Liaison Reports for 1/19/05 GEC Meeting

1. E Board
Emily Hawkins, Liaison

The Ethics Board met on Friday, Jan. 14. Five summer courses and one for this Spring were considered. The one for this semester involved reviewing the syllabus and answers from an instructor who was assigned to a course that earlier had been approved with STAFF. This course was approved without reservation. Of the summer courses, two were approved, two will require more information from the instructors, and the last, a staff course, generated the discussion that Ernestine has already forwarded to the GEO about the approval of STAFF courses.

There was rather broad agreement that the first time designation of a course as having E focus should come from an instructor, not from the chair as STAFF.

The Board also looked at resources available to teachers on our webpages under GEC. A page on common misconceptions is the only page not yet available. Future meetings were planned for Thursday mornings at 8:30 on Feb. 3 and 17.

2. H Board
Jon Goss, Liaison

The H-Board met on January 10. The liaison was excused. The Board welcomed a new member, Ned Schultz, from Korean Studies. The Board discussed and adopted a new method for reviewing proposals: proposals are assigned to individual reviewers who prepare a report for the committee, who then decide appropriate action. Negotiation continues with Community College faculty on proposals submitted in the Fall. One course (a section of HWST 107) was approved. The Board requested that Explanatory Notes be posted on the Focus website so that faculty were better informed on the H-designation process. The Board resolved to discuss planning of a workshop at the next meeting following discussion of a request from the VCAA.

The H-Board met again on January 18. It is finding it hard to accommodate the schedules of all the members, and has settled on a time that the liaison cannot make. There is no available time. Liaison and another member are trying to change schedules. The Board discussed the proposed workshop, agreeing on February 14 as a likely date. Board members will clarify hallmarks and their interpretation of "native voice". Tho proposals were reviewed: one lacked a bibliography but was otherwise acceptable; and the other lacked an annotated syllabus, lacked adequate native voice and did not address hallmarks B or C.

3. O Board

4. W Board
Thomas Hilgers, Chair

1. The W Board, which I chair, has again received requests to give a few courses, not instructors, W designations. The basic argument is that some courses by definition accomplish W hallmarks. Examples include English "Argumentative Writing" and several departments' senior/capstone research courses. GEC sets Focus policy. Before the
W Board asks departments for their thoughts on this, we want to know if GEC is open to such a change. (We don't want to create false expectations.) Can you let us know of your stand?

2. The W Board has some concern about Board/GEC accountability for individual-student compliance with W hallmarks in classes that require group authorship. It is considering, for example, adding a proposal question about individuals' roles in projects that involve group work. One counter argument is that this should be a professor/department concern, not GEC/W Board concern. Have you any guidance for the W Board?

5. **Foundations Board**, Megumi Taniguchi, Liaison
   F Board recommendations for Maui CC Math 100(FS) and Math 204 (FS) are on file with the GEO.

6. **HSL**
   Patricia Fryer, Liaison
   Thursday, Dec. 9, 2004
   I have received email from Jean Toyama who reports that the Chinese, Japanese, and French Language groups have sent in the results of their pilot assessments and are well on their way to continuing their projects. The Spanish, Filipino, Ilokano, and Samoan Language groups have attended all meetings; reports from these are still pending. The Hawaiian Language group has indicated that they want to participate, but have not yet attended meetings. Jean reports that they are working on a slightly different kind of assessment. All language participants are charged to send in by the end of December a proposal for the next step: How will each language continue (or start) their two-year language assessment?

7. **GEO**
   Tom Hilgers, Faculty Administrator
   As you know, vacancies are becoming rampant in the gen ed committees. I suggest that GEC take a lead in working to change the Senate's gen ed governance documents to try to deal with this problem. Since changes will require full Senate action, I suggest that GEC act quickly so that a GEC/CAPP resolution can be on the Feb Senate agenda (before the March and April discussions of classified research).

   My thoughts for the moment on this are contained in this email that I sent on the matter to my SEC colleagues:

   Most FS standing comms consist entirely of senators. A senate resignation leads to appointment of the runner up and that person's appt to the standing committee.

   Of the gen ed comms, only one is a standing committee: GEC. It has 2 senators as chair and vice chair. The rest of the members are from the larger faculty.

   GEC in turn has several standing committees, but these are not FS standing comms. Yet all of these groups require FS confirmation. Since few if any members are senators, since all have 3-yr appts, since 3/7 are likely to have sabbs during their term, we have predictable problems w/ staffing.
What we might do, adopting Robert Bley-Vroman’s suggestion, is

1. keep GEC subject to general senate bylaws: FS confirmation of standing-comm
   members. Ordinarily, this is handled during summer by SEC for the FS.

2. make clear that the rest of the gen ed committees are not FS standing committees (if
   that's not apparent). Have GEC confirm members of its standing committees, to be
   parallel w/ FS bylaws. But don't require full FS action.

We could also request fac w/ upcoming sabbaticals to inform SEC the year before the sabb
begins.

Tom Ramsey and/or I will consult GEC on this next week at its first meeting to see where
they stand on the broad issue. We'll then work w/ you on a proposal for SEC.