

## **Liaison Reports for 3/09/07 GEC Meeting**

### **1. E Board, Jon Goss, Liaison**

#### **2. H Board, 2/26/2007; George Wong, Liaison**

Discussion on what constitutes a “Native Voice”. It was agreed that a native voice did not have to be an indigenous voice and need only be ethnically identified to a particular racial group. The latter is still to be defined. It will be left to the instructor to justify the source of the indigenous voice.

Articulation agreement meeting, with other campuses meeting on Thursday, March 1, 2007.

Discussion of proposed courses:

GG104 (Fall 2007), Instructor – Rowland: Revised, but still pending, not all questions were addressed by instructor. Pending

Anth 165 (Spring 2007), Instructor - Acabado: Revised, additional readings sent, but intersection is still weak for Hawaii though strong for Pacific. Intersection weak.

ITE 360 (Spring 2007), Instructor - Blackwell: Approved

PAC 108, Instructor - Henrenik: Approved

HWST 107, Instructor – Osorio: Approved

HWST 107 (Spring 2007), Instructor – Parker: Approved for Osorio, but not utilizing same syllabus as Osorio.

HWST 107 (Spring 2007), Instructor – Smith: Approved for Osorio, but not utilizing same syllabus as Osorio.

Bot 105 (Fall 2007), Instructor – McClatchey: Mostly Hawaiian, but not much on rest of Pacific. Need specific readings for intersection. Pending.

Next meeting: March 12, 2007, at 10:00 AM.

### **3. O Board, Richard Bigus, Liaison**

#### **4. W Board, 02/26/07 meeting; John Engel, Liaison**

Summer and Fall 2007 instructor based WI proposals previously distributed were approved. Additional WI proposals were distributed.

Eight F07 course-based proposals were discussed. All had been previously approved as instructor-based WI courses in the past. While the board concluded that additional information was needed, a decision was made to recommend conditional approval for one semester. A board member will work with the Department to revise the proposals as appropriate for resubmission.

The Board continued to discuss problems with course descriptions in course-based proposals. In general, board members agreed that something equivalent to “instruction in writing” should be in the course syllabus if not in the course description.

The Board discussed whether there is a need for more information in W explanatory notes regarding what types of writing “count” toward the 16-page minimum requirement. In general, Board members concluded that related information provided in GenEd and MWP websites is clear enough.

The Board continued discussion of ways of dealing and/or “counting” group (as opposed to individual) writing in W proposals. Proposal forms have been revised to make it clear that individual writing must be clearly indicated.

KCC offers a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Institute every summer. A question was raised whether all WI instructors should be notified of this opportunity. Further questions were raised regarding whether the institute experience was truly appropriate for college level teachers. It was decided that the Board should refrain from “endorsing” this institute while it investigates further.

**5. Foundations Board, 2/27/07 meeting; Susan Johnson, Liaison**

1. Language for memo to Art Department: Board members approved language for memo to Art department re: future renewal proposals and Hallmark 6. GEO received permission from Art Department to use the narrative from the Art 175 and ART 176 renewal proposals as examples for other departments.
2. BOT 105: Johnson reported on GEC response to Botany proposals for both H Focus and FG designations. GEC has no problem with simultaneous applications, and asks the Board to consider the BOT 105 application on its merits of the proposal. The Board then recommended approval of the proposal.

Stitt-Bergh asked the Board if there is any generally agreed upon percentage of "globalness" in the FG Hallmarks, pointing out that HAP requires 2/3 of the course to reflect the intersection between Hawaii, the Pacific and/or Asia. The Board confirmed that there are no numerical formulas associated with the global requirement in the FG Hallmarks, and that they had found the BOT 105 course proposal to be sufficiently global.

3. Renewal Proposals
  - a. GEOG 102 - The renewal proposal did not specify which time period from Hallmark 1 the course covers. Wester will ask Geography to provide some narrative to address this, and the Board will make a recommendation at their next meeting.
  - b. GEOG 151 - The Board recommended renewal of this course.
4. Renewal request language for FG,FS, and FW  
In light of the recent change to the renewal request language for FG proposals, the Board reviewed the renewal request language for all F proposals, and made the following changes.
  - a. As the syllabus represents a contract with the student, and as it constitutes part of the record of how the course meets the F hallmarks, the board will require future FG and FS renewal proposals to include recent syllabi. FW renewal proposals already do so. Canham will draft the language for this.
  - b. Future FS renewal requests will be no longer than thirty pages, including supporting materials. FW renewal requests have no page limit, although Canham reports that English is trying to keep renewals proposals at or under thirty pages.
5. Pending Proposals  
ART 101 - No action  
ANTH 151/152 - Reported that new proposal materials will be in by March 9th.  
MUS 107 - Proposal will be posted today for Board review.  
REL 150 - Nothing received so far. Aune will contact Religion Department chair re: status.

6. LCC portfolio for Common F Program

Weiner reported that the Multi-Campus Foundations Board received and accepted the resubmitted portfolio from LCC to join the agreement.

7. Discussion of CC courses up for renewal

The Board decided to send renewal requests to Hawaii CC, Kauai CC, Maui CC and UH Hilo for FS and FG designations in the coming week, with a deadline as yet to be determined. The Board will go through as many proposals as possible before the summer break.

Discussion of renewals for the CC campuses generated lots of additional questions and some new ideas.

- a. How should the renewal requests be delivered? Suggested practice is through the academic officers chain, but communicating directly to departments on the CC campuses might engender more faculty to faculty communication - and perhaps, compliance.
- b. How productive is this paper-based process? Would faculty from different campuses meeting face to face be more useful? (Several members of F Board related their successful experiences with this type of interaction.)
- c. How feasible would it be to set up a discussion list for Foundations? Johnson will ask GEC about this.
- d. Should the Manoa Foundations Board be responsible for renewals? What is the role of the Multi-Campus Foundations Board? Should course renewals be their bailiwick?

The next meeting is scheduled for March 13.

6. **HSL**, Cristina Bacchilega, Liaison