03/30/05

Liaison Reports for 03/30/05 GEC Meeting

1. E Board
   Emily Hawkins, Liaison
   Next meeting:

2. H Board
   Jon Goss, Liaison
   Meeting of March 28, 2005

   The Board discussed two proposals for which additional materials had been received from instructors. One was considered close to acceptable but needed additional native voice: the Board recommends Malo and Kamakau. These are key texts that should be in many HAP focus courses. The second proposal still lacked adequate intersection. The Board then discussed a message from the administration passed on by the liaison: first, there are simply not enough HAP focus courses yet approved to satisfy student demand and registration begins on April 26 at UHM, and perhaps earlier for continuing students at community colleges; second, the administration is receiving complaints from faculty that the review process is taking too long and is “opaque”. The Chair apologized for delays in communication. The liaison suggested sharing some of the administrative burden by dividing the work: either in two, with one member dealing with community college faculty and another with UHM faculty; or among members within their assigned kuleana, along the lines of the W-Board. The Chair preferred to continue as is for now. Other Board members felt that the inefficiencies in communication were not in any case the real issue. All proposals have been reviewed in a timely fashion. The problem is that many faculty still do not understand the criteria and follow the instructions. It is a slow process of educating them. And faculty typically resist because they do not like being told what to do and how to do it, and they do not like the additional work involved. In many cases also, faculty do not respond to Board requests in a timely fashion.

   It was also pointed out that the other Focus requirements, with the partial exception of E, are more “vertical” in their applications, in that activities can be slotted into existing courses and syllabi. The H-Focus is more “horizontal”, requiring new content and materials. And many faculty are not familiar with this content or the materials. Recall that at the workshop, one presenter mentioned, with pride rather than resentment, revising the syllabus for an existing course 3 times before it was acceptable to the H-Board. The H-Board feels that they have been mandated to assure quality as well as quantity of H-Focus courses and that the time taken is necessary.

3. O Board
   Dick Chadwick, Liaison

4. W Board

5. Foundations Board
   Megumi Taniguchi, Liaison
   Foundations board report -3/10/05
1. If a CC that is not part of the multi-campus agreement submits a FG for consideration, then it needs to send the proposal to each campus separately. Manoa has approved LCC's ANTH 151. It will be sent to KCC and HCC next.

2. Todd Sammons reported that the recommendation by the Foundations Board that Math 100 and Math 203 not be approved was not accepted by GEC. The GEC requested that the Foundations Board negotiate with the faculty involved. Todd will e-mail the instructors involved. David Chin will work with them.

3. In terms of assessment, the Foundations Board has elected to contact all departments involved and ask them to respond in terms of what they are doing now or want to do for assessment. The Board felt that this would be a good way to let faculty members know that assessment will be coming up. The Board feels that, considering the variety of courses involved, it may be difficult to propose one set assessment.

4. Disciplinary working groups are being formed to discuss FW, FS, and FG. Manoa (Todd) will chair the FW group, KCC (N. Dwyer) will chair the FS group and HCC (J. Saviano) will chair the FG group. The goal is to work on explanatory notes for each set of hallmarks by the end of the semester. The Foundations committee will primarily be meeting in these disciplinary working groups.

5. HCC report: J. Saviano stated that they accepted Math 135.

6. KCC report: S. Rowe (KCC) attended the meeting with N. Dwyer. She said that it was helpful to attend the meeting. She is trying to emphasize the symbolic reasoning aspect— as opposed to quantitative nature— of the FS requirement on her campus.

7. GEO report: I asked for clarification on how the multi-campus agreement works—in terms of #1, and in terms of a course (i.e. Math 135). The committee verified that if a course is accepted to fulfill FS, then it is accepted by all campuses.

6. HSL
Patricia Fryer, Liaison