Attendees:
- at UHM (Bachman 203): Jim Bayman (UHM), Shawn Ford (KapCC – Chair), Steve Mandraccia (HonCC), Jean Okumura (WCC), Todd Sammons (UHM), Dawne Bost (UHM – recorder), Lisa Fujikawa (UHM – recorder)
at KauCC (LRC 121): Wade Tanaka
- at LCC (AD 102): Candy Hochstein (LCC), Julia Myers (UHWO)

Excused: Bob Wehrman (UHMC)

The meeting was opened at 1:10pm by Chair Shawn Ford. He noted that almost all of the Board members were also part of the FS Working Group, which was comprised of one math and one philosophy representative from each campus.

Ford stated that the FS Working Group met three times to discuss the proposed change in wording to Hallmark Five’s explanatory note. He shared that since there was no consensus to accept the proposed change, the group decided to reject the proposal. The Working Group then decided to reword Hallmark Five and add a new explanatory note to clarify the intent of the Hallmark.

Ford asked the Multi-Campus Foundations Board to discuss the FS Working Group’s rewording of Hallmark Five and the explanatory note and then vote to accept or reject the changes. He stated that if the Foundations Multi-campus Board members accepted the changes, then each representative would then recommend adoption of the changes to their individual campus entities that preside over Foundations-related matters.

The proposed rewordings of Hallmark Five and the additional explanatory note as provided to the Board read:
- “Change Hallmark #5 from ‘not focus solely on computation skills’ to ‘include computational and/or quantitative skills.’”
- “Add an Explanatory Note under Hallmark #5 that states ‘The course will not focus solely on computational skills, i.e., the application of algorithmic processes leading to determinant answers.’”

Prior to unanimously voting to accept the FS Working Group’s recommendations, the Multi-campus Foundations Board’s discussion of the recommendations primarily examined the question of the proper entities for each Board member to approach with the recommendations and what governing body will be empowered to authorize the FS Working Group’s recommendations.

The Board determined all campuses but Manoa will need to present the proposed recommendations to their Faculty Senates. Manoa’s General Education Committee is authorized to make changes to the Hallmarks that clarify the existing requirement and do not alter the requirement’s intent. The FS Working Group’s recommended rewording of Hallmark Five and addition of an Explanatory Note are thought to only clarify Hallmark Five.

Candy Hochstein (LCC) stated that there are some questions at LCC about the impact the changes will have on assessment of computational skills. Ford shared that the FS Working Group did not address assessment issues in relation to the recommendations since the intent of the Hallmark remains unaltered. He also stated that since there is no “system-wide sharing of proposals, it is up to each individual campus to determine if and how they will incorporate this ‘status quo’ change when considering proposals and renewals for FS classes and any assessment processes.”

A brief discussion of the history of the “decentralization” of Foundations courses resulted in no system-wide “overseer” of individual campus decisions about course creation, approval and renewal. Mandraccia noted at the conclusion of the discussion that all campuses “are obligated to honor” the Hallmarks and the articulation agreement, so a coordinating presence should not be needed.

Ford introduced a discussion of the FS Working Group’s suggestions regarding establishment of a quantitative skills/numeracy requirement by stating the changes to Hallmark #5 did not “change the issue that initiated” the original
proposal. The Board was provided with the FS Working Group’s suggestions addressing the introduction of “the possibility” of establishing such a requirement:

1. Create a Foundations–Quantitative Skills (FQ) requirement
2. Create a Quantitative Focus Requirement
3. Require four years of high school math as part of the admissions requirements for four-year campuses

It was pointed out that the second and third suggestions were definitely outside the scope of any Foundations Board and that the third suggestion did not apply to the community colleges. The Multi-campus Foundations Board members agreed that the suggested FQ requirement was relevant for discussion only if the FS Working Group was suggesting a Foundations requirement. The majority of the Board members also agreed that it was preferable to include representatives from as many stakeholders as possible in the discussion.

The Board was informed by Ford that during his March meeting with the Council of Chief Academic Officers (CCAO) there was a “negative response” to the suggestion of an additional Foundations requirement. Sammons concurred that he was given similar information from Administration Officers at Manoa; additional graduation requirements would not be considered unless the proposal included eliminating an existing requirement.

It was generally agreed that a resolution to this issue must come from faculty, not administration. Ford stated CCAO or some other administrative entity may assume responsibility for designing an answer to the problem if the Multi-campus Foundations Board fails to present a viable solution.

Candy Hochstein asked if the issue being discussed was a Manoa problem rather than one affecting all system schools, and if requiring “all schools to have a math requirement” was part of the discussion. Ford responded by stating “it’s always been the intention to have all system campuses increase the math requirement.” Other Board members concurred that the issue was not limited to Manoa, and stated achievement of better student computational proficiency was a goal for all system schools.

Myers stated it was her impression that the Board was “trying to solve a problem that CCAO doesn’t think is a problem.” Ford responded by stating that during the CCAO meeting he attended, CCAO representatives stated clearly that “they hoped our committee would solve the problem.” Other Board members supported Ford’s statement that the group was charged by CCAO to attempt a resolution of the “math problem” at all system schools.

Myers stated she would like to see the CCAO solution to this issue. Other Board members responded by again stating that they would like to see a resolution to the matter come out of faculty groups before it became necessary to request or adopt an administrative solution. Sammons stated he believed CCAO would prefer there be a faculty-designed resolution.

Several Board members agreed that the interests of Philosophy may be what is actually holding back progress on an issue that is considered a priority for resolution in many corners of the UH system. These comments led to other members calling for clarification of CCAO’s stance on maintaining the Philosophy component of the FS designation.

The Board then explored options to the math proficiency issues.

- The first idea discussed was the possibility of resolving the problem at the Focus level through the addition of a Quantitative Focus (Q) requirement. Sammons said this solution would address the administrative mandate to resolve the problem without adding graduation requirements since Focus requirements can be “double-dipped” with other requirements.
- Ford suggested that the community colleges reduce the number of required electives and add a Q Focus requirement that would take the place of the formerly required elective. (Manoa does not have the elective requirement found at the community colleges) It was again noted that a solution located in creation of a Focus designation was outside the scope of the Foundations Boards.
- It was suggested that eliminating the prohibition against “double-dipping” Foundations requirements might allow creation of an additional computational/quantitative skills requirement through Foundations without
necessarily increasing graduation requirements. Some Board members believed that “making an exception to the prohibition against double-dipping in this case opens the door to more unwanted requests for exceptions that the Board does not want.”

- It was noted that the competencies required by WASC and for students in the 21st century must remain a focus, rather than the agenda of a single department, thus a multi-campus, multi-discipline meeting was again suggested as the optimal way to discuss and find a way to implement a resolution that would best serve all parties.

The next order of business was Board member reports about the status of each individual campus’s Foundations programs. The information is provided below in the order of reporting.

**UHWO** – No report was given. Foundations is handled by the General Education Committee.

**LCC** – The following classes had their Foundations designation renewed: ART 175, HIST 151, HIST 152, MATH 140, PHIL 110, and REL 150. MATH 140X was designed to mirror UHM’s corresponding course and was granted an FW designation. ENG 100 and ENG 100E are still under review.

**WCC** – It was a “quiet semester” with no new courses. There are many renewals due in the coming year.

**HonCC** – AMST 150 is a new recently approved FG course.

**UHM** – HAW 100 and LING 105 were both approved with FGB designations. SOCS 150 was not approved for FS. [Note: The course was given a two-year provisional approval by Mānoa’s General Education Committee at its 4/18/12 meeting.] All renewals were approved with the exception of two courses. The Manoa Foundations Board found the Hallmarks were a useful guide in evaluating “ongoing issues.”

**KauCC** – There are several new courses at KauCC. Wade Tanaka encouraged faculty and departments to apply for Diversification and Foundations designations for the courses; there were no new Foundations applications and the number of Diversification applications is unknown.

**KapCC** – ICS 141 and 241 were given FS designations. PHIL 110’s FS designation was renewed. ENG 100 (FW), ESL 100 (FW), and GEOG 102 and 151 (FG) are still under review. Other courses are in the process of being put in Curriculum Central.

Ford described for the Board the circumstances involving the assignment of Foundations designations at KapCC. He stated that in the next year all KapCC Foundations courses will be expiring and will come up for renewal and “approval in Curriculum Central.” Ford stated that the link between course review and Foundations review has been broken at KapCC. He stated his suggestions that KapCC’s Curriculum Committee and Foundations Board work together have been “met with horror” at KapCC.

As a result, the Curriculum Committee is giving courses Foundations designations in Curriculum Central without presenting the courses to the KapCC Foundations Board for review first. Additionally, Ford thinks it is probable that faculty who need to be submitting proposals and renewal documents to the Foundations Board for Foundations designation renewals are failing to do so.

He provided an example of a course recently given an FS designation, MATH 115, that did not go through the Foundations Board review process. Ford stated that when he approached VC Pagotto about this class specifically (and the issue in general), she responded by stating it is her policy to not “meddle in faculty affairs” and told him that since the “articulation agreement is in place, it’s up to faculty to figure this out.”

Mandraccia noted that the articulation agreement states that each campus must have its Foundations Board review and approve all courses receiving a Foundations designation. Fujikawa noted that if the Multi-campus Foundations Board determines that KapCC is not assigning Foundations designations per the articulation agreement’s provisions, then the Board could vote to not accept KapCC’s improperly designated courses.

Ford responded that he apprised the persons making the decision of this possibility, and they seemed unconcerned about this possible articulation issue. He stated that since he made this information available to the Curriculum Committee, “courses have been renewed without review and courses have been added without review.” The discussion
then turned to Board members explaining the procedures for reviewing and approving courses for Foundations designations at their individual campuses.

Hochstein stated that at LCC the Curriculum Committee and Foundations Board are separate; however, since she serves on both, she is able to address any courses that may show up on Curriculum Central with an F designation without review by LCC’s Foundations Board. She added that a course proposer can “type anything they want” into Curriculum Central if there is no monitoring, so she attempts to review Curriculum Central for courses showing designations that were not properly awarded.

Okumura stated that at WCC new course proposals are entered into an online form that is reviewed by WCC’s Curriculum Committee. If the course proposal requests an F designation, then the form is also reviewed by the WCC Foundations Board.

Myers stated that the process for reviewing proposals “is working” at UHWO. All General Education proposals must “go through the UHWO General Education Committee first.”

Ford remarked that KapCC’s procedures worked well prior to the launch of Curriculum Central and KapCC’s decision to go paperless. He said that prior to these to changes, there was a paper routing slip that accompanied all new courses; the routing slip included the Foundations Board. Ford stated he was told by Susan Pope at KapCC that “there is no way to have some kind of checklist” that is automated and coordinates with Curriculum Central usage.

It was generally agreed that Curriculum Central may be at the core of KapCC’s problem with unauthorized Foundations designations. It was also agreed that the KapCC’s Curriculum Committee and the person or persons improperly entering the designations into Curriculum Central and Banner may respond constructively to Ford’s concerns once classes such as MATH 115 are not recognized by other schools participating in the articulation agreement.

Sammons suggested that the Multi-campus Foundations Board vote to accept KapCC courses that have been assigned F designations without KapCC Foundations Board review for one year. Ford concurred with this suggestion. Since Sammons is not a voting member of the Multi-campus Foundations Board and thus could not make a motion regarding his suggestion, the Board entered into a discussion of the wording of a motion following Sammons’ suggestion.

After discussion of the appropriateness of mentioning KapCC in the motion, Bayman (UHM) presented a motion for a vote. The motion stated: “Courses being posted on Curriculum Central without following normal mechanisms of review by the Foundations Board must undergo Foundations Board review in the next year or else risk not articulating to other campuses, effective Fall 2013.” The motion was accepted unanimously.

Myers stated UHWO has numerous courses “hitting the five-year period” and asked for suggestions on how to conduct the renewal process. She stated they are planning to extend a one-year grace period for courses whose Foundations designations would otherwise expire in Fall ’12. She asked for confirmation that UHWO plan was acceptable. Board representatives from UHM, KapCC, and HonCC all stated they had allowed similar extensions in the past. It was agreed that as long as the extension was clear to advisors and students, there should be no issue with the process Meyers described.

Some of the Board members then shared the composition of their individual Foundations Boards:
KapCC – There is a campus board with 2 faculty for each Foundations area (FG, FS, FW). There is also 1 at-large member that is usually a counselor or advisor. Proposals are generally reviewed by the individuals who have expertise in the requested area, who then make a recommendation to the rest of the Board.
HonCC – The same configuration of members comprise the HonCC Foundations Board; it was noted that while all Board members review, the members normally “defer to experts” in each Foundations area when making a decision.
WCC – There is a representative from every department in the faculty senate, for a total of 6 faculty members. All members review all the applications. All renewals must be turned in 2 years in advance to assure full review by all Board members.
UHM – There is one faculty member from each of the Foundations areas and 4 at-large members. The expertise of the Board members in the different areas is used by all members if needed.

It was suggested that the Fall ’12 Multi-campus Foundations Board meeting include presentations by the Board members of the application and renewal processes on their campuses. The goal is to see if there are ways to streamline the processes. The Board will also continue its discussion of the quantitative skills issue.

The next meeting will be held on September 14, 2012 from 1:00pm to 3:00pm.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50pm.

Submitted by Dawne Bost, Recorder