

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee

April 11, 2018, GWP 320, 12:30-2:00pm

**Minutes**

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

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

The 3/14/18 meeting minutes were approved.

**II. New Program Proposals – N/A**

**III. Program Change Proposals – N/A**

**IV. Course Change Proposals**

**Discussion:**

TGEOS 343 – The atmosphere and Air Pollution

This course change is to reactivate a retired course. APCC members wondered how long the course had been retired for and noticed that the attached syllabus was from 2005. APCC member suggested that it be routine for course changes that the syllabus be updated, if needed, and be an opportunity for faculty to consider fit. Perhaps there should be a checklist for faculty to go over when reactivating a course? Due to the attention at the UWCC level to general education requirements, perhaps this should be something the chair determines.

TEGL 271 – American Indians in Film

This course change is to add a Diversity Designation**.** APCC agreed that this course meets the criteria well. There were a few suggested edits:

-Add SLOs, evaluation details/ grading percentages, and hours in UWCM (when courses were added into UWCM, this information was not initially filled in; usually someone would not need to fill in this information for a course change unless these were the sections being changed, but since the UWCM record for this course was not complete, APCC thinks it is best that the rest of the information is filled in for future reference)

-Include an SLO that uses language from the Diversity Designation in order to give clarity to students and future instructors, as well as, tie into a Diversity Designation related course evaluation question

-update the grading section in the syllabus; it only adds to 70%

**VOTE:** The above course change proposals were approved this month by APCC: Evelyn Shankus moved, Jutta Heller seconded: 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 1 absent/late, (9 eligible to vote).

**V. New Course Proposals**

**Discussion:**

T LAW 300 – Street Law

*Course title discussion:* APCC members discussed the course name; some questioned if it was appropriate due to the possible connotations and suggested a title using terms like “Applied Legal \_\_”; others confirmed that the name was derived from a current curriculum of community-based law work that is recognized in that discipline (disciplinary jargon) and believed that the unique name fit the unique course. APCC members asked if it is part of their purview to scrutinize the course name and ask faculty to consider their audience, and if so, should the meaning/connotation of the name be crafted for academia or for student population (which audience)? They considered how the course title would look on a transcript, especially to a future employer. APCC members asked for the student perspective from the student representative. He confirmed that the title would be eye-catching to a student; students do not often consider how it would look on a transcript; the title might help to attract more students; students would know that the course would be about educational subjects and not gang activity.

*Needs Revision:*

-Remove “Students will” from description and adjust remainder accordingly. The description for TPOLS 210 is could be used as model for an appropriate course description in terms of content and formatting.

-Further develop the evaluation criteria (grading). Though a “special topics” course, there needs to be some specific evaluation/grading criteria proposed. Grading appears to be based on 100% participation, which may not get through UWCM without proper explanation/re-working. If the grading needs to be fully based on participation, a justification in the syllabus and UWCM is needed. For example, perhaps each trip could be 30% with a breakdown of what factors/tasks that 30% includes. There are field work models out there to use as a model for this grading. Also, by grading as complete/incomplete, it is actually closer to “attendance” than “participation.” The UWCC/University Registrar indicates that, “Grading/evaluation which includes over 15% of grade based on participation, without corresponding information in the syllabus listing the objective measures by which participation will be evaluated” is contrary to FCAS policy.

-Suggested: create a syllabus that represents an actual version of the course and just note (at the top of the syllabus) that this is an example of a version of the course. This syllabus doesn’t offer enough information for APCC to evaluate.

-List UWT SW&CJ and UWS Law, Societies, and Justice as potentially affected colleges, schools, or departments. May be others as well.

*Other discussion:* APCC members brought up that public scholarship is often considered to be a situation where a university goes out into the community to do some work/research, while community engagement means that both the university and community are partners in the work and are mutually benefitting.

-APCC members noted that this course may include having non-student minors on campus (from local high schools) and that the instructors should be aware of the responsibilities in having non-student minors on campus

-APCC members discussed the proposed course level (300) and wondered if students taking this course would need a previous framework for law; as it is, with no prerequisites and only 2 credits, freshmen could potentially get into this course. If this course is meant to be more introductory (welcoming freshmen) it should include more structure around law. APCC discussed how their committee views course levels. Each academic unit/division could have a different way of structuring courses (see SAM document), but in general, courses should be scaffolded with the lower levels not necessarily being easier but having different expectations. APCC asked if this course should have a prerequisite, and if so, what would be a good one for it? It’s possible that this course is meant as an exposure experience and does not need a prerequisite. What will prepare students for this course.

-APCC members asked if the hours indicated in UWCM (4 in class hours) were appropriate/intentional.

**ACTION:** APCC decided to ask the proposing faculty member(s) to attend the May APCC meeting and answer questions about their intent with the course as it relates to the course title, evaluation criteria, hours, and scaffolding, as well as, request that the proposing faculty and staff work to address the above concerns, especially in adding more content to the syllabus.

TPOLS 210 – Debate

*Needs Revision:*

-Remove “It” from start of second sentence in Course Description.

-In syllabus, under “Late Assignments” there is mention of providing documentation of a health emergency. This is either strongly discouraged or in fact against UW policy now.

-In syllabus, under “Electronic Devices” it is stated that a student’s participation grade may be lowered if using laptops inappropriately. This is not allowed and is one of the examples that UWCC uses for rejecting course proposals for ‘grading on student behavior’ - <https://registrar.washington.edu/curriculum/application-issues/>

-Suggestion to change wording in syllabus to eliminate use of the term, participation

-Confirm that hours in UWCM are correct

-Suggestion that TPOLS 210 syllabus could be a good model for the TLAW 300 syllabus to follow

**VOTE:** The above new course proposal was approved this month by APCC, pending the above revisions: Jeff Cohen moved, Robin Evens=Agnew seconded: 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 absent/left early, (9 eligible to vote).

*Other discussion:* APCC members discussed the issue of face time (in class) to course credits. This ratio is not fixed in the Faculty Code, though, there are some widely used conventions, i.e. 200 minutes a week for a 5 credit course; 90-100 minutes per week, 2 seminar hours, for a 2 credit course. APCC members talked about how they sometimes feel as though they’re squeezing curriculum into a short time frame and they often don’t have time/room for breaks during the class period. Who has the role to address this? Are faculty denying instructional time when they use 10 minutes for a break?

**VI. Graduation Petitions – N/A**

**VII. Policy Issues & Other Business**

**Academic Plan Criteria Feedback Review:**

Lauren Montgomery, FA chair, asked APCC if they would be willing to review faculty feedback on the draft Academic Plan Criteria. APCC agreed and it was decided that the most efficient way would be to circulate it via email and then invite APCC to the 4.23.18 EC meeting for a discussion. From there, the Academic Plan team will meet on May 8th to sequence the plan; bring it to APCC on May 9th for review; bring it to EC on May 14th for review and approval.

This is criteria to establish what programs are offered at UW Tacoma moving forward. It must be thoughtful, fully constructed, but this is the first attempt. The goal isn’t to arrive at criteria that will make decisions for us, because that would be impossible. APCC members encouraged that the Academic Plan team considers communication strategies and messaging, giving feedback around wording. Lauren will send APCC an email with the criteria and EC meeting information.

**Principles that govern APCC (time permitting) – focus on New Course Proposal:**

* Announcement of draft
* All APCC have access via Collaborations in Canvas
* Can be a place to start for new members
* Allot some time at each meeting and write it down together
* Agendas are much shorter this year (due to skinny academic plan)

APCC discussed that, conceptually, they needed to have two documents, (both important):

FAQ

* technical review
* How to, i.e. New course proposal

Principles

* Extend to what it means to add to curricula and how it intersects
* Think about it systematically
* Example: Say four faculty, have 60 courses in catalog, should they add another? Have they reviewed them?
	+ Consider what we are offering/ not offering for students?
* Can/Should APCC think about these things?
* Need big picture context too
* How does this interface with the academic plan?
	+ might come out of conversations
* Criteria coming out of the strategic plan will be in principles document
* Rights and responsibilities of APCC members
* How does APCC keep continuity?
* APCC policies, i.e. every 5 years clean out of course catalog
* We don’t currently have any way of evaluating 10 new courses instead of new options (history example)
* Conversations should happen at unit level too
* Example: LAX prefix change, could see the moving parts, the domino affect
* UWCM may have tools that allow us to have more information for strategic assessment (also myUW)
* Building out dashboards into what faculty are interested in
* What is APCC’s responsibility – articulate in writing – this is where our authority lies – spend time thinking about how to carry it out
* Also want to know rights, i.e. am I staying in my lane when I make this suggestion?

**WAC Update:** Collecting data, readjusting outcomes to have recommendations (not guidelines), and determining if we need to reconvene next year. Surveys/focus groups going out. APCC members asked if the guidelines “have teeth”? Answer: to the extent that they’re enforced. The goal is to have universal writing values and recommendations for how to support.

**UWCC update:** No rep from Tacoma for April.

**Double Formal Options Committee:**

“Double Formal options meeting 3/28/18

Present: Jane Compson, Ali Modarres, Andrea Coker-Anderson, Michal Nolte, Heather Hucks, Julia Smith, Susan Morreira, Leisa Schmidt.

Group discussion led to the following recommended action points to send back to APCC:

It seems reasonable for units to decide whether students can take double formal options. However, it is reasonable to have a LIMIT on how much overlap of classes there can be between two options. To help considerations about this, it was suggested that APCC unit representatives ask their respective units (where double formal options are permitted) how much overlap is currently allowed.

One of the difficulties with having options is that it can be hard to fit them on the transcript, which has a limit of 32 characters. Currently Registrar’s office uses ad hoc abbreviations, and would like some guidance about this. It was suggested that APCC unit representatives ask their respective units for abbreviations, with a view to working out a uniform system that can then be formally adopted, in order to provide clarity and consistency.”

**Chair Approval Policy:**

This proposed policy would be mainly for the summer months and minor changes (prereqs, abbreviations, typos).

APCC agreed that the intent is good and the policy looks good, but recognized it puts a lot of the chair, who is currently not compensated in the summer. APCC discussed a potential summer stipend for the APCC chair as the policy should be backed by compensation. The staff person can time when chair is needed. In the case of grad petitions, if chair feels confident, they could move forward with it, but otherwise, wait till the next APCC meeting to consult.

Action: Bring this to vote next meeting.