

# UH Mānoa Foundations Board Annual Report for 2006–2007

Joel Weiner, Chair of the Foundations Board

## 1 Policies and Hallmarks:

A principal concern of Foundations Board was to determine reasonable and effective policies for renewal of F designations and then establish those policies as standard practice. This effort was to be based on renewals that were carried out last year and this year, with revisions in the procedure taking place as we engaged in and reacted to what transpired during the renewal processes. By the end of the year, we had policies in place for the renewals of all F designated courses that met the requirements of being reasonable and effective. We have established the forms to be used, the questions to be asked and the guidelines for the responses to those questions. The only concerns that perhaps remain have to do with further limitations on the amount of supporting material that is to be submitted with renewals.

We made some very modest changes to the FG Hallmarks. These involved renumbering the hallmarks, by placing the last hallmark at the top of the list of hallmarks, and changing the way some hallmarks are written to make their statements more uniform. No substantive changes were made to any hallmarks.

Now that Explanatory Notes are available for FW, FS and FG hallmarks, concerns regarding interpreting the hallmarks have not arisen. However, hallmarks that ask for students to engage in analysis of some kind, e.g., as in Hallmark 6\* for the FG designation, are not always being met. The F Board, while granting renewals, asked those departments with these sorts of courses to see to it that more of these kinds of activities become part of the course by the time of its next renewal.

## 2 Proposals:

The F Board received 6 proposals, including 3 from community colleges, all of which were approved.

MATH 112: This proposal for the FS designation from WCC was accepted in its original form.

HIST 153 and 154: These proposals for the FG designation from Hawaii CC were originally found inadequate. The F Board's chair contacted the History Department by email to express the board's concerns. These concerns were adequately addressed and the courses were approved

\* Hallmark numbers were reordered in Fall 06. The current Hallmark 6 was previously Hallmark 5.

WS 175: This proposal for an FG designation was approved subject to a change in the course number. The WS department agreed to change the course alpha and number from WS 251.

BOT 105: This proposal for an FG designation was approved. There was some concern by the F Board that Botany was applying for the H Focus designation at the same time but the GEC suggested that we not consider that. The course was then approved.

ART 101; The original proposal was found not to be acceptable. In particular the board felt that the hallmarks were not reflected in the syllabus. Two members of the board contacted the instructor of the course to express our concerns. The board was eventually provided with detailed clarification of the content of the course and how that content linked with the hallmarks. The course was then approved.

### 3 Renewals:

The F Board renewed 16 courses this semester so far, of these, 5 with FS designations, 8 with FG designations and 3 with FW designations.

PHIL 110/110A: The FS designation was renewed based on responses to questions on the Foundation Board Course Review Form and supporting materials submitted.

PHIL 111: The FS designation was renewed based on responses to questions on the Foundation Board Course Review Form and supporting materials submitted.

NREM 203: The FS designation was renewed. However, the F Board was not entirely satisfied with NREM's response regarding Hallmark 2 on the Course Review Form and informed them of what we regarded as a deficiency.

ICS 141: The FS designation was renewed, however the ICS department was asked to provide more supporting materials than originally submitted with their response to the Course Review Form.

ICS 241: The FS designation was renewed, however the ICS department was asked to provide more supporting materials than originally submitted with their response to the Course Review Form.

ART 175: The FG designation was renewed. However, the F Board expressed concern in the renewal letter regarding the Art Department engaging students in too few activities dealing with analysis.

ART 176: The FG designation was renewed. However, the F Board expressed concern in the renewal letter regarding the Art Department engaging students in too few activities dealing with analysis.

GEOG 102: The FG designation was renewed. The F Board needed some clarification regarding Hallmark 1 which was provided.

GEOG 151: The FG designation was renewed based on responses to questions on the Foundation Board Course Review Form and supporting materials submitted.

ANTH 151: The FG designation was renewed. The F Board asked the Anthropology Department to resubmit the Course Review Form to deal with several concerns. The revised form was found acceptable.

ANTH 152: The FG designation was renewed. The F Board asked the Anthropology Department to resubmit the Course Review Form to deal with several concerns. The revised form was found acceptable.

ENG 100/100A: The FW designation was renewed based on responses to questions on the Foundation Board Course Review Form and supporting materials submitted.

ENG 101: The FW designation was renewed based on responses to questions on the Foundation Board Course Review Form and supporting materials submitted.

ELI 100: The FW designation was renewed based on responses to questions on the Foundation Board Course Review Form and supporting materials submitted.

MUS 107: The FG designation was renewed. The F Board needed some clarification regarding Hallmark 1 which was provided.

REL 150: The FG designation was renewed based on responses to questions on the Foundation Board Course Review Form and supporting materials submitted.

#### 4 Multi-campus Foundations Board:

The multi-campus Foundations Board was composed of representatives from UH Mānoa, Honolulu Community College and Kapi‘olani Community College at the beginning of the year. By the end of the year this board also had representatives from Leeward Community College and Windward Community College. The board met twice. On the first occasion we met with representatives of all members of the UH system. We discussed the process by which other campuses could join the multi-campus agreement and encouraged all campuses to do so. At the second meeting, the annual meeting, we again met with some representatives of some campuses that were still not part of the agreement. We again encourage those campuses to join.

The board discussed how to deal with renewals of the F designation for those campuses that are not part of the agreement. The board voted unanimously in favor of having those campuses submit any applications for renewal, as well as proposals for the F designation, to the multi-campus F Board. It is my sense that the multi-campus F Board favors asking the non-member campuses to submit renewal materials comparable to what is being asked of by member campuses for their own renewals. The multi-campus F Board will need to work out the details for renewal if their proposal for renewals and designations is approved by the administration.

## 5 Current Concerns and Issues:

The F Board has been trying to determine how to deal with renewals of the FS, FG or FW designations for members of the UH system which are not part of the multi-campus program for articulation of Foundations courses. The Board met with AVCUE Ron Cambra about this issue and eventually brought it to the attention of the GEC and multi-campus F Board. As mentioned above, the multi-campus F Board is proposing that these kinds of F designations and renewals be handled by the multi-campus board.

Now that the multi-campus F Board is up and running and has 5 member campuses and may soon grow to have 8 members, some considerations have to be given to the process by which Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes are changed. The action by the Mānoa F Board to make unilateral changes as we did this year does not seem to be in harmony with the purpose of the multi-campus agreement. Some procedures that make the multi-campus F Board central to the process seem appropriate