Foundations Board Meeting
November 21, 2014
Present: Patti Chong, Ross Langston (proxy for John Kaya), Malia Lau Kong, Jean Okumura (Chair), Annette Priesman, Jody-Lynn Storm
Meeting convened at 2:19pm.

1. Minutes from the 11/7 were approved with the following corrections:
   a. In 4.d.iv., one “realm” in the sentence “sometimes it is spelt…” needs to be corrected to lower case.
   b. In 4.e., need to change “percent” to “percentage” for Study question 2 in Hallmark 4.
   c. In 4.e., the sentence “a period needs to be inserted after” needs to be designated as 4.e.iii (add the “iii” bullet, then add “Study question 3”).
   d. In 4.g.i., in the first sentence, “been” needs to be changed to “be”

2. The revised GEOG 102 has not yet been submitted with changes requested of Toshi. He will work on this next week after International Education Week.

3. The Board decided to move the next meeting to a later time: Meeting for December 12 moved from 12:30 to 2:00.

4. Jean explained that ICS 141, which has a sunset date of Summer 2015, is unable to submit a renewal because it did not do any course level assessments of the FS Hallmarks (e.g., Course level assessments were halted due to GLO assessments so ICS 141 did NOT do any course level assessments)
   a. The Board passed a Motion to extend the sunset date for ICS 141 to Summer 2016 so that they have enough time to complete the required assessment in Spring 2015. Malia 1st, Ross 2nd, Motion passed unanimously.

5. The Board proceeded to review and revise the “Procedures for Faculty” applying for Foundations designation in the following ways:
   a. In #3: In the sentence that begins “Complete the…” add this statement: AND the Hallmark/SLO alignment matrix for that designation.
   b. Delete #5 as written; then include this for #5: To streamline the review process, it is recommended that you utilize the Writing Center to vet the proposal before submitting it to the Foundations Board.
   c. Board then commenced Discussion on when Foundations Designation should take affect. It was decided that the effective date for designation is Fall in order to avoid confusion for students.
   d. In #9: Add in “with a fall effective date.”
   e. In #6: Board decided that discussion of consultation plan between classes offering the same designated classes should be ongoing. The Board will now be more careful regarding what the consultation plan looks like, and will want to see a plan for regular review of consultation plan. Include in the plan regular review of consultation plan. The word “regular” needs to be added in the “Plan” sentence in middle.
   f. Change to website: On the website need to add in a bullet point on Fall Designation date.
g. On the Foundations Course Designation Proposal Form: Under deadline in the last sentence, need to change “semester” to “academic year” and include this sentence “For inclusion in the Fall semester that it would like designation to take effect.”

6. The Board discussed UH-Manoa’s Quantitative Reasoning email. UHM is proposing to either change FS to FQ or create a separate quantitative requirement. They don’t really want to add more requirements for students so the less invasive method would be to change FS to FQ. Jean mentioned that this proposal will be discussed at the Multicampus Foundations Board meeting on Dec. 5. Board members offered the following concerns, info:

a. There was concern about losing PHIL 110, with some members expressing the need to have this option, explaining that students will take more time if they don’t test into MATH 100 and need to take all these developmental math classes which cost them a lot of $

b. It was suggested that since UHWO has the FS requirement, and a lower division MATH requirement in which PHIL 110 fulfills FS but not their MATH requirement, UHM should adopt a similar requirement rather than go about changing Foundations. Furthermore, at UHWO, MATH 100, 103, 135 will fulfill both the FS and the lower division math.

c. It was mentioned that as the DOE changes to the Common Core, there may be A Smarter Balance Test rather than Compass Test to place into 100-level Math. Furthermore, with better prepared students from the high schools, the number of students straight out of high school who test into MATH 100 & above may increase.

d. It was discussed that basically UHM is breaking the Foundations agreement. It was asked if they are free to do this. Jean mentioned that every spring, the Multicampus Foundations Board votes whether to continue the articulation agreement. A possible scenario becomes this: Come Spring 2015, UHM may say they will have to take this route and change to FQ, then they would decline the Articulation Agreement. If this happens, it was suggested that WCC then ask to dissolve the Foundations Board.

e. Discussion commenced on what exactly an FQ Designation would do. FQ looks to make things more applicable to the student. Some MATH classes would be unaffected by the change (i.e., 135 & 140), but others (i.e., 103) would need tweaking. It was suggested that we encourage the development of PHIL 111 which could meet the FQ Hallmarks.

f. It was also discussed that other campuses have policies that go against WCC policy. For example, at other campuses, they allow CR and quarter-credit classes to fulfill degree requirements.

g. Jean encouraged all members to submit comments on UHM’s proposal via the link sent out by UHM.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:51pm.