Liaison Reports for 02/23/07 GEC Meeting

1. **E Board**, Jon Goss, Liaison
2. **H Board**, George Wong, Liaison
3. **O Board**, Richard Bigus, Liaison

4. **W Board**, John Engel, Liaison

**January 29, 2007 Meeting**

The new Director of the English Language Institute, Kenton Harsch, was welcomed by the Board. Mechanical Engineering professor Weilin Qu has agreed to serve in Bruce Liebert’s position on the Board.

Spring and Summer WI proposals previously distributed were approved. Fall 2007 WI proposals were distributed.

As of 01/25/07, there were 102 W sections (93 previously approved) for Summer Session and 487 sections (55 new/renewal proposals to be reviewed) for Fall Semester. Numbers are somewhat higher than in previous semesters.

A copy of the Spring 2007 calendar was distributed and the Board was reminded that the first Summer and Fall deadlines will be at the end of February, with late deadlines in April.

A need for neighbor island placement exam proctors was announced for April and May.

**February 12, 2007 Meeting**

New Board member Weilin Qu (Mechanical Engineering) was introduced.

Spring, Summer, and Fall WI proposals were approved (some continue as pending). Fall 07 course based proposals were discussed. Issues include the extent to which course based proposals adequately indicate “instruction in writing” in course descriptions, and whether proposers need more explicit directions for appropriate language. One proposal was approved, and two provisionally (language to be adjusted) approved for recommendation to the GEC.

Additional Summer and Fall 2007 WI proposals were distributed.

There was a good response to the call for neighbor island placement exam proctors. All exams are now covered.

An issue was raised and discussed related to TAs, rather than approved instructor, giving writing feedback. Currently there is no formal policy regarding supervision and/or training of TAs doing this work. Some policy and/or guidance may be needed. Meanwhile, proposal reviewer can assess whether/how instructor interacts with TA. There may be a need for related guidance or models to be provided on the W web site.

There was some discussion of what kinds of writing counts, formal writing versus informal writing, and what meets the writing hallmarks.
There was some discussion of individual versus group writing assignments. The “number of pages required of each (individual) student” should be clear in the WI proposal.

The Board discussed plagiarism and ways they might help colleagues minimize the problem. A visiting scholar has offered to present a workshop on plagiarism prevention in March. Members of the Board have also provided related workshops. More may be needed for the future.

5. **Foundations Board, 2/13/07 meeting**

   Susan Johnson, Liaison

   1. Stitt-Bergh reported on the articulation videoconference held 1/25/07. LCC and WCC articulation portfolios have already been submitted to the Foundations board, and Stitt-Bergh indicated that West Oahu is also moving in this direction. All UH campuses participated in the videoconference; response was positive but, since it requires adopting UHM general education requirements, it is not likely that all will join.

   Weiner suggested that the next Foundations Board meeting take up the question of which CC courses to review, and when.

   2. The board reviewed the following FG proposals:

      a. **ART 175** - Discussion about Hallmark 6, and the lack of activities demonstrating actual student analysis & evaluation. Because classes are large, and TA’s few, this hallmark is difficult to implement.

         Action: The board recommended approval, with strong encouragement to more fully implement this Hallmark before the course comes up for renewal again. Weiner will draft a memo to this effect.

      b. **ART 176** – As in the discussion about ART 175, the lack of activities demonstrating student analysis & evaluation as mandated by Hallmark 6 is an area of concern. The board hopes that by strongly suggesting improvements in this area for both courses, the Art Department may be able to get additional help in the future.

         Action: The board recommended approval, with strong encouragement to more fully implement this Hallmark before the course comes up for renewal again. Again, Weiner will draft the memo.

      c. **ANTH 151** – Board members had to work hard to make the case for this application. Hallmarks 5 and 6 were well addressed, but the connections between the narrative, supporting materials and other hallmarks were not clear.

         Action: Kelley will contact department and request that application be reworked, fleshing out the narratives and making connections between hallmarks and supporting materials explicit. Suggested deadline is March 21th (print catalog deadline).

      d. **ANTH 152** – The board found the same problems as in ANTH 151; Kelley will work with department to improve the application.

      [These applications indicated problems in the actual requests for renewal proposals, which was addressed later in the meeting.]
e. **BOT 105** – The board initially recommended approval. When noted that the department was also submitting this course for an H focus designation, the board retracted the recommendation, and requested a policy statement from GEC on simultaneous applications for different designations.

f. **WS 251** – The board recommended approval. GEO is concerned about the course number, and will contact the department to ask about giving this course a 100 level number more suitable for a Foundations level course. [The department has since renumbered the course to WS 175.]

   This proposal generated a short discussion about the need for consistent numbering of Foundations courses across departments.

3. The use of WebCT for board business is an agenda item for the next GEO meeting; Foundations Board members responded positively to their experience so far.

4. The board agreed to rewrite the documentation for proposal submissions. From now on, departments should submit no more than 5 pages of supplementary materials per hallmark, for a maximum of 36 pages per proposal. The new guidelines will be sent to departments with outstanding course renewal proposals (Music, Religion & Geography).

6. **HSL**
   Cristina Bacchilega, Liaison