

2008-2009 Annual Report: Contemporary Ethical Issues (E) Focus Board
Spencer Leineweber, Chair

The Board members included Spencer Leineweber (Chair), Dian Dooley, Ilan Noy, Jonathan Okamura, and Ned Bertz. Susan Johnson served as GEC liaison.

The Board had excellent support this year from the General Education office both in continued excellent administrative support from both Duane and Jo-Anne, but also excellent work from the Assessment Office. The General Education office held workshops to help instructors meet proposal requirements during both the Fall and Spring Semesters. Hopefully this will improve the completeness of proposals. A rubric was developed by the Office of Assessment for E Focus courses to evaluate Learning Outcomes. This rubric was sent to all Spring 2009 instructors. The Assessment Office collected materials from Fall 2008 E Focus courses which were evaluated by two Ethical Issues Study Groups which was quite informative.

The primary issue with regard to review by the Board was incomplete applications. While the wording of the hallmarks was changed last year to no longer require a "specific framework" it is still necessary to discuss how each course develops the skills necessary to make ethical decisions. This was the single most common missing element.

Proposal Review Statistics:

In F08, the E Board reviewed 44 proposals. 15 were returned for additional info, of which 3 were not approved. In S09, the E Board reviewed 34 proposals (13 are still being reviewed). 11 required additional information, of which 2 were not approved as of 4/15.

All returned applications were missing one or more of the following:

- the required questions answered for renewal proposals
- the complete syllabus for renewal proposals
- how the hallmarks will be addressed for new proposals
- complete course description for new proposals

On Line Review:

The on-line review over Laulima, greatly increased the efficiency of the Board and allowed for timely review of all proposals. This on-line preliminary review allowed the discussions at the meetings to focus only on the most difficult issues or proposals. If any Board member in the initial review had a specific issue with the proposal it was returned to the proposing faculty member for revision. In the second review by the Board it took a vote of three to pass the proposal.

Goal for next year:

The proposers should be required to submit the entire application on-line for proposals next year. This would require a form fillable .pdf file be uploaded to the Gen Ed website. If there are blanks to fill in with the required information, it is expected that more applications will be complete.