Present: Patti Chong, Roy Fujimoto, Malia Lau Kong, Jean Okumura (Chair), Dave Ringuette, Navtej (Johnny) Singh

Absent: Leslie Lyum

1. The meeting began at 2:30pm.

2. Minutes from the last meeting (11/5) were accepted as circulated.

3. Old Business
   a. Curriculum Central Question: Jean asked for clarification from Brian and Kathleen regarding the question on the designation of Foundations Courses in Curriculum Central that arose from our last meeting. Brian provided feedback on some of the questions, noting that within the Curriculum Central form, there is one item asking how the course connects to degree requirements, and that there is a note within the form saying that to designate it as a Foundations class, there needs to be separate approval from the Foundations Board. However, the question on what happens after the course is approved for Foundations designation remains. Clarification is needed on who is the person who then goes into Curriculum Central and checks that this course now has a Foundations designation, and Jean will follow up with Brian and Kathleen on this matter.

4. New Business
   a. PHIL 110 Review: Jean brought up Richard’s request to table discussion of PHIL 110’s renewal until Spring 2013 pending new information from UHM regarding their concerns with Phil 110 satisfying FS but not being a quantitative course. Discussion commenced on whether this request would be beneficial. All Foundations courses are renewed according to the Hallmarks as they exist now, not how they exist later. It was decided that we should review PHIL 110 now in case something needs to be revised on the renewal so that there is time to get it fixed. If no new information comes in from UHM by February 28, 2013, then the Foundations Board will give a final decision on renewal of Phil 110 for FS designation. We will let Ron know that we’re honoring Richard’s request in delaying final approval until spring 2013 when more information about whether Phil 110 would satisfy FS at UHM is anticipated.

   b. Renewal Proposal Review: The following course renewals were discussed, and approval was tabled for all until the following revisions are made:

      (1) HIST 151:
          • Need to add in how HIST 151 assesses FG Hallmark #5.
• Need to revise the Assessment portion so that the distinction between the perception survey and essay questions used for assessment is clear.
• Need to clarify the post-assessment review process.
• Need to clarify that the benchmark of 2.2 was for each question.
• Need to add in representative questions for how the course meets Hallmark #2.

(2) HIST 152:
• Need to revise the Assessment portion so that the distinction between the perception survey and essay questions used for assessment is clear.
• Need to clarify the post-assessment review process.
• Need to clarify the benchmark of 2.2 was for each question.
• Need to add in representative questions for how the course meets Hallmark #2.

(3) REL 150:
• Need to provide more assessment details in the Assessment portion of the form by showing what assessment was used and which Hallmarks it is addressing (i.e., link assessment questions to specific Hallmarks). Also, need to indicate whether the Rel 150 courses taught by lecturers participated in the assessment.
• Need to address the assessment data in terms of benchmarks and if they were met, and whether there are plans for to make changes based on the assessment data.
• Need to mention what is done to ensure that all sections of REL 150 (i.e., those taught by lecturers) are meeting the FG Hallmarks.
• Should write the Assessment details on a separate piece of paper so that the signature page is unaffected by any revisions.
• For FG Question #1, need to do a list of all major religions covered and their time periods in order to clearly show that it meets the FGC time period requirement.
• For FG Question #3, need to select the top 10 questions that give a varied representation of the various areas.
• In general, need to take out 1st person statements and make general statements since more than one instructor teaches the course.

(3) MATH 203:
• Need to include the assessment.
• Discussion will continue on Monday, 11/26.

c. During the renewal discussion of the above courses, it was brought up that the Foundations Form’s Question #5 should be revised so that it includes what is expected of assessment in a renewal application. For example, all renewals should address questions of what assessment was used, what hallmarks were assessed, how the assessment is tied to specific hallmarks, and how it is ensured that all sections of the course (whether taught by lecturers and full-time instructors) are meeting the hallmarks.
5. The meeting ended at 4:00pm when quorum was no longer met.