5929

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
University of the Philippines Diliman
Date: AUG 31 2016 Time: 10:37am
By:

Received: OVCAA
BY:
DATE: 30 AUG 2016
NO: 14-5003 1:10 pm

August 30, 2016

Michael L. Tan
Chancellor
UP Diliman
Quezon City

Through: Vice-Chancellor Benito M. Pacheco, UPD OVCAA

Re: Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the UPD Hybrid GE Program

Dear Chancellor Tan,

Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to serve in the ad hoc committee to review the UP Diliman Hybrid GE Program. Our committee was tasked to review the Hybrid and other UPD GE programs, their scopes, limitations and operational advantages and disadvantages. The committee was also tasked to review non-UPD GE programs and finally, as justified by the review and/or new contexts of the educational system, to recommend a format for a new UPD GE Program.

For our final report, attached is a document entitled, "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee: Hybrid General Education Program Review". (A printed copy of the report is submitted to your Office.)

The review report would not be possible without the assistance and support from various UPD offices. We would like to acknowledge the Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs for providing the relevant GE documents, and the Office of the University Registrar, Office of the Director of Instruction and the CRS Team for their assistance in the mining of enrolment data and SET scores. We thank also the UPD GE Committee and Executive Committee for their valuable comments and suggestions, which we believe have improved our report.

We would be glad to provide additional information, if required.

Maraming salamat po.

Percival F. Almoro (College of Science)

Regina Banaag-Gochuico (College of Arts and Letters)

Leslie Joy L. Diaz (College of Engineering)

Jay A. Yacat (College of Social Sciences and Philosophy)

Noted:

BENITO M. PACHECO, PhD
Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs

May be released to Exec Com.

NOTED:
8/31/16
MICHAEL L. TAN
Chancellor
UP Diliman

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE:
HYBRID GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW

UP DILIMAN, QUEZON CITY
AUGUST 30, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEFINITION OF TERMS*:

1. **Core.** Core GE courses are courses that are prescribed for all students, regardless of their area of specialization or major.**
2. **Elective.** Course a student can choose from any area or discipline and regardless of course number.
3. **General Education.** Set of 45 units, with 15 units in each general domain (arts and humanities, social science and philosophy, natural science and math) that all students must take from a range of courses listed in each domain.
4. **Legislated.** Course mandated by law or, in the case of professional fields, by the Professional Regulatory Commission; for example, Philippine Institutions 100 (Rizal course).
5. **Major.** Set of courses in principal discipline/field of study with prescribed total number of courses and units, of which certain courses are specifically required.

*OVCAA Memo 2003-41 (Curricular Nomenclature and Review of Curricular Programs)
**Memorandum OVPAA No. 2016-16, p. 11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The UP Diliman (UPD) University Council (UC) resolved to review the Hybrid General Education (GE) program as pre-requisite to decisions that the UC will make regarding the UPD GE Program.

- An Ad Hoc committee was formed to: 1) review previous studies on the UPD GE program; 2) review administrative and operational aspects; 3) benchmark with other GE programs; and 4) recommend a format for a new GE program.

- Previous reviews of UPD's GE programs (2002 review of GE, 2009 review of the Revitalized GE Program (RGEP), 2014 initial studies of Hybrid GE) highlight the absence of comprehensive and systematic program evaluation. One constraint to program evaluation of the UPD Hybrid GE Program is that the goals are not clearly translated into corresponding student outcomes.

- In the present review, an analysis of the 15 most subscribed GE courses taken by UPD students with Student Number (SN) 2012 revealed that these courses registered "Very Good" evaluations based on the SET scores from AY 2012-2015 (i.e., in UP grading system: 1.25 to 1.75). However, the available data is not adequate to fully gauge the effectiveness of the GE program considering that it only represents the perception of the students enrolled during AY 2012-2015. Likewise, the list of 15 most-subscribed GE courses was determined from a single batch of students only (i.e., students with SN 2012).

- The shift from a free distribution (RGEP) to a mix of mandatory and elective courses in the Hybrid GE highlighted the inability of some departments to meet the enrollment demands. Enrollment backlog has been a serious operational concern in GE program implementations and must be continuously addressed.

- The UPD GE program was compared to 18 universities (chosen based on world rankings and regional distribution) in terms of program goals and objectives, type of curriculum (core, free choice or blended), and distribution requirements (e.g., number of units).

    - Liberal education is still the hallmark of many general education programs in the surveyed universities based on world rankings and regions of the world. We are seeing more, not less, of general education even in countries or regions that do not originally have GE programs (e.g., European nations or their former colonies).
    - Most other GE programs clearly specify student learning outcomes related to their program goals and objectives. This clarity facilitates program assessment and evaluation.
    - A majority of the analyzed GE programs either adopt a core curriculum or a blend of mandatory and elective GE courses.
    - It was found that, on average, universities in the sample require around 18 courses in their GE programs (three more than the current 15 in the UPD GE). For those universities in the list that require less than this average number of GE courses, the modal number seems to be 12 courses (36 units).

- To improve GE program design, the Committee proposes the following: 1) that the University adopt an outcomes-based approach; 2) develop an assessment mechanism that taps specific GE learning objectives/outcomes; and 3) review current courses to avoid duplication with K-12 courses.

- To improve GE program implementation, the Committee recommends the following: 1) more administrative resources and support to meet operational demands; 2) regular and timely updates on backlog and enlistment demands for academic departments offering GE courses; and 3) activate the GE Center to facilitate the necessary operational mechanisms for improved implementation of the GE program.

- On the possible GE format, upon consideration of the analyzed data and other available information, the Committee proposes a general format based on a three-tiered design and presents several options for its possible implementation.

BACKGROUND

The UPD Hybrid GE Program approved by the UC in December 2011 requires students to take 7 prescribed courses or 21 units of the 45-unit total. This was in response to the need to modify the 45-unit free-choice format of the 2001 RGEP.

There have been proposed resolutions in the UC to make certain changes in the UPD Hybrid GE program. These include a reduction in the number of units and changes in the prescribed courses. These were mainly in response to the upcoming K-12 program and a related change in some degree programs in terms of duration from 5 years to 4 years.

The rationale for the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee as indicated in the Terms of Reference (TOR) dated February 19, 2016 states: "The UPD University Council on its 137th (Special) Meeting on 25 January 2016 resolved to convene a University Council (UC) committee to review the Hybrid General Education (GE) Program as pre-requisite to changes that the UC will make to GE."

The AdHoc Committee was formed by the Chancellor in order to fulfill this task. The committee members included (1) Percival F. Almoro of the College of Science, (2) Regina Banaag-Gochuico of the College of Arts and Letters, (3) Leslie Joy L. Diaz of the College of Engineering, and (4) Jay A. Yacat of the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy.Another member, Portia Padilla, of the College of Education, declined due to personal reasons. The committee first convened on March 15 and met once a week until April 30, 2016. A draft of the Committee report was submitted on June 13 for comments and suggestions, which subsequently resulted to additional committee meetings in June to August 2016 to incorporate suggestions received from the UPD GE Committee and the Executive Committee.

TASKS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE

The following are the tasks of the Committee based on its Terms of Reference:

1. Review earlier studies that have been conducted on the UPD Hybrid GE Program and, as relevant, other studies on RGEP – quantitative, qualitative or both – in so far as assessing the effectiveness of the GE program in attaining its declared goals;
2. Review the scope and limitations of each of the studies, in so far as determining appropriate methods and tools for UPD GE Program evaluation not only retrospectively but prospectively as well;
3. Review the administrative and/or operational advantages and disadvantages of the UPD GE Program design compared to the previous;
4. Review the literature on non-UPD GE programs in the Philippines and overseas, in so far as appropriate to UP for benchmarking; and
5. Recommend a format for a new UPD GE in terms of minimum and maximum number of GE units, and Diliman-wide prescribed core courses, as may be justified by the review of the current and past GE programs and/or by new contexts of the educational system.

METHODOLOGY

In addressing the given tasks, the Committee adopted the following methodologies:

1. Desk review of past reports and related documents on UP GE Program

   Several documents were provided by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) to the Committee that included the following:

   (i) GE Evaluation Reports and Related Documents;
   (ii) Proceedings of GE Conferences;
   (iii) 2012 & 2015 UPD GE Conference Presentations; and,
   (iv) 2016 Proposed UP GE Framework.

   A detailed list of these documents is presented in Appendix A.

   From these set, the Committee centered on four (4) documents that particularly focused on the RGEP and Hybrid GE Program. These include the following:

   (i) 2009 RGEP Evaluation Report;
   (ii) 2010 UP System Final Report - Reexamining UP's General Education Program;
   (iii) 2014 ECA and RLJ – A Look into the Current GE Courses: Some Performance Statistics; and,
   (iv) 2014 JAY – From RGEP to Hybrid GE: A Preliminary Look into Student Outcomes.

   For the above set of reports, the Committee identified and summarized the following aspects:

   - Methods used in the evaluation of the RGEP and Hybrid GE Program;
   - Description of the appropriateness of methods and tools used in the evaluation;
   - Results on the evaluation of the GE program effectiveness; and,
   - Advantages and disadvantages of operational and administrative aspects of the specific GE program.

   In addition the following documents were also considered in coming up with recommendations for the revisions of the UPD GE Program:

   (i) Proceedings of the 2011 UPD GE Conference;
   (ii) 2015 GE Subcommittee Report on Assessment; and,
   (iii) 2016 Proposed UP GE Framework.

2. Data mining of available data from the Office of the University Registrar (OUR), Computerized Registration System (CRS) and Office of the Director for Instruction (ODI)

   Available data on GE course offerings, enlistment statistics of students with student number from 2007 to 2012, and average results on Part II (The Course) of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) from 2012 to 2015 were obtained through the assistance of Mr. Jacob S. Obinguar of the CRS Records Section and Dr. Violeda A. Umali of the Office of the Director of Instruction. Note that CRS only started in 2007 while the SET was activated online starting 2010. SET results from 2012 to 2015 were the ones used to provide a partial evaluation on the effectiveness of the Hybrid GE program.

The Committee made an attempt to map out competencies based on the current GE Program objectives and the University Council (UC) approved course syllabi of the most subscribed GE courses. However, the Publications and University Council Secretariat Section did not have on file, the syllabi of several courses (Math 1, STS, Kasaysayan 1, Kasaysayan 2, Philosophy 1).

3. General survey of information about GE programs in other universities

   Although benchmarking was the term employed in the TOR for the Committee, the limited time and availability of accessible information resulted to the conduct of a general survey of online information about GE programs offered in other selected universities. Selection of universities was based on a criteria also established by the Committee that is detailed later in the report.

4. Design of a possible GE format

   The Committee made effort in merging available information and data (from items 1-3) in an attempt to arrive at a possible revised format of the UPD GE Program.

   The following were also taken into consideration: (a) previous decisions made on having a mix of prescribed/core and elective GE courses; (b) current objectives of the GE program; (c) the 6-unit Philippine Studies requirement of the GE program; and (d) proposed reductions in the total number of GE units.

THE GLOBAL CONTEXT OF GE

Relevance of GE

An ensuing debate about the purpose of higher education and its role in developing human resources for a fast changing economy has been happening globally. Particularly, social leaders and educationalists are now questioning whether a professional focus, that which prepares students for employment, is still adequate in an ever-changing knowledge economy (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009). A new trend is emerging that highlights the value and potential need for liberal or general education, which emphasizes a broad interdisciplinary curriculum focused on learning outcomes such as creativity, critical thinking, cultural awareness, problem solving, and communication skills. It is argued that the knowledge economy requires a workforce of generalists who are adaptable, know how to learn, and "can manage and assimilate greatly expanded quantities of information" (Task Force on Higher Education and Society, 2000).

Adopting the GE

Higher education institutions around the world are beginning to adopt general education curricula, even in places where they have previously not existed (e.g., Russia and Eastern Europe). For example, in Hong Kong, which originally followed a British system of education, all universities extended the length of the undergraduate degree from 3 to 4 years and added General Education as a degree requirement in 2012 (Jaffee, 2012). There was a consensus that the additional year should not be devoted to further academic specialization in a disciplinary or professional subject, thus, the decision to adopt a general or liberal education approach was deemed to be the most logical choice.

Educational system in the Netherlands was recently revised to include what is known as a university college in order to address lack of differentiation and excellence, as well as their weak international dimension (Redden, 2013). University colleges are set-up as appendages to large public research universities and enroll only a small number of students. A large selection of courses is offered such that each student graduates with a unique package of courses taken.

In countries with emerging democracies, general education is being considered as "a means for developing a critical and participatory citizenry" (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009).

GE Reforms

In the United States, general education reforms are motivated by questions on program effectiveness, usually as a result of a systematic program review or evaluation: Are students really learning what they are supposed to learn from general education program? This may have been influenced by a growing movement toward accountability in higher education in the last ten years (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2011). Many higher education institutions have adopted an outcomes-based approach to general education in order to facilitate the assessment of student learning outcomes.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND THE UPD GE PROGRAM

Program evaluation involves both quantitative and qualitative analysis of information obtained at some specific time in the implementation of a program. Program evaluation could either be *formative* or *summative*. In formative evaluation, programs are evaluated while it is still in the process of implementation in order to know if the instructional goals and objectives are being met. Formative evaluation was also found to be useful in analyzing learning materials, student learning and achievements, and teacher effectiveness. These activities are done to provide information about how to best improve the program.

Meanwhile, summative evaluation is usually done at the end of the program implementation and focuses on the program outcomes. Thus, both methods are recommended for use, when possible, to provide ongoing feedback for program modification (formative) as well as a periodic review of long-term progress related to program goals and objectives (summative). However, with the Hybrid GE only at its fourth year of implementation, no standardized evaluation, whether formative or summative, has yet been conducted.

In evaluating the then GE program in 2000, various methods were employed such as surveys and focused group discussions from relevant stakeholders within and outside the University. Consultations were made with different sectors within the University and across constituent units prior to the implementation of the Revitalized General Education Program (RGEP) in 2002 (Alonzo, 2009).

However, the series of evaluation activities were not as thorough for the RGEP. While it is important to recognize the laudable attempt to gather data based on an exit competency exam for graduating students in 2009, the sheer variety of GE courses taken by the students who took the exam rendered it difficult to accurately make sense of the results of the data.

This particular challenge led many faculty members who participated in the 2011 UP Diliman Faculty Conference to push for the adoption of mandatory courses in the GE curriculum, which resulted in the implementation of a Hybrid GE (a mix of prescribed and elective or free choice GE courses) in 2012.

There have been initial studies to examine specific aspects of the UPD Hybrid GE Program, for example, enlistment and other administrative concerns (Amor & Jalao, 2014) and student learning outcomes in core GE courses (Yacat, 2014). However, it would be difficult to say that these activities form a systematic process of evaluating the Hybrid GE's effectiveness, efficiency or impact.

The Committee was tasked to pore over available documents of previous evaluation activities of the GE program (2002 review of GE, 2009 review of RGEP, 2014 initial studies of Hybrid GE). These reviews highlighted several recurring issues in the design and implementation of all of UPD's GE Programs:

- need for clearly-stated measurable program objectives;
- need for systematic monitoring, assessment and evaluation of the GE program;
- shortage of course offerings and slots resulting in severe backlogs in enlistment; and
- the debate on who could better teach the GE.

Another recurring issue is the lack of agreement as to what constitutes the "Tatak-UP," which is bandied around as the supposed outcome of UP's GE Program.

PROCEDURE FOR CHOOSING EVALUATION SAMPLES

In order to obtain an estimate of the profile of the UPD GE Program students go through since the implementation of the Hybrid GE in 2012, the Committee assessed which particular GE courses UPD students take, aside from the prescribed GE courses.

Identification of such highly subscribed GE courses facilitated the selection of the sample courses that were used for this review. Enrollment data from 2012 to 2015 were processed to find out the other 8 GE courses (aside from the seven prescribed courses) that most UP Diliman students take.

Since the shift from the RGEP to the Hybrid GE is largely administrative (i.e., some courses are now required under the new program), there is an expected increase in the number of students enrolling in the seven prescribed courses.

The Committee decided to compare the top five most subscribed GE courses in the RGEP and Hybrid programs to see if there were any fundamental differences. Tables 1-3 show the list of most subscribed courses in the three domains: Arts and Humanities (AH), Math, Science and Technology (MST), and Social Sciences and Philosophy (SSP). The RGEP column reflects the average enrollment of SN 2007-2011 while the Hybrid column represents the enrollment of SN 2012.

Table 1. Five most subscribed GE courses in the AH domain

RGEP (SN 2007-2011)		Hybrid (SN 2012)	
Courses	Average number of enrolled students	Courses	Number of enrolled students
Comm 3	2106	**Fil 40**	3557
Eng 1	1934	**Eng 10**	3473
Art Stud 1	1648	**Comm 3**	3254
Eng 11	1472	Art Stud 1	1267
Art Stud 2	1146	Eng 1	1037

Note: In **bold** are the prescribed courses in the Hybrid program.

Table 2. Five most subscribed GE courses in the MST domain

RGEP (SN 2007-2011)		Hybrid (SN 2012)	
Courses	Average number of enrolled students	Courses	Number of enrolled students
Bio 1	2058	**STS**	2269
STS	1373	Bio 1	2252
Nat Sci 2	1272	**Math 1**	976
Nat Sci 1	1120	Physics 10	965
Math 2	926	Chem 1	855

Note: In **bold** are the prescribed courses in the Hybrid program.

Table 3. Five most subscribed GE courses in the SSP domain

RGEP (SN 2007-2011)		Hybrid (SN 2012)	
Courses	Average number of enrolled students	Courses	Number of enrolled students
Geog 1	3050	**Kas 1**	3287
Kas 1	2701	**Philo 1**	3278
Kas 2	1493	Geog 1	1969
Anthro 10	1221	Kas 2	1298
Philo 1	1016	Anthro 10	1127

Note: In **bold** are the prescribed courses in the Hybrid program.

As expected, there were significant increases in enrollment among the prescribed courses in the Hybrid program. This was most obvious for Filipino 40, which was not among the most subscribed among SN 2007-2011 but shot up to the top spot in the Hybrid program. It is also interesting to note that almost the same set of courses make up the top five most subscribed courses. This is most especially true for the SSP domain.

It would be difficult to tell if the high enrollment in a particular course can be taken to mean a high level of student interest in that course. However, the safest assumption would be that the high enrollment is a product of the large availability of course offerings or increase in the number of sections offered for that particular course.

Nevertheless, this procedure allowed the Committee to have a sense of the GE courses that a prototypical UPD student would most likely have taken in his or her stay in the University. This same set of courses was considered in examining the program effectiveness and efficiency in the succeeding sections.

A CURSORY LOOK AT GE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Program effectiveness refers to the level by which a program produces its desired effects. The only way to determine this is by measuring student learning outcomes. Unfortunately, the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) is the only available instrument that indirectly measures student outcomes. An examination of the items in the Course Evaluation section of SET would show that the items focus on the following:

- **student motivations** *("This course stimulates me to study beyond the lessons assigned"* and *"I have worked more conscientiously in this course than in most other courses".)*
- **satisfaction with the course** ("*Even if this course were not required, it would still be worthwhile taking it" and "Even if this course were not required, it will be worth taking it".)*
- **perceived outcomes for students** ("*This course has developed in me a greater sense of responsibility", "This course stimulates me to think creatively", and "This course develops critical thinking".)*

The literature on program assessment and evaluation is very clear on what to measure in order to gauge program effectiveness: student learning outcomes. While the SET does provide some indirect measures of student learning outcomes (e.g., sense of responsibility, creative and critical thinking), it is unclear how these outcomes relate to the stated GE program goals and objectives.

Nevertheless, the Committee looked at the ratings for these items in the Course Evaluation section of the SET (Part II) for the 15 prototypical GE courses enrolled by SN 2012 in order to see how these courses fared based on student evaluations.

An item from the Evaluation of Teaching section (specifically, "Course is related to other fields and current issues and concerns") was included as a proxy to the GE objective "broadening of intellectual horizons."

Table 4 provides a way to interpret the SET scores based on the UP grading system.

Table 4. Range of SET scores and their corresponding interpretation based on UP grading system

Range	Interpretation
1.00-1.24	Outstanding
1.25-1.75	Very Good
1.76-2.25	Average
2.26-2.75	Fair
Below 2.75	Needs Improvement

Tables 5-7 present, respectively, the SET ratings from AY 2012-2015 in the 8 evaluation items (covering student motivation, course satisfaction, particular student outcomes and broadening of horizons) averaged across the top five AH (Table 5), MST (Table 6) and SSP (Table 7) courses.

An examination of the data would show that SSP and AH courses received similar profiles: Average in student motivation but Very Good in course satisfaction rating and student outcomes.

A closer look at the figures would reveal that, overall, SSP courses received slightly higher ratings compared to AH and MST courses. MST courses, on the other hand, were given Average ratings in student motivation, course satisfaction, fostering sense of responsibility, and creative thinking, but Very Good ratings in critical thinking and broadening of horizons.

At least based on student ratings, the GE courses in the Hybrid program (the most subscribed courses at least) are evaluated moderately positive (Average to Very Good). Data from Amor and Jalao's analysis (2014) show no significant difference in ratings of how much they have learned from the courses in the RGEP and the Hybrid Program which suggests that, at least from the perspectives of students, the Hybrid Program is as good as the RGEP.

Is the Hybrid GE effective?

It would be difficult to tell with the available data. In order to accurately assess effectiveness of programs, focus should be on the measurement of outcomes, such as skills or abilities.

However, UP's GE Program articulates only program goals and objectives, such as:

(a) broadening of intellectual horizons;
(b) developing awareness of various ways of knowing;
(c) developing an integration of knowledge; and
(d) balancing nationalism and internationalism.

There is virtually no mention of how these goals relate to particular outcomes for students. Proper assessment and evaluation should focus on what students have learned (outcomes) in the context of the aforementioned program features.

Table 5. Ratings in particular Course Evaluation items for Top 5 AH Courses

Evaluation Items	Fil 40	Eng 10	Comm 3	AS1	Eng 1	AVE
Student Motivation						
This course stimulates me to study beyond the lessons assigned.	Average 1.841	Average 1.833	Average 1.810	Average 1.895	Average 1.810	Average 1.838
I have worked more conscientiously in this course than in most other courses.	Average 1.976	Average 1.794	Average 1.828	Average 2.105	Average 1.913	Average 1.923
Course Satisfaction						
Even if this course were not required, it would still be worthwhile taking it.	Average 1.779	Average 1.832	VG 1.447	Average 1.758	VG 1.679	VG 1.669
I am fully satisfied with the way this course was handled/conducted.	Average 1.834	Average 1.856	VG 1.528	Average 1.822	VG 1.642	VG 1.736
Student Outcomes						
This course has developed in me a greater sense of responsibility. (i.e., self reliance, self-discipline, independent study)	VG 1.671	VG 1.587	VG 1.555	Average 1.793	VG 1.639	VG 1.649
This course stimulates me to think creatively.	VG 1.685	VG 1.562	VG 1.404	VG 1.586	VG 1.485	VG 1.544
This course develops critical thinking.	Average 1.834	Average 1.856	VG 1.527	VG 1.641	VG 1.522	VG 1.551
Broadening of Horizons						
Course is related to other fields and current issues and concerns	VG 1.439	VG 1.530	VG 1.467	VG 1.563	VG 1.542	VG 1.508

Table 6. Ratings in particular Course Evaluation items for Top 5 MST Courses

Evaluation Items	STS	Math 1	Bio 1	Chem 1	Phys 10	AVE
Student Motivation						
This course stimulates me to study beyond the lessons assigned.	Average 1.929	Average 1.921	Average 1.956	Average 1.883	Average 1.805	Average 1.929
I have worked more conscientiously in this course than in most other courses.	Average 2.097	Average 2.067	Average 2.147	Average 2.043	Average 2.104	Average 2.064
Course Satisfaction						
Even if this course were not required, it would still be worthwhile taking it.	Average 1.760	Average 1.794	Average 1.913	Average 1.803	VG 1.655	Average 1.760
I am fully satisfied with the way this course was handled/conducted.	Average 1.939	Average 1.758	Average 1.968	Average 1.821	Average 1.810	Average 1.827
Student Outcomes						
This course has developed in me a greater sense of responsibility. (i.e., self reliance, self-discipline, independent study)	Average 1.814	Average 1.776	Average 1.846	Average 1.766	VG 1.800	Average 1.786
This course stimulates me to think creatively.	Average 1.807	VG 1.745	Average 1.986	Average 1.835	Average 1.805	Average 1.807
This course develops critical thinking.	VG 1.741	VG 1.649	Average 1.866	Average 1.732	VG 1.659	VG 1.688
Broadening of Horizons						
Course is related to other fields and current issues and concerns	VG 1.502	VG 1.539	VG 1.649	VG 1.552	VG 1.609	VG 1.554

Table 7. Ratings in particular Course Evaluation items for Top 5 SSP Courses

Evaluation Items	Kas 1	Philo 1	Ant 10	Geog 1	Kas 2	AVE
Student Motivation						
This course stimulates me to study beyond the lessons assigned.	VG 1.713	VG 1.729	Average 1.835	VG 1.713	VG 1.747	Average 1.754
I have worked more conscientiously in this course than in most other courses.	Average 1.923	Average 1.902	Average 2.108	Average 1.912	Average 1.903	Average 1.950
Course Satisfaction						
Even if this course were not required, it would still be worthwhile taking it.	VG 1.706	VG 1.605	VG 1.610	VG 1.481	VG 1.750	VG 1.630
I am fully satisfied with the way this course was handled/conducted.	VG 1.726	VG 1.724	VG 1.722	VG 1.540	VG 1.749	VG 1.692
Student Outcomes						
This course has developed in me a greater sense of responsibility. (i.e., self reliance, self-discipline, independent study)	VG 1.633	VG 1.630	VG 1.739	VG 1.612	VG 1.657	VG 1.654
This course stimulates me to think creatively.	VG 1.725	VG 1.525	VG 1.670	VG 1.533	VG 1.739	VG 1.694
This course develops critical thinking.	VG 1.598	VG 1.327	VG 1.625	VG 1.506	VG 1.654	VG 1.542
Broadening of Horizons						
Course is related to other fields and current issues and concerns	VG 1.504	VG 1.523	VG 1.503	VG 1.324	VG 1.580	VG 1.487

A CURSORY LOOK AT GE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

As mentioned earlier, UPD GE Programs suffer from a major administrative concern: severe backlog as highlighted in Amor and Jalao's (2014) report. With the shift to the Hybrid GE program, UP Diliman must now ensure that every incoming batch will be given adequate slots for the mandatory courses within an academic year.

For example, if the number of entering students in 2012 was 3812, UPD must be able to provide that number of slots within the academic year in order to avoid a backlog that will carry over to the next academic year.

For a class size of 35, there should be a total of 109 sections that need to be opened for each of the eight required GE course in academic year 2012-2013. However, this was not the case. Table 8 shows the capacity of the GE courses to take in students in AY 2012-2013.

Table 8. Backlog in enlistment in GE Hybrid Prescribed Courses in 2012

Course	Domain	Enlistment	Backlog in Number of Students	Number of Classes Needed*
Fil 40	AH	3557	255	7
Eng 10	AH	3473	339	10
Comm 3	AH	3254	558	16
STS	MST	2269	1543	13**
Math 1	MST	976	549	16***
Kas 1	SSP	3287	525	15
Philo 1	SSP	3278	534	15

* pegged at class size = 35
** pegged at class size = 120
*** Students from the College of Engineering and the College of Science (estimated at 60%) do not take Math 1

The Committee computed the average enlistment in the GE courses across the three domains over four academic years (see Table 9). The AY 2012 enrollment was considered as a constant (3812) and subtracted this number from the average enlistment to get an idea of the average backlog (in terms of number of students) across the domains. As seen in Table 9, the MST domain suffers from the most backlogs on the average.

Table 9. Estimated backlog in enlistment across domains

Domain	Enlistment (averaged from AY 2012-2015)	Estimated Backlog (in Number of Students)
AH	3180	632
MST	2372	1440
SSP	3367	445

Table 10 shows the percentage increase/decrease in the number of sections for both prescribed and elective GE courses from RGEP to Hybrid.

Table 10. Percent change in average number of sections for GE prescribed and elective courses from RGEP to Hybrid

Domain	Prescribed/Core	Electives
AH	50.7	0.4
MST	16.5	**-0.2**
SSP	125.6	3.9

As a result of the shift to the Hybrid, the number of sections offered for the core courses has significantly increased to meet the surge in demand. The SSP core courses, Philosophy 1 and Kasaysayan 1, registered a significant 125.6% average increase as a consequence.

On the average, the number of sections for the AH core courses, English 10, Filipino 40 and Communication 3, increased by 50% after Hybrid implementation. In order to adequately meet the demand, the course offerings for the GE electives should also register a slight increase (to cover the backlog in the previous years). However, MST elective courses even registered a slight reduction (0.2%) instead.

To a certain extent, the numbers could also be indicative of the varying priorities given to the teaching of the GE courses and at the same time reflective of the limited capacities of the academic clusters and departments to meet the demand.

The information on the estimated backlog has important implications towards the efficient implementation of the GE program. If armed with this kind of information, academic clusters and departments can make more informed decisions about the number of GE course offerings needed every academic year and at the same time try to prepare for the corresponding demand on their resources (faculty complement and space requirements).

Equally important is the support system provided by the UPD administration to ensure that the departments have the needed faculty items and facilities. In addition, faculty (especially those newly hired) assigned to teach GE subjects should be equipped with the necessary training to ensure correct delivery and implementation.

As the University is contemplating the distribution requirements for the GE Program (e.g., number of core and electives), this kind of information can help us determine the resource demands that certain decisions would result in.

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER GE PROGRAMS

The Committee was also tasked to "benchmark" with other GE programs locally and internationally. Benchmarks provide reference points for producing self-studies, conducting detailed program reviews, and promoting program development (Dunn et al., 2011).

A recurring criticism of UPD's GE Programs and other succeeding proposals is that they are patterned after mainly American-based universities.

Recognizing this challenge, the Committee agreed to a comparison procedure that would also cover the practice of General Education in leading universities in Southeast Asia, other parts of Asia, Europe, Latin America and Africa, aside from the American universities.

The procedure

Originally, the Committee decided to focus on ten top ranking universities in each of the following regions/locations: Philippines; Southeast Asia; Asia; and the rest of the world. The Committee compiled an initial list based on the universities' 2015-16 QS rankings. For the Philippines, a list of top five state and private universities was generated based on the number of current Centers of Excellence as decreed by CHED [ref]. This procedure yielded an initial sample of 38 universities.

However, after deliberations, the Committee decided to achieve breadth in the sample by also including universities in regions not originally considered: Middle East, Europe, Africa and Latin America. Some highly-ranked universities were not included in the sample because they do not have formal GE program at the university level as the students specialize quite early. Examples for this are the top UK universities, namely, University of Cambridge (2015/2016 QS ranking: 3rd or 4th), Oxford (6th), University College London (7th), and Imperial College London (8th). In addition, the Committee also agreed to include in the final sample only those universities that have accessible online information about their GE program through their institutional websites. This criterion drastically reduced the number of universities that were analyzed, as only 18 universities were included in the final list. The final sample of universities comprised of the following:

a) 5 from North America
b) 3 from East Asia
c) 2 other Philippine universities
d) 2 other Southeast Asian universities

e) 2 from Middle East
f) 2 from Africa
g) 1 from Latin America, and
h) 1 from Europe.

Table 11 shows a comparative summary of the GE programs from 18 universities. As a limitation of this study, the range of percentages of GE to the total units for each degree offering in the universities considered was not determined.

For each university, the following pieces of information were documented:
a) GE program objectives
b) type of curriculum (whether core, distributed or blended), and
c) required number of courses, units or credit hours.

The absence of well known European universities in the sample may be attributed to the fact that in Europe, especially in France and Germany, there is a tradition of fostering specialized, skill-specific, "vocational" education at the upper-secondary and higher levels over a concept-based, "general" education (Nash, 2012).

Similar to our country's K-12 program, students choose a path, usually the humanities, natural sciences, engineering, or the social sciences, often during high school. Once in this path, they take very few classes outside of their intended area of focus. However, once in the chosen track, it is very difficult to change track.

The European system also combines apprenticeships with classroom education, a system that streamlines students directly into the workplace resulting in low unemployment rates.

Table 11. Comparative description of 18 General Education Programs

QS Rank	University	Country	Type of Curriculum	Distribution requirements*
1	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	USA	**Blended**: Combination of required and elective courses in 5 areas.	17 courses
2	Harvard University	USA	**Distributed**: students must take one course in each of the 8 categories/ themes.	8 courses
3	Stanford University	USA	**Core**: Students take a series of required courses in three areas/ programs.	22 - 23 courses (18 core courses)
5	California Institute of Technology	USA	**Blended**: Students take courses in 8 areas; mixture of required courses and courses to be chosen by the student.	70 courses** (210 units)
9	ETH Zurich – Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich	Switzerland	(no information available)	20 courses (60 credits)
10	University of Chicago	USA	**Blended**: students take courses in 3 domains. Students should take language requirement equivalent to 1 year of study	13 -19 courses plus language requirement
12	National University of Singapore	Singapore	**Distributed:** students should choose one module each from the 5 pillars (themes). Some colleges or units have restrictions on which module the student will take relative to his/her major.	5 courses (20 modular credits)
25	Tsinghua University	China	**Core**: Students must take a set of required courses.	16-18 courses
28	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	Hongkong	**Core**: Students complete the same set of courses regardless of major.	12 courses (36 credits)
36	Seoul National University	South Korea	**Distributed**: Students choose courses from an approved list and varies per college/ unit. Courses are categorized in 3 themes.	12- 15 courses (36-45 credits)
199	King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals	Saudi Arabia	**Core:** Students complete the same set of courses regardless of major.	20 courses (60 credit hours)
253	Chulalongkorn University	Thailand	(no information available)	10 courses (30 credit hours)
268	American University of Beirut	Lebanon	**Core**: Students complete the same set of courses regardless of major.	11-12 courses (33-36 credits)
345	The American University in Cairo	Egypt	**Blended**: Students take a series of courses (some are required, some are to be chosen by the student) in three levels.	13 courses (40 credits)
491-500	Pontificia Universidad Catolica del Peru	Peru	**Core**: Students take a set of required courses regardless of their major	25 courses (75 credits)
501-550	Ateneo De Manila Universiy	Philippines	**Core**: Students take the same set of courses except for Mathematics and Natural Sciences (varies per college).	30-33 courses (92-105 units)
700+	De La Salle University	Philippines	**Blended**: Courses to be taken by students on each domain are identified by the college. Some colleges allow their students to choose from an array of approved GE courses.	17-21 courses (51-63 units)
701+	University of Ghana	Ghana	**Blended**: Combination of required and distributed.	11 courses

*The committee opted to use courses to standardize the language and enable a comparison with the UPD General Education

** CalTech is the most atypical which requires around 70 courses to fulfill the GE requirements

***As a limitation of this study, the range of percentages of GE to the total units for each degree offering in the universities considered was not determined.

Nature, goals and outcomes of general education

A recurring theme that surfaces in the description of general education programs across the different universities is the philosophy of liberal education. General goals of the program center on broadening the knowledge and skills of the students, exposing them to diverse body of knowledge and intellectual tradition, and in honing analytical and reasoning skills. Interdisciplinarity, different modes of inquiry, and diversity in teaching methods/approaches are almost always given emphasis.

Through the general education program, it is expected that students will become lifelong learners, intellectuals, and/or well-rounded scholars. Note how Harvard University has clarified what particular outcomes are expected for students who have gone through its GE program based on the following goals:

(a) to prepare students for civic engagement;
(b) to teach students to understand themselves as products of, and participants in, traditions of art, ideas, and values;
(c) to enable students to respond critically and constructively to change; and
(d) to develop students' understanding of the ethical dimensions of what they say and do.

Higher education organizations such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) have specified five key outcomes for a liberal (general) education:

(a) strong skills (analytical, communication, quantitative information);
(b) deep understanding and applied experiences within disciplines that study nature, society and culture;
(c) collaboration skills and intercultural knowledge;
(d) civic responsibility with a proactive approach; and
(e) habits of mind that promote integrative thinking and the ability to apply/transfer knowledge and skills from one setting to another.

Although the UPD Hybrid GE Program goals cover these attributes, the goals in its present form read more like a description of the aspects of the courses that should comprise the GE program and are not focused on measurable outcomes for the students, thus making it rather difficult to evaluate program effectiveness.

Types of Curriculum

Generally, there are three types of curriculum that comprise General Education: the **core**, the **distributed**, and the **blended**.

Core Curriculum

The earliest mode of General Education is comprised of a core curriculum that requires all students to take the same set of courses. UP Diliman's GE adopted this type of curriculum from the 1986 to 2001.

This curriculum equated GE with breadth and, in institutions organized around academic departments, involved a sampling of courses from the broad array of academic disciplines (usually in the following domains, the natural sciences and mathematics, the social sciences, and the arts and humanities).

Six (6) universities in the comparative list still adopt this particular mode: Tsinghua University, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, American University of Beirut, American University of Cairo, Pontificia Universidad Catolica del Peru, and Ateneo de Manila University.

Distributed Curriculum

A second mode, secures breadth of knowledge by means of a distributed curriculum, in the sense that it involves distribution requirements in particular fields of knowledge and, in some cases, students are given a great deal of latitude as to what particular courses to take under these fields or domains.

UPD's RGEP is an exemplar of this type or mode. Four universities (Harvard University, National University of Singapore, California Institute of Technology, and Seoul National University) have adopted this approach.

A major criticism of this mode is captured by this statement from the University of Pennsylvania (2004):

> "*The effect of student choice, however, is to impose rather strong market constraints on faculty teaching. If a large number of the students find that they have no use for or interest in a certain field of knowledge, there will be no educational reason for an institution to build faculty strength in that area. Equally seriously, students may graduate with wide gaps in their knowledge and with little competence in one or more critical intellectual skills*."

Blended Curriculum

For the same set of reasons, UP Diliman adopted a blended curriculum of prescribed or core and elective courses distributed in the three domains: AH, MST, and SSP.

Six other universities have also adopted a similar approach to the GE curriculum: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford University, University of Chicago, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, De La Salle University, and the University of Ghana.

The three approaches may be different but they essentially consist of courses in the arts and humanities, social sciences, philosophy, mathematics and natural sciences. In addition, most universities include language requirement and scientific writing requirement in their general education program.

More interestingly, universities in the Asia and Africa require their students to take courses in the local history/ local culture studies and/or local languages (e.g. University of Ghana's African Studies, National University of Singapore's Singapore Studies, The American University in Cairo's Arabic Languages, etc.).

Distribution Requirements

The total number of GE course requirements ranges from as few as five courses (National University of Singapore) to as high as 70 courses (California Institute of Technology). The average number of courses is around 18 (54 units), three more than the current UPD requirement.

This is also way above the prescribed number of courses in the new CHED GE curriculum, which is set at only 11 courses (33 units). For a number of universities in the list, 12 courses (36 units) seem to be the modal number.

Do the number of GE courses have an impact on student outcomes? It was found that it is not the number of GE courses per se but the degree of balanced curricular emphasis on general education that made a difference (Forrest, 1982 as cited in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Universities that devoted an average of 46 percent of the curriculum to general education with even content distribution in four areas (written and oral communication, social science and history, science and mathematics, and fine arts and humanities) had gain scores in general and intellectual skills twice as large as those that devoted only 31 percent of their curriculum to general education and with uneven distribution.

In a later survey of American colleges and universities (Ratcliffe et al., 2001), it was found that the average general education requirement is 37.5% of a baccalaureate degree.

How do the degree programs in UP Diliman fare? Table 12 shows the percent distributions of GE in arbitrarily selected degree programs from the four academic clusters in UP Diliman.

Table 12. Percent distribution of GE courses in selected degree programs from the academic clusters

Degree Program	Academic Cluster	Total GE units	Total number of units	% GE
BA Speech Communication (4 yrs)	Arts and Humanities	45	132	34.09
BS Business Administration (4 yrs)	Management and Economics	45	145	28.96
BS Psychology (4 yrs)	Social Sciences and Law	42*	148	28.37
BS Metallurgical Engineering (5 yrs)	Science and Technology	39*	181	21.55
BS Physics (5 yrs)	Science and Technology	36*	174	20.68

* These programs specified permanent substitutions for the specific GE courses (e.g., Math courses)

Fourteen (14) of the programs reviewed had GE course requirements that are distributed along knowledge domains (e.g., social sciences, natural sciences, arts and humanities) and basic or foundational skills (e.g., oral and written communication, foreign language).

However, in the remaining four universities (Stanford, Harvard, NUS and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology), distribution requirements are organized along themes or topics.

For example, the NUS has the following themes: (a) Human Cultures; (b) Asking Questions; (c) Quantitative Reasoning; (d) Singapore Studies; and (e) Thinking and Expression. Meanwhile, in HKUST, students are required to go through a General Education Foundation (two courses); and select two courses in four GE areas (Chinese Cultural Heritage; Nature, Science and Technology; Society and Culture; Self and Humanity). Meanwhile, the two other universities, ETH Zurich and Chulalongkorn University, did not provide sufficient information.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The first three tasks of the Committee involved a review of earlier studies on RGEP and Hybrid GE programs in which determined program effectiveness and operational/administrative concerns. Information from these studies revealed the following:

- the need for clearly-stated measurable program objectives;
- the need for systematic monitoring, assessment and evaluation of the GE program which should be undertaken by a fully-operational GE Center;
- lack of course offerings and slots resulting in severe backlogs in enlistment;
- issues on pedagogy and who should teach GE; and
- a clearer definition of "Tatak-UP"

Based on the enrollment data, the shift to the Hybrid GE program highlights the pressing challenge for the colleges to adequately meet the enlistment demands. Although student evaluation of the most subscribed courses in the Hybrid GE reveal positive evaluations, it is emphasized that these measures are inadequate to gauge the program effectiveness because the learning outcomes in the SET have unclear relations to overall GE program goals and objectives.

	AH and SSP	MST
Student motivations	Average	Average
Course satisfaction	Very Good	Average
Student outcomes	Very Good	Average
Broadening horizons	Very Good	Very Good

The fourth task was to review the literature on non-UPD GE programs in the Philippines and overseas for benchmarking. The following observations were made based on the 18 universities sampled.

- **Liberal education is still the hallmark of many general education programs worldwide**. More, not less, of general education are being adopted even in countries or regions that do not originally have GE programs.
- **Most of the GE programs reviewed adopt either a core** (students take the same courses regardless of major) **or a blended** (some courses are mandatory, some are elective) **curriculum**. Most are doing away with a free choice distribution.
- **Twelve of the 18 universities sampled have GE requirements more than the 15 courses (45 units) that comprise the Hybrid GE Program in UP Diliman**. The Committee's final task was to recommend a format for a new UPD GE based on reviews done on the RGEP and Hybrid GE programs. This includes a range (minimum - maximum) of GE units and specific courses to make up the core (prescribed) GE.
- **A blended distribution model of GE might still be the most realistic curriculum for UPD to implement.** This is based on the 2010 System-wide GE Evaluation and the 2011 UPD GE Conference Report which reflect a combination of University- and program-prescribed core courses and electives (free choice).
- **There is no sufficient data to suggest a radical change in the current prescribed core courses.** However, it is important to note that a number of degree programs (Engineering and Science) do not require their students to take Math 1/2.
- **The lack of a more systematic evaluation of the UPD GE program makes it difficult to determine the range of units.** From the 18 universities sampled, the modal seems to be 12 courses or 36 units.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above mentioned observations, the Committee presents the following recommendations:

Administration and Implementation

1. **Activate the GE Center.** Develop a GE assessment plan, facilitate syllabi construction and evaluation, coordinate course offerings across academic clusters, regularly inform academic departments and clusters about enlistment demands and backlog, develop evaluation instrument for GE courses and faculty, and promote a culture of assessment in GE.
2. **The University needs to pour in more resources and support to adequately meet the enlistment demands of the core or prescribed GEs.**
3. **Re-design the GE by adopting an outcomes-based approach.** All GE offerings must specify the learning outcomes for each course, conduct a curricular map in order to determine common learning outcomes, and come to an agreement as to what the GE learning outcomes are.

4. **Develop an assessment mechanism that taps into specific GE learning objectives**. There is a need to re-configure the SET to go beyond its focus on satisfaction with teaching, student motivations, and ratings of teacher competence, and address relevant student learning outcomes (Thompson & Serra, 2005). This would contribute one component of the data needed for the systematic assessment of student learning outcomes across the GE curriculum.
5. **Review current courses to check duplication with courses in the K-12 program and revise the courses accordingly**. The University must see to it that the GE courses do not duplicate courses in senior high school. The course offerings should extend and add on to the competences that have been developed in basic education.

Format for a new UPD GE

The Committee proposes a general format that rationalizes the way GE courses may be designed and implemented. Subsequently, four illustrations (A-D) that embody the general format design are presented. The proposed design is based on classifying GE courses into three tiers or categories:

(a) Core GE courses (Tier I)
(b) Domain-Specific GE courses (Tier II)
(c) Integrative GE courses (Tier III)

Tier 1: Core GE Courses

This tier contains courses that come from the current Hybrid program: Communication 3, English 10, Filipino 40, Kasaysayan 1, and Philosophy 1. Math 1/2 are excluded since it was found that not all programs include these for their Math requirement. The Committee proposes that students take these five courses in their first year of study, as these would equip them with the necessary competencies for higher-level GE courses and academic majors.

Tier II: Domain-Specific GE Courses

The second tier of General Education coursework provides a broad foundation of knowledge and an understanding of methods of inquiry in disciplinary areas. Courses in this category are domain-specific (but not discipline-specific) in the three academic domains: natural sciences, social sciences, and arts and humanities. This means that the courses are not to be treated or taught as an introduction to a specific discipline. For example, Biology 1 should not be taught as an introduction to Biology. A good example of a domain-specific GE course is Social Science 1, which lays down the foundation for the social sciences. As much as possible, students take these courses in their second and third years in the university. Either the students or the academic departments select which particular courses to take to complete this requirement.

Tier III: Integrative GE courses

The Committee proposes that students also take integrative GE courses, preferably in their fourth year. Courses classified under this tier should demonstrate that it: (a) has content and/or methodologies that cut across two or more academic domains in the course design; (b) develops integrative thinking; and (c) would emphasize some form of experiential learning.

The courses could also serve as a capstone experience for students. STS may be considered as a prototypical course for this category. However, other courses could either come from existing GE courses in the current Hybrid (e.g., L Arch 1, CE 10, SEA 30) or from the proposed System GE courses.

This format is in line with the proposed UP GE Curriculum Structure which states:

> "Core GE courses are courses that are prescribed for all students, regardless of their area of specialization or major. These core courses, which provide a shared experience for students in various degree programs, are considered by the CUs to be necessary for their students to effectively meet the GE program objectives while also reflecting the CU context and niche. The elective GE courses, on the other hand, provide students with an opportunity to pursue their interest in specific domains and to develop autonomy through the exercise of critical choice, which are skills and dispositions that the GE program should foster. CUs may select their core and elective GE courses from the 11 GE courses proposed through the Systemwide GE mini-conferences, as well as GE courses currently being offered under the hybrid GE program. They may also propose new GE courses for approval based on the principles and guidelines laid out in this framework." (Memorandum OVPAA No. 2016-16, p. 11)

The Committee presents the following illustrations depicting how this three-tier design may be implemented.

Illustration A: Tiered Hybrid (36 units minimum)

Illustration A takes into consideration the modal number of units in the universities sampled (which is 36 units). The committee proposes a GE curriculum with a minimum of 12 courses (36 units) composed of: (a) five core courses that would develop basic competencies among UPD students; six elective courses distributed across major disciplinal domains that would expose students to ways of thinking and doing beyond their academic majors; and (c) one elective integrative course that would promote integrative thinking about contemporary issues. It is up to the academic programs to decide if they want to add more domain-specific GE courses or integrative GE courses.

Table 13. Illustration A: Tiered Hybrid (36 units minimum)

	AH	MST	SSP	Total
Tier I: Core	Comm3		Kas 1	**15**
	Eng 10		Philo 1	
	Fil 40			
Tier II: Domain-Specific	Elective 1	Elective 1	Elective 1	**18**
	Elective 2	Elective 2	Elective 2	
Tier III: Integrative		STS		**3**
TOTAL	**15**	**9**	**12**	**36**

Illustration B: Tiered Hybrid, Academic Cluster-Specific (36 units minimum)

This is a variation of Illustration A. It follows Tier I and adds the MIT model for Tier II, which is cluster-specific. For the Tier II electives, students take courses in other domains/clusters. For example, Engineering students would have to take 3 GE SSPs and 3 GE AH. English majors, on the other hand, will need to take 3 GE SSPs and 3 GE MSTs.

Tier I: Same as Option A
Tier II: Electives outside the student's academic cluster
AH cluster: 3 MST and 3 SS
SS cluster: 3 AH and 3 MST
MST cluster: 3 AH and 3 SS
Management: 2 AH, 2 MST and 2 SS (same as Option A)
Tier III: Same as Option A

Table 14.1 Illustration B: Tiered Hybrid, for AH Cluster (36 units minimum)

	AH	MST	SSP	Total
Tier I: Core	Comm3		Kas 1	**15**
	Eng 10		Philo 1	
	Fil 40			
Tier II: Domain-Specific		Elective 1	Elective 1	**18**
		Elective 2	Elective 2	
		Elective 3	Elective 3	
Tier III: Integrative		STS		**3**
TOTAL	**9**	**12**	**15**	**36**

Table 14.2 Illustration B: Tiered Hybrid, for SSL Cluster (36 units minimum)

Type/Category	AH	MST	SSP	Total
Tier I: Core	Comm3		Kas 1	**15**
	Eng 10		Philo 1	
	Fil 40			
Tier II: Domain-Specific	Elective 1	Elective 1		**18**
	Elective 2	Elective 2		
	Elective 3	Elective 3		
Tier III: Integrative		STS		**3**
TOTAL	**18**	**12**	**6**	**36**

Table 14.3 Illustration B: Tiered Hybrid, for MST Cluster (36 units minimum)

	AH	MST	SSP	Total
Tier I: Core	Comm3		Kas 1	**15**
	Eng 10		Philo 1	
	Fil 40			
Tier II: Domain-Specific	Elective 1		Elective 1	**18**
	Elective 2		Elective 2	
	Elective 3		Elective 3	
Tier III: Integrative		STS		**3**
TOTAL	**18**	**3**	**15**	**36**

Table 14.4 Illustration B: Tiered Hybrid, for Management Cluster (36 units minimum; same as Option A)

	AH	MST	SSP	Total
Tier I: Core	Comm3		Kas 1	**15**
	Eng 10		Philo 1	
	Fil 40			
Tier II: Domain-Specific	Elective 1	Elective 1	Elective 1	**18**
	Elective 2	Elective 2	Elective 2	
Tier III: Integrative		STS		**3**
TOTAL	**15**	**9**	**12**	**36**

Illustration C: Tiered Hybrid (24-45 units)

Consistent with the three-tiered design, this illustration attempts to incorporate some features from the Hybrid GE and the proposed System GE programs but with more flexibility in the total number of GE units in consideration of those programs in need of these options.

Academic programs planning to require more than the 24-unit minimum may do so as long as they do not exceed the current 45-unit maximum.

For the domain-specific electives, academic programs would specify whether these are equally distributed across the three domains such that, the minimum will be 9 units, or taken outside the respective cluster, such that, the minimum will be 6 units.

Table 15. Illustration C: Tiered Hybrid (24-45 units)

	AH	MST	SSP	Total
Tier I: Core	Comm3		Kas 1	**15**
	Eng 10		Philo 1	
	Fil 40			
Tier II: Domain-Specific	Electives			**6-27**
Tier III: Integrative		STS		**3-24**
TOTAL				**24-45**

Illustration D: Tiered, Open (21 units minimum)

Consistent with the three-tiered design, this illustration takes into consideration the 21-unit minimum proposed during the 2015 UPD GE Conference (UPD GE Conference Proceedings, p. 12).

A major concern for this illustration would be the identification of the core courses.

For the domain-specific electives, academic programs would specify whether these are equally distributed across the three domains such that, the minimum will be 9 units, or taken outside the respective cluster, such that, the minimum will be 6 units.

Table 16. Illustration D: Tiered, Open (21 units minimum)

	AH	MST	SSP	Total
Tier I: Core	(core courses that are yet to be identified and approved by the appropriate bodies)			**6-12**
Tier II: Domain-Specific	Electives			**6 or 9**
Tier III: Integrative				**3 or 6**
TOTAL				**21**

Table 17 contains a comparison of the GE curriculum structure of the different CUs and the proposed UPD GE format. The table is adapted from the UP GE Curriculum Structure. Note that here, the label "Core Courses" refers to all prescribed courses. For consistency with the UP System data presentation, STS which is an integrative course in the proposed three-tiered design, is placed under the category of core courses.

Table 17. Comparison of UP GE Curriculum Structure Across CUs

CU	Core Courses			Sub-total	Elective & Program-prescribed courses	TOTAL
	AH	MST	SSP			
Manila	6	6	6	18	6-18	24-36
Visayas	9	6	6	21	15	36
Baguio	9	9	9	27	9	36
OU	6	9	6	21	9	30
Cebu	6	9	9	24	12	36
Mindanao	3	6	9	18	12	30
Los Baños	6	3	9	18	9	27
Diliman						
Illust. A	9	3	6	18	18 (6+6+6)	36 minimum
Illust. B	9	3	6	18	18 (9+9)	36 minimum
Illust. C	9	3	6	18	6-27	24-45
Illust. D				6-12	9-15	21 minimum

REFERENCES

Alonzo, R.I. (2009). *Evaluation of the Revitalized General Education Program (RGEP).*

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education.

Amor, E. & Jalao, E. (2014). *A look into the current GE courses: Some performance statistics.* Presented at the UP Diliman GE Conference.

Barnish, K. & LeMaster, J. (2014). Benchmarking General Education Programs at Institutions Offering Two- and Four-Year Degrees. The Advisory Board Company.

Dunn, D. S., McCarthy, M. A., Baker, S. C., & Halonen, J. S. (2010). *Using Quality Benchmarks for Assessing and Developing Undergraduate Programs*. John Wiley & Sons.

Forrest, A. (1982). Increasing student competence & persistence: The best case for general education. ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices. Cited in E.T. Pascarella & P. T. Terenzini (1991), *How College Affects Students. Findings and Insights from Twenty Years of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jose, R. T., Samson, L. L., & Sabio, G. S. (2011). *Celebrating the birth and rebirth of the UP College of Liberal Arts (1910-1983).* UP College of Arts and Sciences Alumni Foundation, UP Diliman, Quezon City.

Nash, B. J. (2012). Journey to work: European model combines education with vocation. *Economic Focus*, (4Q), 17-19.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2011). Testing student and university performance globally: OECD's AHELO. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org

Porter, A. C. (2006). Curriculum assessment. *Handbook of Complementary Methods in Education Research*, 141-159.

Redden, Elizabeth. (2013). *In the Netherlands, the growth of liberal arts colleges has influenced the higher ed sector as a whole.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/02/08/netherlands-growth-liberal-arts-colleges-has-influenced-higher-ed-sector-whole.

Ratcliff, J. L., Johnson, D. K., La Nasa, S. M., & Gaff, J. G. (2001). *The Status of General Education in the Year 2000: Summary of a National Survey*. Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Rossett, A. & Sheldon, K. (2001). *Beyond the Podium: Delivering Training and Performance to a Digital World*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. R.W. Tyler, R M. Gagne, M. Scriven (eds.), *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*, pp.39-83. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Task Force on Higher Education. (2000). *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* (No. 440). World Bank.

Thompson Jr, R. J., & Serra, M. (2005). Use of course evaluations to assess the contributions of curricular and pedagogical initiatives to undergraduate general education learning objectives. *Education*, *125*(4), 693.

University of Pennsylvannia (2004). Why General Education matters. Retreived from:http://www.sas.upenn.edu/ugrad/symposium/why_gen_ed_matters.pdf.

Warner, D. B., & Koeppel, K. (2009). General education requirements: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of General Education, 58*(4), 241-258.

Yacat, J.A. (2014). *From RGEP to Hybrid: A preliminary look into student outcomes*. Presented at the UP Diliman GE Conference.

APPENDIX A
List of Reference Materials from the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

1) GE Evaluation Reports and Related Documents
    a. 1994 Report of the UPD Task Force on Undergraduate Program
    b. 1995 Final Report of the Task Force to Review the GE Program
    c. 2009 Interim Document – RGEP 2009 Final Report
    d. 2009 RGEP Evaluation Report
    e. FGD Report, 2010 RGEP Evaluation
    f. 2010 UP System Final Report - Reexamining UP's General Education Program
    g. 2014 ECA and RLJ – A Look into the Current GE Courses: Some Performance Statistics
    h. 2014 JAY – From RGEP to Hybrid GE: A Preliminary Look into Student Outcomes
    i. 2014 JAY – Comparing GE Objectives

2) Proceedings of GE Conferences
    a. 2009 May 20-22 System Conference Proceedings
    b. 2011 October – UPD GE Conference Report
    c. 2014 UPD GE Conference Proceedings
    d. 2014 UPD GE Conference Annexes to the Proceedings
    e. 2015 UPD GE Conference Proceedings
    f. 2015 UPD GE Conference Annexes to the Proceedings

3) 2012 UPD GE Conference Presentations
    a. BMPacheco and MAHZarco: Mainstreaming Disaster Mitigation, Adaptation and Preparedness Strategies through the General Education Program
    b. BMVallejo: Science, Technology and Society (STS): Challenges and Opportunities
    c. CAL GE Committee: Liberal Education, Change, and the Humanities: Issues in 21st Century U.P. General Education
    d. FMVDatuin: Aesthetic Literacy and Changing Education Paradigms
    e. FRNemenzo: Math and GE: Why is Mathematics Part of Liberal Education?
    f. History GE Committee: Ang Pagtuturo ng Kas 1 sa Panahon ng K+12
    g. LAquino: What GE Teachers Can Glean from UPCAT Results: Lessons Learned and Insights Gained from the Reading and Language Tests

4) Philo GE Committee: Anyo ng Mapanuring Pag-iisip at Kompas na Pang-moral sa Philo 12015 UPD GE Conference Materials on GE Evaluation
    a. MPRoque – Assessing the Future GE Program
    b. GE Subcommittee Report on the Review of the UP General Education Assessment, 1994-2014

5) 2016 Proposed GE Framework
    a. 5 February 2016 Proposed UP GE Framework for UC Discussion per Memorandum OVPAA No. 2016-16
    b. Annex A – Infographic Version: UP-General Education through the Years-A-Timeline-from-1910-to-2016
    c. Appendix H Revised Summary of Decisions 1317th BOR Meeting
    d. GE Framework BOR April 16
    e. GE Program Curriculum Structure per CU

APPENDIX B
Enrollment Data

COUNT OF ENLISTMENT									
AH	2007 students	2008 students	2009 students	2010 students	2011 students	2012 students	Grand Total		
	18,782	18,900	18,681	19,637	19,978	19,376	115,354		
Aral Pil 12	647	554	655	542	463	150	3,011		
Art Stud 1	1,794	1,569	1,401	1,504	1,419	1,267	8,954		
Art Stud 2	1,263	1,092	964	1,022	998	958	6,297		
BC 10	81	83	66	88	136	65	519		
Comm 3	2,119	1,907	1,962	1,987	2,081	3,254	13,310		
CW 10	892	975	859	763	952	592	5,033		
EL 50	102	131	134	194	171	104	836		
Eng 1	1,567	1,997	1,832	2,056	2,119	1,037	10,608		
Eng 10	777	1,026	1,148	1,306	1,552	3,473	9,282		
Eng 11	1,275	1,448	1,657	1,672	1,644	1,032	8,728		
Eng 12	966	955	942	933	848	453	5,097		
Eng 30	848	760	879	843	746	561	4,637		
FA 28	207	280	214	261	395	125	1,482		
FA 30	275	290	236	290	299	204	1,594		
Fil 25	229	193	157	134	123	63	899		
Fil 40	1,068	918	969	1,053	1,441	3,557	9,006		
Film 10	90	106	131	200	203	122	852		
Film 12	71	115	136	202	223	100	847		
Humanidades 1	430	472	314	289	284	74	1,863		
J 18	22	21	25	12	19	7	106		
Kom 1	579	308	331	333	244	144	1,939		
Kom 2	236	143	123	112	90	27	731		
L Arch 1	445	469	445	525	458	227	2,569		
MPs 10	465	440	397	359	205	67	1,933		
MuD 1	18	24	36	30	17	20	145		
MuL 13	154	150	148	110	164	122	848		
MuL 9	147	148	113	84	138	60	690		
Pan Pil 12	200	380	300	388	297	117	1,682		
Pan Pil 17	352	437	499	711	615	212	2,826		
Pan Pil 19	625	795	859	884	874	551	4,588		

COUNT OF ENLISTMENT	2007 students	2008 students	2009 students	2010 students	2011 students	2012 students	Grand Total
Pan Pil 40	81	72	69	52	50	8	332
Pan Pil 50	107	63	32	25	13	4	244
Phil Stud 12			1		3	3	7
SEA 30	458	347	408	435	443	384	2,475
Theatre 10	38	48	72	102	116	124	500
Theatre 11	47	59	59	49	60	34	308
Theatre 12	107	125	108	87	75	74	576
EngComm	**8,444**	**9,068**	**9,279**	**9,560**	**9,942**	**10,402**	**56,695**
Comm 3	2,119	1,907	1,962	1,987	2,081	3,254	13,310
CW 10	892	975	859	763	952	592	5,033
Eng 1	1,567	1,997	1,832	2,056	2,119	1,037	10,608
Eng 10	777	1,026	1,148	1,306	1,552	3,473	9,282
Eng 11	1,275	1,448	1,657	1,672	1,644	1,032	8,728
Eng 12	966	955	942	933	848	453	5,097
Eng 30	848	760	879	843	746	561	4,637
MST	**12,374**	**12,604**	**12,184**	**12,572**	**12,259**	**10,493**	**72,486**
BIO 1	1,852	1,737	2,039	2,061	2,316	2,252	12,257
CE 10	5	12	77	171	145	66	476
Chem 1	596	528	406	649	677	855	3,711
EEE 10	220	224	227	299	209	107	1,286
Env Sci 1	824	507	266	373	303	226	2,499
ES 10	472	521	400	474	386	321	2,574
FN 1	16	37	95	102	136	67	453
GE 1	545	507	456	450	507	301	2,766
Geol 1	803	800	783	700	780	436	4,302
L Arch 1	445	469	445	525	458	227	2,569
Math 1	537	545	636	776	861	976	4,331
Math 2	871	921	848	804	612	544	4,600
MBB 1	370	421	537	667	653	544	3,192
MS 1	697	630	549	553	467	337	3,233
Nat Sci 1	1,057	1,032	928	631	216		3,864

COUNT OF ENLISTMENT	2007 students	2008 students	2009 students	2010 students	2011 students	2012 students	Grand Total
Nat Sci 2	1,005	1,294	1,013	683	283		4,278
Physics 10	659	777	836	841	1,324	965	5,402
STS	1,400	1,642	1,643	1,813	1,926	2,269	10,693
PhilStud	**8,812**	**9,418**	**8,940**	**9,576**	**9,569**	**9,383**	**55,698**
Aral Pil 12	647	554	655	542	463	150	3,011
Arkiyoloji 1	420	521	481	559	643	285	2,909
FA 28	207	280	214	261	395	125	1,482
Fil 40	1,068	918	969	1,053	1,441	3,557	9,006
Film 12	71	115	136	202	223	100	847
Humanidades 1	430	472	314	289	284	74	1,863
Kas 1	2,655	2,706	2,623	2,733	2,455	3,287	16,459
L Arch 1	445	469	445	525	458	227	2,569
MPs 10	465	440	397	359	205	67	1,933
MuL 9	147	148	113	84	138	60	690
Pan Pil 12	200	380	300	388	297	117	1,682
Pan Pil 17	352	437	499	711	615	212	2,826
Pan Pil 19	625	795	859	884	874	551	4,588
Pan Pil 40	81	72	69	52	50	8	332
Pan Pil 50	107	63	32	25	13	4	244
Socio 10	845	989	775	860	955	525	4,949
Theatre 11	47	59	59	49	60	34	308
SSP	**16,539**	**16,597**	**16,207**	**17,305**	**17,513**	**16,519**	**100,680**
Anthro 10	1,088	1,288	1,245	1,454	1,441	1,127	7,643
Archaeo 2	472	463	399	601	657	418	3,010
Arkiyoloji 1	420	521	481	559	643	285	2,909
CE 10	5	12	77	171	145	66	476
Econ 11	633	579	583	646	601	456	3,498
Geog 1	2,934	2,817	2,835	2,909	2,747	1,969	16,211
Kas 1	2,655	2,706	2,623	2,733	2,455	3,287	16,459
Kas 2	1,658	1,514	1,366	1,635	1,373	1,298	8,844
L Arch 1	445	469	445	525	458	227	2,569

COUNT OF ENLISTMENT	2007 students	2008 students	2009 students	2010 students	2011 students	2012 students	Grand Total
Lingg 1	351	489	556	636	768	548	3,348
Philo 1	1,250	1,290	1,183	1,002	1,230	3,278	9,233
Philo 10	304	242	484	487	706	483	2,706
Philo 11	965	893	948	1,076	1,090	775	5,747
SEA 30	458	347	408	435	443	384	2,475
Soc Sci 1	459	393	492	578	537	567	3,026
Soc Sci 2	948	967	823	594	863	580	4,775
Soc Sci 3	644	614	484	404	401	246	2,793
Socio 10	845	989	775	860	955	525	4,949
Econ 31	5	4					9
Grand Total	**64,951**	**66,587**	**65,291**	**68,650**	**69,261**	**66,173**	**400,913**

APPENDIX C
BOR Approval of GE Curriculum Structure of CUs

1317th BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING
28 APRIL 2016, 9:00 a.m.
BOR Room, View Deck (4th Floor), Quezon Hall
UP Diliman Campus, Quezon City

ITEM NO.	BOARD ACTION
6	**DESIGNATED WITH A FIXED TERM** Assoc. Prof. NELSON JOSE VINCENT B. QUERIJERO as Director, Human Resources Development Office (HRDO) under the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration, UP Los Baños, effective 10 May 2016 to serve at the pleasure of the Chancellor
7	**DESIGNATED WITH A FIXED TERM** Asst. Prof. LEAHLIZBETH A. SIA, as Associate Dean for Administration, UP Cebu, effective 1 January 2016 to serve at the pleasure of the Dean
8	On the Policies and Guidelines on Selection and Appointment of Deans, **the President to talk to Prof. Patricia R.P. Salvador Daway to do further work to reflect the decisions of the Board.**
ACADEMIC MATTERS	
9	**APPROVED** the proposed revisions to existing OVPAA Programs and Initiatives to increase the number of PhD faculty and researchers and improve the production of new knowledge and creative outputs in UP.
10	**APPROVED** the appointment as UP Scientists, Effective CY 2015-2016
11	**APPROVED** the proposed UP General Education (GE) Program Framework and UP Manila GE Program Curriculum Structure Effective AY 2018-2019
12	**APPROVED** the proposed UP General Education (GE) Program Framework and UP Visayas GE Program Curriculum Structure Effective AY 2018-2019
13	**APPROVED** the proposed UP General Education (GE) Program Framework and UP Baguio GE Program Curriculum Structure Effective AY 2018-2019
14	**APPROVED** the proposed UP General Education (GE) Program Framework and UP Open University GE Program Curriculum Structure Effective AY 2018-2019
15	**APPROVED** the proposed UP General Education (GE) Program Framework and UP Cebu GE Program Curriculum Structure Effective AY 2018-2019
16	**APPROVED** the proposed UP General Education (GE) Program Framework and UP Mindanao GE Program Curriculum Structure Effective AY 2018-2019
17	**APPROVED** the proposed UP General Education (GE) Framework and UP Los Baños GE Program Curriculum Structure Effective AY 2018-2019

APPENDIX D
GE Core Courses in CUs

	UPB	UP Cebu	UPLB	UPM	UP Min	UPOU	UPV
Kasaysayan ng Pilipinas	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Ethics and Moral Reasoning	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Science, Technology & Society	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Critical Perspectives in the Arts	■	■	■		■	■	■
Critical Perspectives in Communication	■	■	■	■			■
Math, Culture & Society		■		■	■	■	■
Wika, Kultura at Lipunan	■			■		■	■
Living Systems	■	■				■	
Self and Society	■	■					
Physical World	■						
Others			■		■		
Total	**27**	**24**	**18**	**18**	**18**	**21**	**21**

■ Required

APPENDIX E
CHED GE Curriculum

For reference, the following provides a background and status of the CHED memoranda on GE Curriculum:

I. The old GE Curriculum is based on the following documents: CHED Memorandum Order No. 4, series 1997; and, CHED Memorandum Order No. 59, series 1996. These memoranda describe a GE Curriculum that focuses on content and structure.

For students majoring in Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications, the total required units is 63, where 9 units are in Filipino and Philippine Literature.

For students from fields other than Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications, the total required units is 51, where 6 units are in Filipino and Philippine Literature.

Sources: http://www.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/CMO-No.59-s1996.pdf
http://www.dlsu.edu.ph/offices/iaa/downloads/CHED-MEMO-59-1997.pdf

II. The new GE Curriculum is based on the CHED Memorandum Order No. 20, series 2013. This memorandum describes a GE Curriculum that focuses on goals and outcomes and is set to be implemented in the (AY) 2018-2019.

It requires a minimum of 36 units distributed into: 24 units of core courses, 9 units of electives (inter-disciplinary), and 3 units on the Life and Works of Rizal.

The following are the descriptions of the core courses: 1) Understanding the Self, 2) Readings in Philippine History, 3) The Contemporary World, 4) Mathematics in the Modern World, 5) Purposive Communication, 6) Art Appreciation, 7) Science, Technology and Society, and 8) Ethics. The new curriculum emphasizes GE outcomes which are categorized into: a) intellectual competencies, b) personal and civic responsibilities, and c) practical skills.

Source: http://www.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/CMO-No.20-s2013.pdf

III. Status

Stemming from a petition that referred to the CMO No. 20 as “anti-Filipino”, the Supreme Court issued on April 22, 2015 a TRO against the new GE curriculum (CMO No. 20).

Source: http://www.ched.gov.ph/central/page/ched-respects-sc-decision-to-respond-in-10-days

On July 18, 2016, CHED instructed all HEI’s to continue implementing the GE Curriculum based on the CMO’s issued in 1996 and 1997.

Source: http://api.ched.ph/api/v1/download/1864