills that support the development of their graduate capabilities.

It is hoped that the recommendations presented in this report will support GE in continuing its fine work in the next few years of substantial change at CUHK.

Professor Lai Pan Chiu
Professor Deborah Martinsen
Professor Cheng Shiu Yuen
Professor Poon Wai Yin
Professor Carmel McNaught

March 2009