

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee March 8, 2017, GWP 320, 12:30-2:00pm **Minutes**

**Present:** Robin Evans-Agnew, Jeff Cohen, Lauren Montgomery, Menaka Abraham, Evelyn Shankus, Jane Compson, Jill Purdy, Justin Wadland, Johnny Chen, Eric Bugyis, Jarek Sierschynski, Patrick Pow, Andrea Coker-Anderson, Lorraine Dinnel. **Excused:** Anthony Falit-Baiamonte

**I. Consent Agenda**

The 2/8/17 meeting minutes were approved.

**II**. **New Program Proposals**

**Discussion:** APCC was curious if it would make sense for the T EDUC 301 and T EDUC 492 courses to be sequenced within the minor, i.e. would it make sense to make 301 a prerequisite for 492? APCC was not making this a directive, but

wanted to offer this as feedback.

**VOTE:** The following new program proposal was approved this month by APCC: Robin Evans-Agnew moved, Jane

Compson seconded: 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 1 absent (9 eligible to vote).

SIAS/SOE - Minor in Education and Community Engagement (Catalyst)

**III**. **Program Change Proposals – N/A IV. New Course Proposals**

**Discussion:** In reviewing the proposed GIS courses (460; 470), which were approved by the APCC on March 8th, members of the committee noticed that in the weekly schedule the learning is tied to "goals." They appreciated the explicit link between content and goals, but wondered if the faculty member meant to tie the learning to the "objectives" instead of "goals." They know it is purely semantic, but it might catch someone's eye up in Seattle and wanted to give the proposing faculty all a heads up in case there is time to change it prior to submission to Seattle in order to avoid additional delays.

**VOTE:** The following new course proposals were approved this month by APCC: Eric Bugyis moved, Robin Evans-Agnew seconded: 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 1 absent (9 eligible to vote).

T EDUC 301: Community Education: Learning Beyond the Classroom (Kuali)

T EDUC 492: Applied Urban Education (Kuali)

T GIS 470: GIS Scripting and Automation (Kuali)

T GIS 460: Cartography and Data Visualization (Kuali)

**V. Course Change Proposal**

**Discussion:** APCC discussed the justification for the TRELIG 467 course change: there are a limited number of philosophy classes, but many students who want to take them. This change is to make another course available for students who want more philosophy classes. APCC asked if there is a way to transcript the changes in a course so that people can see the difference. If it’s a special topics course, students are allowed to repeat it, and transcripts indicate that.

**VOTE:** The following course change proposals were approved this month by APCC: Robin Evans-Agnew moved, Menaka

Abraham seconded: 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 1 absent (9 eligible to vote).

T PHIL 453: Political Theory of Human Rights –Prefix Change (Kuali) T RELIG 467: Philosophy of Religion (Kuali)

**VI. Graduation Petition– N/A**

**VII. Policy Issues & Other Business**

a. SIAS – Major in Economics and Policy Analysis – Shortened Review Period

APCC discussed the request for a "late submission" of the new program proposal for Economics and Policy

Analysis. The committee agreed that 8-days would be sufficient to conduct the review.

APCC also discussed that it has become increasingly difficult for them to fully review and, if warranted, advocate for the approval of a new program without information provided by the Deans and Directors and relevant budget committees. APCC recommends, therefore, that submission of the Economics and Policy Analysis full proposal is delayed until after the Deans and Directors and relevant budgetary entities are able to provide their feedback. This feedback would then be included as part of the full proposal so that APCC can make a more informed decision.

APCC is fine with the shortened review period, but they are not convinced that a full and positive review can occur without feedback from the Deans and Directors and relevant budgetary entities.

b. Language restrictions for courses – “ Calling BS o n…”

The language of course titles is currently under discussion within UWCC due to a recent course with the term,

“BS” (full words). As the discussion develops, APCC will remain informed.

c. DL processes – Guest Darcy Janzen

Darcy informed APCC of the current DL process and how it doesn’t easily fit into the new kuali system. Darcy shared some potential solutions that they’re working on with the UW Curriculum Office and will keep APCC updated.

d. W-Course Policy Discussion and Vote: Revised W-Course Policy

APCC discussed the proposed W-Course Policy developed by the Writing Advisory Committee (WAC). Members of the APCC were very impressed with and encouraged by the hard work of the WAC and their dedication to improving writing across the curriculum at UW Tacoma. That said, there were a number of concerns raised by APCC members and by faculty in academic units as communicated to and by APCC members. These concerns are both specific to items within the proposed policy and more general in terms of process and curricular authority. One such set of concerns was raised by faculty in Nursing and Healthcare Leadership (Appendix A). Their concerns mirror many of the concerns raised by other units on campus.

In terms of the more general concerns related to process, several APCC members and other faculty had concerns regarding the relative lack of representation on the WAC across academic units. It was noted that this is not a reflection of WAC’s attempts to be inclusive of all academic units, but more a reflection of individuals within those units not agreeing to participate. However, given that any curricular changes are under the purview of the faculty and that the proposed W-Course policy would apply across campus, the APCC recommends that a more fully represented WAC be constituted so that curricular control remain appropriately placed within the hands of faculty.

Based on these concerns, the APCC recommended to the Executive Council (EC) that a re-constituted WAC be formed as an ad-hoc committee of the APCC. The re-constituted WAC would be required to have representation from every academic unit in a similar proportion as is currently practiced within the APCC (one representative from each academic unit other than SIAS and three from SIAS). The WAC would also include Asao Inoue, University Writing Program Director, as an ex-officio member. Once constituted, the WAC would elect a Chair, who must be a voting member of the faculty at large.

APCC hopes that the re-constituted WAC will build on the proposal that they have already created with the added benefits of institutional authority and legitimacy.

e. Subcommittee Updates

The Diversity Designation Review subcommittee has scheduled their 1st meeting which will be in-person. It will be to decide process. The second meeting they will be able to conduct electronically after they do their review.

The PNOI Template subcommittee had their first meeting and are working on a draft template. Also, they used a mind-mapping software called “coggle” to show all of UW Tacoma’s majors and enrollment (Appendix B.)

f. UWCC Update

Menaka Abraham attend the February UWCC meeting on behalf of APCC. She noted that UWCC is very attentive to the details of course proposals.

**VIII. Adjourn**

**Appendix A**

Date: 3-7-2017

To: APCC

From: Nursing and Healthcare Leadership

Re: Concerns with the Proposed UWT “W” Course Policy

The overwhelming majority of our majors are transfer students. These students will never be able to enter their majors with the proposed requirements already met. That said, we share additional questions and concerns below:

• It is not clear what problem or dilemma this proposal is addressing. Is there evidence that the current standards, in excess of what is required at UW Seattle, are not effective? Why are new standards necessary? Faculty in our program have benefitted from the writing instruction provided to them through fellows programs and summer course offerings.

• The information under “all W-courses at UWT will” (pg 3 of the proposal) lists 7 elements; none of these mentions “pedagogical statements (pg. 5). Page 5 lists elements that are a combination of resources (faculty who might teach in the future?), enrollment cap, when feedback is provided. So this is to be in the syllabus? Our syllabi are reviewed for professional accreditation. Requiring some of these elements and not designating a course as W in a timely manner make creates an unnecessarily complex process and places us at risk.

• Having 50% of a course grade based on “writing” is impossible, given the constraints imposed by and material

that must be covered to satisfy national accreditation and state law requirements.

• We do not currently have the number of faculty required to comply with recommendations in the proposal. We are very unlikely to be able to fund, either within the program or at the campus level, the additional faculty required, given the current proposed cuts/reallocations and the best estimates of state funding in the near future.

• We have concerns about the need to certify, and recertify, to teach a W course. From what source will funding come for this training? One should not assume it will come from programs/schools. The capacity of faculty to carry out their roles responsibly should be the domain of each school/program, given the range of disciplinary differences.

• Further, there is a lack of clarity between how much of this policy is targeted at faculty certification vs course

certification.

• What becomes of the material submitted? From a program perspective, we want all material returned and not used for research or scholarly inquiry that would be published on the digital commons or peer reviewed journal, for example, or shared at a conference without explicit permission.

• The stated proposal to “Certify” a course 2 weeks after the quarter starts is not effective. Student may select a course based on its W designation. Not having that before the course starts disadvantages the student. In our program the faculty teaching a course designed as a Writing course have the syllabus finalized before the course starts, not later; the W-designation appears in our registration guide and catalog, which are available months before the quarter starts. We understand that this might not be common practice for UWT courses taught in other Schools & Programs.

In summary:

Our students must be able to meet the writing requirement within our current curriculum with no additional credit burden.

We do not have enough faculty to comply with the requirements as we grow. These policies appear to be excessively onerous.

We cannot commit to “at least 50% of total course work is discipline specific writing”, given the required content we

must address and evaluate (As per our National and State Accreditation bodies).

would be huge budget and workload implications from this policy as written. Certification/recertification is not necessary and as proposed, is not effective.

This proposal is over-reaching, and we are uncertain as to what “problem” it is addressing.

We do not see a need for this policy

Recommendation:

A program/school may adopt these standards OR may opt to continue to use the current W-course standards. We believe we have the academic freedom to do this as empowered by Article XII of our bylaws:

“XII: The faculty of University of Washington Tacoma delegates to the faculties of its several academic units\* the

following powers and duties (23-43.C): A. with respect to academic matters,

1. To determine its requirements for admission and graduation;

2 To determine its curriculum and academic programs;

3. To determine the scholastic standards required of its students;

4. To recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University  degrees;

5. To exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of  its students.”
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