## COMMITTEE ON Academic Policy and Planning
### MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING DATE:** November 4, 2015  
**LOCATION:** Hawaii Hall  
**ATTENDANCE:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>GUESTS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHATTACHARYA, Torsha</td>
<td>JOHNSON, Shannon</td>
<td>P BUTLER, Marguerite SEC liaison</td>
<td>P Nassir, Mike (GEC)</td>
<td>3PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFFMAN, Makena</td>
<td>E MCKIMMY, Paul</td>
<td>P JUN, Soojin</td>
<td>Stewart, Maria (VC, GEC)</td>
<td>3PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL, Marcus</td>
<td>P IRVINE (SORENSEN), Christine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aikau, Hokulani (GEC)</td>
<td>3PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIKSON, David</td>
<td>STEPHENSON, Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSNELL, William</td>
<td>WARD, Cynthia</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION / INFORMATION</th>
<th>ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CALL TO ORDER**  
3:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**  
10-28-15 minutes were not reviewed, lack of quorum

**Issue 18.13 Quantitative Reasoning**  
Ad hoc committee looked at various models, including requiring additional Q course on top of FQ. Staggering process over 3 semesters, last Fall 2017, rollout Fall 2018. Hallmarks to be used for review of courses meeting FQ requirement. Feedback solicited from faculty via email blast, held CTE workshop on same. Revised hallmarks into current form based on feedback. GEC met today, minor changes, approved. Next step is send the hallmarks and process summary to SEC by Friday.

Marguerite: What’s driving this? Hoku: being driven by accreditation. Former requirement not meeting WASC standard. Need this in place and preliminary data by 2021 for WASC full review.

Marguerite: These are middle school math skills, not college level.
Disagrees with WASC. Hoku: committee has grappled with this, hopes it’s been addressed.

CAPP and SEC disapproved of prior draft Hallmarks. Mike explained changes between former and current versions.

Carolyn, Marguerite: Asked for basis of the 10% explanatory note. Pragmatic basis, satisfied some critics whereas 20% was seen as problematic. “spread throughout the course” does not specify intent - temporal distribution or otherwise.

30:1 faculty ratio widely supported by faculty as a maximum. Discussion of GA training examples in explanatory notes. MB suggested adding faculty mentorship as acceptable form of training.

Section 4b, discussion on separation: selection of approach from assumptions and limitations. Mike invited revision suggestions - one-size-fits-all hallmarks are difficult, needs to apply to range of classes. Section 4d discussion of wording around “assumptions”. Language modified based on discussion.

Maria to send CAPP an updated version based on this discussion, with tracked changes. Combined feedback to arrive back on 18th.

Respectfully submitted by Paul McKimmy.

Approved on Date with X votes in favor of approval and X against.