Foundations Multicampus Group
Fall 2011 Meeting
November 4, 2011
Meeting Notes

Present:
Shawn Ford, Kapi‘olani CC
Erik Guentner, UH Mānoa
Candy Hochstein, Leeward CC
Steve Mandraccia, Honolulu CC
Julia Myers, UH West O‘ahu
Jean Okumura, Windward CC
Jerry Saviano, Honolulu CC
Wade Tanaka, Kaua‘i CC
Bob Wehrman, UH Maui College
Dawne Bost, UH Mānoa (guest)
Lisa Fujikawa, UH Mānoa (guest)
Joanne Itano, UH System (guest)
Joe Jarrett, UH Mānoa (guest)
Todd Sammons, UH Mānoa (guest)

Locations:
Kaua‘i CC – Learning Resource Center 121
Leeward CC – Conference Room AD 102
UH Mānoa – Bachman 203
UH Maui College – Ka‘a‘ike 103
Windward CC – Alakai 118

The meeting began at 1:35 pm.

1. INTRODUCTIONS
- Jerry Saviano, Honolulu CC Foundations Board Co-Chair; Multicampus Group Chair 2009-2011
- Steve Mandraccia, Honolulu CC Foundations Board Co-Chair and future Curriculum Committee Chair
- Shawn Ford, newly appointed Kapi‘olani CC Foundations Board Chair; represents FW
- Erik Guentner, UH Mānoa Foundations Board Co-Chair (with Jim Bayman)
- Joe Jarrett, UH Mānoa General Education Committee Chair
- Candy Hochstein, Leeward CC Foundations Committee Co-Chair
- Julia Myers, UH West O‘ahu General Education Committee Chair (Foundations falls under GEC)
- Jean Okumura, Windward CC Foundations Board Chair
- Bob Wehrman, UH Maui College Foundations Board Chair
- Wade Tanaka, Kaua‘i CC Curriculum Committee Co-Chair (equivalent to Foundations Board Chair)
- Dawne Bost, UH Mānoa Academic Support, Mānoa Writing Program/General Education Office
- Lisa Fujikawa, UH Mānoa Academic Support, Mānoa Writing Program/General Education Office
- Joanne Itano, UH System Director of Academic Affairs
- Todd Sammons, UH Mānoa Faculty Administrator for General Education
2. ELECTION OF 2011-12 CHAIR
Shawn Ford was unanimously voted in as the 2011-12 chairperson.

3. UHM MEMO: REQUEST TO CHANGE FS EXPLANATORY NOTES
Request: UHM General Education Committee (GEC) Chair Joe Jarrett explained that the UHM GEC and Foundations Board are proposing a change to the current FS Explanatory Notes. UHM wants to add an Explanatory Note to Hallmark #5, which states that “a[n FS] course will not focus solely on quantitative skills.” The new Explanatory Note would state that FS courses must include some quantitative skills. This would help Mānoa to meet WASC requirements.

Discussion:
Major or minor change? Shawn said that Hallmark #5 seems to presume some quantitative/computational skills in FS courses. If that is the case, the proposed new Explanatory Note is more of a clarification than a major change. Jerry said the FS people he consulted (Ron Pine of HonCC and Sharon Rowe of KapCC) felt that Mānoa was “wrong to assume that there is the implicit assumption that FS requires math.” Both thought that the proposed change to require quantitative skills was not a minor one.

WASC. Shawn asked that a copy of the WASC standards for four-year institutions be provided to the members and inquired about what WASC’s reaction to the current FS requirement was at the last accreditation visit. Joe stated that the new FS Explanatory Note is being proposed in an effort to address the WASC “quantitative skills” requirement.

Definition of “college-level computational/quantitative skills.” Currently, the term is being used very generally, but it will need to be clearly defined - perhaps with examples - so that the requirement is understood by all. Joe felt that examples would be difficult to provide because the requirement is open to the interpretation of the Foundations Board. Steve agreed that providing examples might give too much specificity and unintentionally narrow the scope of the requirement. Wade suggested contacting WASC for clarification and language and/or looking at similar requirements at peer institutions. Joe said that WASC leaves the particulars up to each individual campus. Lisa felt that most peer institutions do not have an FS-like requirement; Jerry said that most have a two-course requirement in math and logic.

Upper- or lower-division? Because “college-level quantitative skills” are required by WASC for a bachelor’s (but not necessarily an associate’s) degree, some members questioned whether quantitative skills should be a Foundations requirement or a more general requirement which could be taken at any time throughout a student’s college career. One member suggested making it an upper-division requirement, perhaps as a new Focus area. Others felt that it was better to keep it as a Foundations requirement, because then it can be fulfilled at a community college.

A third possibility would be to create a new Foundations-Quantitative Skills (FQ) requirement, which can either be double dipped with some of the current FS courses (e.g., MATH 140) or fulfilled separately (e.g., PHIL 110 for FS and a statistics course for FQ). Several members pointed out that if the change were made, statistics courses and courses from such diverse areas as music theory could meet the requirement.

New requirement? If a new requirement is created, the group would need to figure out new Hallmarks. The concern is that a new requirement could potentially add to the number of credits required for graduation. Most majors appear to have a required course that would meet a
quantitative skills requirement, but it might be an extra requirement for students in the humanities. If such a change were to be proposed, Mānoa faculty felt that there should be an open meeting to discuss it.

Joe asked if the group members could bring the proposed change to their respective Foundations Boards and provide feedback to Mānoa’s GEC by early spring. Jerry felt that the multicampus group should rely on the FS working group, since it is their area of expertise. The working group, which has been convened several times since the multicampus agreement was signed in 2003, wrote the original (current) FS Explanatory Notes, and can make recommendations to the multicampus group.

**Decision:** In the end, the group decided to reconvene the FS working group. Shawn will email all Foundations Board Chairs to ask for the names of two people from each campus to serve on the group. The group should be comprised of faculty who teach (or come from departments that offer) deductive logic courses and/or courses involving quantitative/computational skills. The group will be asked to consider the following:

- the proposed change to the FS Explanatory Notes, which would require inclusion of quantitative skills in each FS course
- a possible new Foundations requirement for quantitative/computational skills if the proposed change is rejected

Joe pointed out that a new working group might need to be convened if the FS working group recommends creating a new FQ requirement. In that case, Joe felt that a new FQ working group should be created to include representatives from departments whose courses weren’t FS-eligible (e.g., business, sociology, information and computer science). The new working group would draft the Hallmarks for the proposed requirement.

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

a. **Mechanism for revising Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes**

**Background:** Both Joe and Jerry felt that the Foundations Multicampus Group could make minor changes to the Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes without involving the Faculty Senates of the participating campuses. Joe pointed out that the original Hallmarks were created by Mānoa’s Foundations Board and approved by Mānoa’s GEC. Similarly, the Explanatory Notes were written by the campuses that were participating in the multicampus agreement at that time (Honolulu CC, Kapi’olani CC, and UH Mānoa). Consequently, changes to the Explanatory Notes require consultation with all campuses participating in the multicampus agreement. (from the UHM General Education Handbook)

**Discussion:** WCC felt strongly that all participating campuses have to agree on any proposed changes, although they conceded that it might be hard to get consensus. Ultimately, they were willing to let the multicampus group decide what type of agreement/vote was required. WCC also felt that a working group should be convened if there are any major changes proposed. The working group would make recommendations to the multicampus group. UHMC and HonCC were in agreement. UHWO, LCC, KauCC, KapCC, and UHM are still discussing the issue with their campuses’ Foundations Boards.
Several other group members were uneasy about requiring consensus, although they agreed that consensus was the goal. Some members didn’t like the idea of one campus having the power to stall the process or “blackball” a decision. One alternative suggested was to allow decisions to be made with the support of a “super majority” (75%+).

**Decision:** Representatives will email the UHM GenEd Office (GEO) with their campus’s recommendations. The GEO will compile the responses and send them out to the group.

b. **Effective dates for Foundations courses**

**Discussion:** The group continued a discussion that began last spring regarding the possibility of backdating Kaua’i CC Foundations courses. Wade referenced former UHM Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA) Neal Smatresk’s memorandum of agreement (MOA) which said not to “hold students hostage” when the student transfers from one UH campus to another. The MOA proposed that the “born on” date of the course serve as the grandfather date as long as no significant changes to the course had been made. Wade felt that the logic of the memo supported backdating KauCC’s Foundations courses.

UHMC and HonCC were in support of KauCC’s request. Lisa said that it was against Mānoa policy to backdate any GenEd courses, and doing so for certain System courses could jeopardize that policy.

Jerry wondered whether the current UHM VCAA should look at all of the courses in question. Erik suggested handling the courses in the same way that non-System transfer credits are handled. Lisa explained that this would be difficult, because credits for non-System courses are granted based on when students transfer those courses to Mānoa, whereas credits for System courses are granted based on when the courses were taken.

**Decision:** The group ran out of time, so discussion will continue at the Spring 2012 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

*Submitted by Lisa Fujikawa*