Liaison Reports for 9/23/04 GEC Meeting

1. E Board
Emily Hawkins, Liaison

The Ethics Focus Board met on Tuesday, Sept. 14. All members were present and spent the first 30 minutes reviewing proposals that had not been reviewed. The minutes of the Sept. 7 meeting were approved. Ernestine Enomoto, the chair, updated information about the E Board website, which was part of the April minutes, and set new deadlines for implementation. The need for telephone recruiting, one of the proposed tasks, was brought into question with a request to identify the number of seats already being accommodated by existing E courses relative to fulfilling the requirement for the student enrollment. These numbers will be looked at again. Another question was raised about present thinking that students would likely take the E course in their major. Ernestine agreed to call Psychology and Accountancy, the two most underserved departments with a question, such as, “What are your students doing to fulfill the E focus requirement?” This will be discussed again. A stack of proposals received positive comment from all reviewers and were approved. For 2 new and 3 renewal proposals there were questions which Ernestine agreed to follow up on with the proposers. The next meeting will be on Sept. 28 with a report to the GEC on the following day.

2. H Board
Jon Goss, Liaison

HAP Focus Board meeting 2, Fall 2004

The HAP Board met on September 21. It was announced that one of the Board members had resigned the day before. The Board will suggest some names to the Faculty Service Committee for possible replacements. The replacement should be an individual who represents the Hawaiian/Pacific, or is of that descent. There was a proposal to revise the approval process to require a majority of four votes for approval, but this was tabled while the Board lacks full membership. The Board reviewed 22 proposals (GEO received 20 proposals compared with 21 for Spring 2004 and 32 for Fall 2004). There were some general observations on proposals including the following: 1) there is often an inconsistency between the intent on the proposal forms and the content in the syllabus; 2) instructors tend to rely on tertiary materials rather than a genuine native voice; and 3) there is a difference between a native person and a native viewpoint. There was some discussion about the difficult compromise between the goals of encouraging faculty to incorporate native perspectives and ensuring they meet strict standards. There was also discussion of the difficulty of assessment based on faculty self-reporting and the Board’s own evaluations: is there a better way to target assessment, for example, by accessing native Hawaiian and Pacific students in classes? The Board reviewed the proposals: it rejected one new proposal and approved 6 proposals. Consideration of 9 renewals and 6 new proposals is pending additional information.

3. O Board
Randy Hensley, Liaison

O Board met on 9/17; liaison unable to attend.

*****
4. W Board
Jeannie Lum, Liaison
W Board met on 9/15, 9/22.

*****

5. Foundations Board
Megumi Taniguchi, Liaison
The Foundations Board met on Wednesday, September 22. One of the Board members (Graves) has resigned, so the Committee on Faculty Service will be contacted. The vacant seat has a special responsibility for FG.

Manoa, KCC and HCC have developed a three campus agreement to accept each others’ foundation courses. All three campuses have their own foundation boards and will proceed by Manoa’s hallmarks. The KCC and HCC foundation board heads will attend meetings at Manoa to observe the designation process. (The KCC foundation board head, J. Saviano, did attend the meeting.) One of the goals of the Foundation Board heads is to create an interpretation of the hallmarks to be able to present to faculty members. Note: Other campuses not following this agreement will be handled through a proposal form that goes from the VCAA to the GEO to the Foundations Board.

Monica Stitt-Bergh from the GEO was invited to the meeting to discuss assessment. The Foundations Board chair asked for an overview of other campuses conducting assessment. All these institutions have support staff and resources. A question was raised about the sources of assessment support that are offered on campus. Here at Manoa, though there are pockets of expertise, there is no centralized “assessment hotline.” In light of this, the committee made a recommendation / request that the GEC stress to the OVCAA that it would appreciate any institutional support that can be provided in this area.

*****