

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee

March 14 2018, GWP 320, 12:30-2:00pm

**Minutes**

**Present:** Evelyn Shankus, Jutta Heller, Jill Purdy, Justin Wadland, Andrea Coker-Anderson, Menaka Abraham, Jarek Sierschynski, Anthony Falit-Baiamonte, Patrick Pow, Serin Anderson, Jeff Cohen, Jane Compson, Lorraine Dinnel, Lauren Montgomery. **Excused**: Emmett Kang **Guests:** Arwa Dubad for Emmett Kang (ASUWT).

**I.** **Consent Agenda**

The 1/10/18 meeting minutes were approved.

**II. New Program Proposals – N/A**

**III. Program Change Proposals**

**Discussion:** Both 1503 forms need to check the box for revised program requirements for the major. Chair will notify proposers of this edit.

**VOTE:** The following program change proposals were approved this month by APCC: Jeff Cohen moved, Jane Compson seconded: 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 1 late/absent, (9 eligible to vote).

TCES: Major in CES within the Bachelor of Science

TEE: Major in EE within the Bachelor of Science

**IV. New Course Proposals**

**TESC 279**

* Is this course repeatable? APCC members assumed that it is not since that box was left blank.
* How many credits count toward general electives?
* Need explanation of field work in syllabus to help understand how the 40% is calculated
* APCC will clarify these questions with proposers.
* APCC reviewed this course in January 2018 and gave feedback. The proposers implemented the feedback and resubmitted.

**TSOCW 223**

* This is a graduate class
* The syllabus addresses objectives and then competencies
  + The competencies associated with the accrediting body
  + They have to be addressed across curriculum and included on each syllabus, but do not have to all be addressed in each course
  + On the MSW website there are different competencies given. The syllabus doesn’t seem to align with what is on the website
  + The syllabus doesn’t include source of the competencies, but should
  + Suggestion to include “this course addresses the key competencies required by \_\_\_\_\_”
  + SWCJ rep will check in on this for their website

**VOTE:** The above new course proposals were approved this month by APCC: Jutta Heller moved, Evelyn Shankus seconded: 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 0 absent, (9 eligible to vote).

**V. Course Change Proposals – N/A**

**VII. Policy Issues & Other Business**

**APCC Chair 2018-2019 nominations and election**: Current chair, Menaka Abraham called for nominations at the 1.10.18 meeting. Jeff Cohen has nominated Menaka and Evy Shankus seconded that nomination. No other nominations were made, but since several members were absent from the meeting, APCC decided to wait until the February meeting to gather more nominations and vote.

As there were no other nominations, APCC voted to elect Menaka Abraham to APCC chair for 2018-2019. Robin Evans-Agnew made a verbal agreement to shadow Menaka during 2018-2019 so that he could run for the 2019-2020 APCC chair position.

**VOTE:** Evelyn Shankus moved, Lauren Montgomery seconded: 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 0 absent, (9 eligible to vote).

GENERAL DISCUSSION FOLLOWING APCC CHAIR ELECTION: There is a steep learning curve for serving as APCC chair and when someone is a new member. It’s helpful if the APCC chair can serve two years in a row. Standing committees are having their chair elections early so the next person can begin to learn. Also, some members are willing to volunteer for additional term.

APCC members had an idea to put into writing some of APCC’s principles, for instance, around graduation petitions. Something like, “Guiding Principles for APCC” in to avoid principle drift. Perhaps APCC could devote 20 minutes of each meeting to brainstorming principles? Another idea was to do a short film/guide with a 1503 expert (like Kelly Kledzik) or a series of orientation videos that tell what the various curriculum pieces are and what to look for in review. Or a Wiki page that links to our website? APCC could benefit from beginning of the year orientation in 2019 (add an hour to September meeting).

The academic plan will involve APCC next year. The current exercise is putting a campus-wide overview into place so that faculty can make prioritizing decisions. The academic plan will also influence the evaluative criteria for making prioritized decisions. APCC will need to have a conversation about how to interpret information provided. APCC will need to think altruistically about what is best for the whole campus.

There are always constant pressures to develop something new. The Writing Advisory Council and the Diversity Designation Review Committee are APCC projects, but there is pressure that they need to be separate from APCC.

APCC’s leading role needs to be better understood on campus. EC designates APCC to have authority. Moving past administrative gate-keeping and toward evaluating will be difficult, but is needed. How should APCC reps balance representing their units and also thinking campus-wide? If the APCC unit rep needs to advocate then the proposer hasn’t done their work. APCC will probably continue to be “in the weeds,” but also needs to enlarge its strategic role. APCC is a place to have a conversation with academic heart.

APCC plays a central role through its work in advising on budget and resources and has the power to say, for example, “we don’t want to invest resources here and want to invest there here instead.” Now with academic plan, we can be data informed and strategically informed. In the spirit of shared governance, APCC needs to be elevated to the level of prioritizing and thinking with a campus-wide framework.

How much of it will be spelled out in the academic plan and how much will APCC need to come up with?

The academic planning core team will come to APCC with results of stage 2 templates, present with options, have conversation and deliberation and essentially do a test run and dev together. Then, we’ll write down what we learned over the summer. Once the academic plan is in place we shouldn’t have any surprises in APCC – not out of sync – we will just have surprises every 3 years when we enter a new cycle of academic planning (make a new plan).

The ASUWT/student representative was new to the committee and asked:

1. What do you do?
   1. APCC is the faculty body that approves curriculum and academic policy.
2. What does the academic plan look like?
   1. The academic plan is about new programs and major changes. It won’t go in and change a bunch of majors, but it asks big questions like should we offer law school, etc. Deciding whether or not to offer a new program and/or keep a program will be based on how it serves the community, generates jobs, aligns with guiding principles of equity, inclusion, access, diversity. If they don’t meet these objectives, faculty will look more closely because of wanting to use resources well. The academic plan is a collaborative format to look at bigger picture.
3. How is this body implement diversity, equity, and inclusion in classes? The student gave an example of book that was inappropriate and discussed torturing people of color
   1. APCC doesn’t deal with details of academic freedom, but issues like that are handled elsewhere, like with a program’s dean.

**WAC Update:** WAC is meeting on 2.16.18 to develop questions for faculty, staff, students, alum, and employer focus groups, i.e. what are expectations for writing from your perspective? What are you hoping students to get/show? To students: What do you hope to learn? How do we help students achieve objectives? Objectives can be specific to disciple. WAC’s focus is on developing models of support for achieving objectives in writing. This process helps identify the problems we’re trying to fix and attempts to make W-Course guidelines more unit focused. We want employers to know what when they hire a UW Tacoma graduate they’re also getting someone who can write well. WAC has asked for Emmett and Arwa to help with student focus group (which Asoa Inoue, Writing Program director, will facilitate).

**Double Formal Options Committee:** Members will be Jane, Emmett, Andrea, Michal. Anthony might join. The hope is to start the ad hoc committee in February. APCC reps were asked to help solicit volunteers. This group will come up with policy using the document Menaka circulated as a starting point.

**Diversity Designation Policy Draft:** These revisions are only to clarify the review process. It includes suggested questions. When he arrives, APCC can ask the new ACEI to review and consult on the policy. Some faculty gave feedback that there should be a committee including people who have diversity expertise, but the subcommittee needs to be operated out of APCC so that they can keep track of the Diversity Designation as it is academic policy.

The student representative shared that students can’t trust all faculty to teach diversity related courses. Students only trust certain faculty to teach these. Students of color share with one another which faculty to not take courses from. There have been students who do speak up to faculty who are being racist in their classes and these students are often penalized in the classroom by receiving a failing grade. All agreed that if students give feedback on a course they need to be protected. If APCC gets feedback that Diversity courses are not doing what they mean to do, then the course needs further assessment.

APCC members responded that as UW Tacoma goes through the long process of addressing faculty representation, APCC needs to keep an eye on Diversity courses and need to have student feedback on Diversity courses. The Diversity Designation review committee can include APCC members and other people on campus who are experts in this field. There will be a structured evaluation process every three years.

**VOTE:** The revisions to the Diversity Designation Review Process were accepted: Jeff Cohen moved, Robin Evans-Agnew seconded: 7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 2 left early/absent, (9 eligible to vote).

**DL Issue Resolution:** A memo has been sent to Seattle to get the new process approved that turns all existing UW Tacoma courses into DL. Darcy Janzen is attending the February UWCC meeting just in case there are any questions.

**Transfer Courses that meet Diversity requirement:** This item was moved to the March agenda.

**General Education assessment across UW**:APCC has been asked to recommend individuals to be involved in these communities of learning; ideally those teaching Gen. Ed. courses with the various Areas of Knowledge, as well as, CORE faculty. An overview can be found in the course module for this meeting with the title, Gen Ed Pilot Study Description DRAFT.pdf

UW is beginning an effort to write definitions for Areas of Knowledge through an indictive approach, i.e. gathering across campuses and disciplines into communities of practice around these AoKs. UWT has already done work around the Diversity designation and is working on the Writing designation.

This effort will start soon and meet monthly with remote meeting options. Most of the work will be virtual.

APCC members remembered similar conversations when Beth Kalikoff was leading the UWT TLC. She will also be a part of these conversations Amanda Cornby was the head of teaching and learning in Milgard. She would be another good person with a tri-campus perspective and expertise.

APCC members asked if there could be other designations, like Information Literacy? UW doesn’t do well with general education in comparison to other institutions. There does need to be a more comprehensive overall; we can add to gen. ed. requirements for our campus (though they might not be tracked through the UW system).There is the assessment evaluation piece and the philosophical piece; the latter needs to go first: what do we want our students to have as their breadth of learning?

APCC members talked about an article that addressed opportunities for people who major in the humanities. Since the overall STEM push has created a demand for STEM programs, the humanities are in danger of being so under-enrolled to the point that they might go away. The humanities need to get their due in terms of resources, respect, and connection to careers. This effort could think about revamping gen. ed. requirements to broaden support of the humanities.

**ACTION:** APCC reps will gather nominations for this before their March meeting.