## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA

## Minutes Academic Policy Committee (APC)

Monday, November 2, 2009

12:30-1:30 GWP 215

Attendees: Deirdre Raynor, Chair; Charles Emlet, Lisa Hoffman, Greg Noronha, Cathy Tashiro, Ankur Teredesai

Guests: Marcie Lazzari, Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly; Marcily Brown, Bobbe Miller-Murray

## Synopsis:

- 1) Approve Minutes from October 19, 2009
- 2) Proposal process: Marcily Brown
- 3) Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Minors recommendations: Law and Policy, Economics, and Politics
- 4) Feedback on Academic Foundations Plan
- 5) Adjournment

## Meeting:

- 1) The minutes from October 19, 2009 were approved with the following changes:
  - a. Discussion: Greg Norohna noted that this might be open to interpretation. Cathy Tashiro questioned the statement in the minutes tht the UWT Faculty Resolution on Budgetary Priorities charges the APC with the ability to act as "gatekeepers," as there is no reference to the APC committee in that document. Lazzari noted that Johann wanted APC to be aware of the Faculty Resolution on Budgetary Concerns.
  - b. Foundations of Excellence (FoE)

Raynor explained that the FoE Project may inform the work of APC. For instance, new programs may need to be developed as a result of FoE findings. Lisa Hoffman noted that the FoE is concerned with something different than the APC's role with budgetary concerns.

- 2) Marcily Brown from Academic Affairs
  - a. Brown handed out the <u>UW/ Bothell/Tacoma 1503 Approval Process Flowchart for New Degrees and Majors</u>. She advised the following for UW Tacoma: the "Directors Approval" also represents Deans; "Campus Committee Committees" also represents APC and PARC. Brown informed the committee that Beth Rushing, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs meets with directors and deans. Then the proposal writer might attend APC meetings to address any questions.
    - 1. Brown noted that New Minors do not have a budget.

- b. Cathy Tashiro asked whether this committee is concerned with resources. Brown explained that the Director of IAS can address resources.
- c. Ankur Teredesai asked about the proposal process. Brown noted that the dean and director might meet the proposal writer at one time. Teredesai asked where the Executive Council (EC) fits in the proposal process. Brown clarified that the EC fits at the "GFO/FA Approval" stage.
- d. Charles Emlet noted the potential issues when coordinating meetings with deans and directors, the proposal writer and APC. Emlet described his concern as a potential constraint/ stumbling block for the process of new proposals. Bobbe Miller-Murray asked whether it is appropriate for APC representatives to meet with the proposal writer to address the APC suggestions. Tashiro noted her concern about directors/deans, APC, and the proposal writer meeting simultaneously; potentially, there are different types of feedback.
- e. Brown updated the APC about current proposals. The *Sustainable Urban Development* is at the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) today. *Criminal Justice* is awaiting external review. *Masters in Community and Metropolitan Development* is (?). There will be conversions in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences to majors. Nine concentrations will be turned into majors). The concentrations will go through a process called "moderate degree change." By the end of this year, some finished proposals might be the *Masters of Science, Environmental Science Bachelors*, and *Engineering*. When they come through they might fee based, or depending on resources, they may not come through.
- f. Tashiro asked about the process fee-based programs. Teredesai expressed concern and asked for clarification about the quality of fee-based programs program. Brown noted that these are issues that faculty might want to discuss.
- g. Teredesai asked about proposals, once they are at the "Vice Chancellor Approval" stage, and if there are significant changes to the budget (funding constraints), how the APC will respond. Brown explained that, theoretically, Beth Rushing will consider the Deans/ Directors and the APC suggestions. Brown was not sure about the process, if the HECB might deny proposals. Teredesai suggested that the APC and the Deans and Directors should be made aware that the proposals may change depending on the process and approvals. In the Institute of Technology they followed the plan given to APC until the HECB directed IT to change certain aspects of the plan which later did not come to APC's review.
- h. Teredesai suggested that the APC Chair should be ccd on communication to the HECB during their proposal review and question answering phase. Hoffman asked if the proposal writers provide APC information about the quality of the program. This will improve the process at the HECB. Brown suggested that the program writer can better address these questions.
- i. Emlet provided two thoughts: A) Changes must be standardized. B) There is a great deal of subjectivity when the APC Chairs change. Emlet suggested that the committee table this conversation.

- j. Brown passed out an example, the Math minor a completed proposal.
- 3) Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Minors recommendations: Law and Policy, Economics, and Politics
  - a. Raynor confirmed there are resources and staff for the new Minors.
  - b. Emlet suggested that Economics and Politics show, 'required core course' and 'other requirements,' but in the Law and Policy minor the language differs, with 'required core' and 'required courses.' Proposal writers need to use consistent language.
  - c. Noronha questioned the rigor of courses in the Economics minor. Miller-Murray asked if the Economics minor should come from the Milgard School of Business rather than from Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS).
    - Raynor explained that in IAS, a minor shows on students' transcripts. These minors
      develop from a particular track, which is an interdisciplinary approach. Noronha
      asked about the credibility of program. Teredesai noted that minors give students
      knowledge about the differences between micro- macro- economics. Miller-Murray
      added that student's transcripts will be clearer once we move away from the
      curriculum codes (how this is listed on the student's transcript).
  - d. Teredesai suggested that Politics minor, page 1, should be an objective and not an outcome. Tashiro noted that this relates to the form.
    - 1. Raynor explained that the form comes from Seattle. Emlet added that the form lacks measurable criteria; either this is a definitional problem or it is not designed to be measureable. Teredesai suggested that the writer should note which criteria can/cannot be measured. Tashiro added that she is reviewing the proposals from a conceptual outcome. Hoffman agreed that APC inquire about the form.

<u>APC vote</u>: The APC unanimously passed the Economics and Politics minor. The APC unanimously passed the Law and Policy minor, with the proviso that the courses language be changed to establish consistency.

- 4) Academic Plan: This came out of a meeting in September 2008. Rushing met with deans and directors.
  - a. Raynor asked for APC feedback because this plan will impact new proposals. Raynor explained that Beth Rushing used this document among other things (i.e. discussions with members of the UWT campus community) to inform the academic plan
  - b. Marcie Lazzari, Chair of the Faculty Assembly explained that the APC will make recommendations.
  - c. Norohna suggested that Rushing should explain to APC purpose of the Academic Plan.
  - d. Tashiro noted that a vision for academic excellence should be included.
  - e. Emlet suggested that APC come up with a formal statement. This should be a priority issue for the next meeting.
  - f. Raynor suggested that Beth Rushing, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs attend the next meeting.
  - g. Hoffman noted Academic Excellence should be defined.
  - h. Tashiro asked to clarify what this plan will be used for and what it the goal.
  - i. Lazzari suggested that the APC might ask about what constitutes *Academic Excellence*, will UW Tacoma staff lecturers, and this is where the budget fits in.

5) The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.