

Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Issues Board

Annual Report AY 2002-2003

The Board consisted of Carl Evensen, Julie Iezzi, Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa, Ron Solis, and Ricardo Trimillos. Markus Wessendorf served as liaison to the GEC.

The Focus Statement

1. The Board continues to point out that the principal Focus statement is inconsistent, flawed, and problematic. The Board must work under conditions which exclude many colleagues who do not feel they can or should include a Native Hawaiian intersection within a course, particularly those with Asian expertise.

Policy decisions

1. The Board reaffirmed its position that the Hallmark B understands the representation of native voices within the course, be it in the readings, the class presentations, audiovisual aspects, etc. The Board feels some direct contact with indigenous perspectives is critical to the Focus.

2. The role of the liaison person was clarified. The liaison reports to the GEC, but has no active role in the evaluation or recommendation of courses for the Focus. The Board feels the liaison role should be clear and unequivocal.

3. As practice rather than policy, the H focus designation for a course continues in the event of a "staff" designation or a change in instructor so long as the new instructor adheres to the syllabus and the hallmark statements submitted at the time of its review.

4. Course proposals submitted to the Board by other campuses within the system, e.g. community colleges for the purposes of articulation, require the same kinds of supporting data as Manoa courses including statement and detailed syllabus.

Hallmarks

1. A set of explanatory notes was developed to assist faculty submitting proposals for the H Focus. They will be distributed with the Fall 03 applications.

2. The Hallmarks themselves cannot be re-written until the Focus Statement is re-written.

Procedures improved

1. The practice is to hold as few meetings as possible, with the workload being concentrated immediately following the deadline for submissions each semester.

2. Late proposals are reviewed at a specific time set by the Chair, and not "on demand."

3. The practice of faxing proposals to each Board member greatly improved the efficiency of the decision making.

4. Records keeping by the GEO (Elaine) developed a number of charts, which makes the review process and the review of work accomplished more efficient.

Caveats

1. The Board must continue to be sensitive to misperceptions about its nature, i.e. that it is biased toward certain fields and against others. The review statistics show the assumption to be unfounded, but it still persists. This misperception can color the interaction between an applicant and the Board.

2. The Board should be firm about the standards for review it has set, in spite of personal interventions or claims.

Assessment

1. The Board developed and student-based assessment instrument which has been administered for the last two semesters. It is at the stage of establishing baseline criteria with the statistics gathered so far.

2. These assessments will be used when reviewing courses submitted for renewal for the next two-year period.

3. The Board has considered other kinds of assessment, including long-term assessment of the Focus. An exit instrument with a HAP component for graduating seniors following full implementation of the new core was given some discussion.

Summary

In general, the Board functioned efficiently during the past year. Although there were absences at meetings, there was always a quorum and a spirit of consensus in the decision made.

We note that Carl Evensen and Julie Iezzi have completed their terms and thank them for their important contributions to the first years of implementation for the Focus.

Ricardo D. Trimillos Acting Board Chair AY2002-2003

26 May, 2003