

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee

June 7, 2017, GWP 320, 12:30-2:00pm Minutes

**Minutes**

**Present:** Jeff Cohen, Evelyn Shankus, Jill Purdy, Justin Wadland, Eric Bugyis, Andrea Coker-Anderson, Lorraine Dinnel, Lorraine Dinnel, Jane Compson, Patrick Pow, Robin Evans-Agnew, Johnny Chen. **Excused:** Lauren Montgomery (sent votes via email), Menaka Abraham (sent votes via email), Jarek Sierschynski, Anthony Falit-Baiamonte. **Guests:** Raj Katti, Kelly Kledzik.

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

The 5/10/17 meeting minutes were approved.

**II. New Program Proposals** - NA

**III. Program Change Proposals**

**Discussion:** The APCC would like the proposing unit(s) to provide the following in a resubmittal of the Education Minor Program Change proposal to change the title to the Teaching, Learning, and Justice Minor:

1. A more fully developed articulation as to how this makes the distinction between the two minors more clear for students. There is concern on the part of APCC members that this would actually confuse students more.

2. A clear articulation of the reasons for include "justice" as part of the title of the minor. APCC members are glad to see this as a focus on the minor, but not sure how it manifests in the minor and why it is necessary for the title.

**VOTE:** The following program change proposals were approved this month by APCC: Evelyn Shankus moved, Jane Compson seconded: 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 absent (9 eligible to vote).

Addition of TNPRFT 231 as a foundation course in Museum Studies minor

 Combining of elective lists for Nonprofit Studies minor

 Removal of Law and Policy elective list from general catalog

The following program change proposal was returned to submitting unit(s) with a request for more information (see Discussion above):

Changing the title of the Education minor to the Teaching, Learning, and Justice minor

**IV. New Course Proposals**

**Discussion:**

Some members asked why TSOCWF 365 wasn’t also a Diversity Designation course. It is because there is another course within the program that is a diversity course and is required. These courses are in a cohort model, so it is unlikely that other students would be able to take these as their Diversity classes because of class capacities.

Members asked about TCSS 455 having “introduction” in the title though it is a 400 level class. It is a 400 level class that introduces a very advanced topic, so it is appropriate. There are prerequisites in place for it so that unprepared students do not accidently take it.

For BIO 320 and TLIT 391, the syllabi need to articulate how participation is measured/evaluated.

For TWRT 274, the course description and syllabus should indicate the U.S. focus because of the U.S. focus of the Diversity Designation requirements. The course will be approved pending these additions.

APCC noted big- picture issue(s):

-Faculty need guidelines/resources about the need to articulate in the syllabus how participation is measured/evaluated (if participation is more than 15% of the grade.) Perhaps APCC should consult with UWCC and FCAS for what information already exists and then supply it to the faculty.

-In academic year 2017-2018, APCC should revisit the requirements of the Diversity Designation, especially the requirement to have a U.S. focus. The committee may want to look at record of why this was included as a requirement. FA Admin. will look through files for information regarding this.

-Faculty and curriculum coordinators need to know that all information needs to be filled in for all submitted courses (in kualiu), even course changes. Faculty/curriculum coordinators should submit old and new syllabi for course changes to show the difference.

**VOTE:** Pending a few stipulations noted above, the following new course proposals were approved this month by APCC: Robin Evans-Agnew moved, Evelyn Shankus seconded: 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 absent (9 eligible to vote).

TSOCWF 356: Disabilities: Individual and Community Perspectives

T CRIM 156: Criminal Justice and the War on Drugs

T CSS 455: Introduction to Machine Learning

T ARTS 151: Fundamentals of Acting

T BIOL 320: Vertebrate Anatomy and Diversity

TWRT 274: Spoken Word Poetry

 Diversity Designation for TWRT 274

T BIOL 222: Evolution and Its Implications

TPOL S 360: Genocide

T LIT 391: Science Fiction Literature

T INFO 473: Applied Data Structures and Algorithms

TEE 372: Computer Architecture for Electrical Engineers

T INFO 476: Threat Modeling

**V. Course Change Proposal**

**Discussion:** LAW 150 needs to include SLO’s and the syllabus since UWCC has been sending proposals back that don’t include that information.

**VOTE:** The following new course proposals were approved this month by APCC: Jane Compson moved, Evelyn Shankus seconded: 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 absent (9 eligible to vote).

T LAW 150: Introduction to the American Legal System (change to course number)

TECON 101: Understanding Economics (change to description)

TWRT 287: Creative Nonfiction Writing (allow for it to be repeated Winter 2018 only)

TEE 331: Applied Electromagnetics (reduction of credits from 5 to 4)

**VI. Graduation Petitions** - NA

**VII. Policy Issues & Other Business**

1. Subcommittee Reports

Diversity Designation Review Subcommittee: Appendix A

The subcommittee chair, Robin Evans-Agnew, spoke about how the committee met, designed their process, added things to look for to the review form, and of 88 Diversity courses, reviewed a random sampling of 12 courses. He noted that these were not divided by course level before randomizing, so the sampling had more of some course levels than others. The committee also discussed the various terms (diversity, social justice, etc.) and how these terms have connotations of strengths and challenges. This is an ongoing conversation.

Some observations from the process:

* The group wanted to view student evaluations of the courses, but received push back
* Some syllabi didn’t list assignments and/or were difficult to read
* The course evaluations don’t include specific questions for diversity courses, so there is no data to assess how these courses were in light of the Diversity Designation requirements
* The U.S. specific requirement felt out of place since we are a very globally minded school
* The randomization of courses to review was okay, but the review was essentially blind because there was no interaction with the faculty who are teaching the courses

Some Recommendations:

* Interaction with the faculty who teach the diversity courses is needed
* In another 3 years, have a conversation about the terrain in the field of diversity issues and how that impacts the Diversity Designation; revise as needed
	+ The concept of diversity is changing and we must change with it
* Look closely at the identities that are covered by the various diversity courses; think about other identities as well
* Review the courses that have been new within the last year
* Find out how accessible these courses are to students. How do they know the Diversity Course offerings?
	+ How often are they offered? How many students can take them?
* Continue ongoing conversations with ASUWT around diversity courses (thanks to Johnny Chen, our ASUWT rep. who facilitated that connection this year)
	+ Johnny will share the report with the incoming ASUWT team
* The way faculty teach diversity courses should encourage students to give input into how diversity courses are taught and what is covered in them
* How does APCC feedback get to faculty who teach diversity courses?
* Share Diversity Designation Review report with Faculty Affairs Committee, Executive Council, and other units as well
* Some faculty are concerned about the qualifications of those who teach diversity courses
* Also recommended: get more faculty and courses to seek the Diversity Designation
	+ Jill Purdy and Andrea Coker-Anderson will partner on an analysis and bring it back to APCC
* Have reviewed sampling of courses be stratified across various disciplines instead of a purely random sample.
* Punt all of this to APCC 3 years from now since it will develop over time

PNOI Subcommittee: Appendix B

The subcommittee chair, Evelyn Shankus, spoke about the group’s charge to create new, clarified content for the PNOI (Planning Notice of Intent). She shared about how the group struggled through asking how much work a PNOI should be for a proposing faculty member, but were committed to making it more clear and comprehensive. A guiding principle was that Faculty Assembly and APCC should play a role on advising around recourses, and therefore, need to be informed about the resources involved in a new program. For instance, a proposing faculty must now consider what library resources the new program may require (including a new webpage with instructions for considering this, written by UW Tacoma Librarian, Justin Wadland.) Lastly, the new PNOI Instructions align well with the proposed Step Zero coming from the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy.

APCC voted to pass the PNOI Instructions as policy. It will next go to EC to be voted on in Fall 2017. From there, it will be posted online with other pertaining documents and be circulated to faculty and curriculum coordinators with the help of APCC and EC representatives.

1. There will be no APCC summer meeting.

**VIII. Adjourn**

**Appendix A**

Diversity Designation Review Committee Report May 25, 2017

Reviewers: Evans-Agnew (Chair), Compson, Bugyis, Abraham, Chen, & Falit-Baiamonte

Other participating members: Cohen (APCC Chair), & Chen (ASUWT Rep)

Preamble: This review committee was designated by the UWT Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee to complete the required three year review of courses designated as meeting the diversity requirement. In March 2017, courses (n=12) were randomly selected and reviewed from all the Diversity-Designated Courses at UWT (n=88).

Methods: Committee members met on 3/14/2017 and agreed to conduct both an outcome and process evaluation of the requirement. They would attempt to review course materials including student evaluations if-possible. Members used a standard form to review courses based on the original Diversity designation application with two additions: “Review (if possible) supporting documentation may be submitted as needed, such as assignments, reading lists, descriptions of experiences, other course materials, and the CANVAS site”, and a prompt for reviewing “Pedagogical modes & Methods”. Chair of this committee visited and briefed ASUWT on the process and solicited feedback.

Results:

Table 1. Evaluation of the diversity requirements for diversity courses from randomly selected syllabi from the UWT catalog (n=12)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course Reviewed | Reviewer initials | Meets Criteria? |
| TCOM 444 | EB | Y |
| TCRIM 225 | MA | Y |
| TEGL 304 | JC | Y |
| TEGL 340 | REA | Y |
| TEGL 401 | EB | Y |
| TEST 211 | JC | Y |
| TFILM 488 | REA | Y |
| THIST 220 | AFB | Y |
| TLIT 433 | AFB | Y |
| TSOC 460 | REA | Y |
| TURB 210 | MA | Y |
| TWOMN 251 | AFB | Y |

Table 2: Socially constructed identities covered in the random sample (n=12 syllabi)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| N | Identity |
| 2 | Age |
| 8 | Class |
| 2 | Disability |
| 6 | Ethnicity |
| 9 | Gender |
| 6 | Nationality |
| 10 | Race |
| 7 | Sexuality |
|  | Other identity(ies)  |
| 1 | Indigeneity |
| 1 | American Indian |

Table 3. Diversity Criteria Goals covered in the random sample (n=12 syllabi)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8 | To provide an in-depth analysis of at least one socially constructed identity |
| 8 | To teach about the intersections of socially constructed categories, perspectives and experiences |
| 10 | To teach students to think critically about power, inequality, marginality and activism |
| 4 | To explore the customs, traditions, and cultural expressions (art, dance, music, literature, etc.) as they relate to experiences of power, privilege, oppression and activism |
| 7 | To explore the historical precursors of contemporary power relationships and the interconnected histories of various people as they relate to power, privilege and oppression |
| 8 | To investigate contemporary society and how institutions like education, law, government, religion, science, health, military, and others contribute to the inequitable distribution of power and privilege in society. |

We met difficulties in gathering information in the following areas:

1. Some departments were reluctant to share student evaluations
2. Some courses had not been taught recently
3. Syllabi did not often specify assignments so it was not clear whether the student could opt not to address diversity in their assignment, or how diversity was addressed in the assignment
4. Student evaluations did not include a specific question pertaining to the diversity requirement
5. Operationalizing the criteria was difficult for reviewers:
	1. Assessing the extent of the US focus was difficult. Members noted that as long as some US content was described they scored the course as meeting this criteria.
	2. 60% of content was also difficult to assess and was largely subjective.

Recommendations:

1. Members suggested that future review committees contact faculty who have recently taught the course to ask them to describe how the learning objectives are put into practice and what explicit concepts are covered.
2. Members suggested that future APCC Diversity Designation reviews consider addressing gaps identified in tables 2 and 3, most notably the relatively few courses that address age, disability, or indigenous identities.
3. Members noted the variations in approaches to diversity in the courses and recommended that a future review committee could consider how well students are able to access diversity courses that would provide them this variety.
4. Members recommended that the review only include courses taught in the last year

**Appendix B *– Some updates to be applied Fall 2017***

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINTON, TACOMA

NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW PROCESS

**PLANNING NOTICE OF INTENT (PNOI) INSTRUCTIONS**

*Approved by APCC 6.6.17. To be ratified by the Executive Council.*

**Purpose:** The Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI) is a preliminary step in the proposal of a new undergraduate degree program. It precedes the formal proposal (1503) and serves to fulfill several objectives including the following:

* Provide an efficient mechanism to communicate to the stakeholders within the UWT community of the ***intention to propose*** a new undergraduate degree program
* Assist faculty in assessing the feasibility of a possible program prior to a significant investment of time in proposal development
* Create a forum for feedback and collaboration within the larger UWT community which will help to align the future proposal with on-going initiatives and programs already developed or in development

**CONTENT OF THE PNOI**

***STEP 2*** *in the* [*Narrative Steps: UW Tacoma New Program Development & Review Process*](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/node/43111#Curric%20Dev)

[**Coversheet:**](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/node/43111#Curric%20Dev)This form provides an overview of the program that will be proposed.

**Internal Alignment:** This section describes how the program fits into the portfolio of undergraduate offerings at UWT. New undergraduate programs should be aligned with the mission, values and goals of the campus. Additionally, new programs should ideally align with existing programs in ways that facilitate sharing of limited and vital resources of space and talent. To that end, the internal alignment section of the PNOI should include a brief overview of the following discussion points:

* How the program supports the [unique role, mission and Strategic Plan of the institution](https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/strategic-planning)
* How the program compliments existing programs; Identify any areas of potential synergy in terms of student pathways, dual majors, shared faculty expertise and interests
* How the program competes with other programs in terms of overlap or duplication of course offerings
* How the program is unique and ways in which the program seeks to differentiate itself from others within the institution

The following resources are available to assist in assessing the above:

* [UW Curriculum Management/Kuali Website](https://uw.kuali.co/cm/#/programs) to search for curricular overlap
* [UW Tacoma General Catalog](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/catalog-17-18/uw-tacoma-general-catalog-2017-2018) for overview of undergraduate programs offered
* [Find Program Tool in MyPlan](https://myplan.uw.edu/program/#/orgs?states=N4IgCgTg9g5hCGBbAQtA7gZwKYGUAuUEWIAXCMADogAm8e8AalhBgJZQB2VJVAjFQBoqGenizdKIAGaFEAETrwJAXyEhWGAIIBjPOw5gsHaqw4xuU+ABtsa+Lv2HjpmABUsADzzcqVZcpABEAB5CBhUKExiMklaeiYWfR8QfkDhUXFSSRkIeUUVNQALeAwFegtrWyoNHT1OJxMzCpssOwd6o0a3T29SXzT1DBwAV21tLAwMZqq)
* [Maps of UW Tacoma undergraduate programs](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UW_Tacoma_Undergraduate_Majors_2708_Declared_Majors_in_Fall_2016.pdf) offered, including enrollments
* [UW Tacoma Undergraduate Majors list with Major codes](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UW_Tacoma_UG_Majors.pdf)

**External Supply and Demand for the Program:** This section describes the recent statewide number of graduates in the field of study and prospective student interest in it. Such an analysis helps assess the sustainability of the proposed program and which undergraduate degree programs are most important to the on-going development and social welfare of the South Puget Sound region and beyond. Supply and demand information is needed on existing degree production as well as the documented intentions of students to seek specific degrees and major fields of study. To that end, the external market section of the PNOI must include a brief summary of information from the following external data sources:

* The current degree production in the past 5 years in Washington State ([National Center for Education Statistics with IPEDS DATA](https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/Home/UseTheData))
* The current degree production by Institution within Washington State ([National Center for Education Statistics with IPEDS DATA](https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/Home/UseTheData))
* The current degree production specific to Community and Technical Colleges that might compete, augment or supply matriculating students ([State Board of Community and Technical Colleges](https://www.sbctc.edu/our-colleges/search-college-programs/default.aspx))
* The intended college major data as detailed in data collected by the [College Board Search Services](https://collegeboardsearch.collegeboard.org/pastudentsrch/login.action)

Summary Narrative: Once data is compiled, include a brief narrative that characterizes the external supply of and demand for competing degrees in the relevant market, as well as how the proposed degree program will differentiate itself as unique from others in the region and nationally.

([See Sample provided on APCC website](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/New_Program_Demand_data_example.pdf))

**Potential Value to the Greater Community:** This section describes how the program might impact the community. Considerations of community value includes both instrumental improvements such as employment as well as individual and societal enrichment based upon intrinsic and aesthetic values.

***Instrumental Value:*** Consider employment projections for graduates. Evidence can be gathered utilizing public data sets as well as preliminary interviews and partnership options gathered through personal networks ([Washington State Employment Security Department Salary Data](https://www.esd.wa.gov/labormarketinfo) ; [Occupational Outlook Handbook](https://www.bls.gov/ooh/))

***Community and Personal Enrichment***: Consider the role of the degree program in providing a catalyst for a richer cultural experience in the South Sound Community as well as an appreciation for the area of study.

**Anticipated Resource Needs:** This list is a ***preliminary*** step that is not meant to provide exact financial values. Budgeting and financial forecasting is not a "bid" or request for funds. The Anticipated Resource Needs list identifies the kinds of resources that the program will likely need in order to successfully meet its objectives. It should not be developed with a "low cost" mindset but with an "appropriate resources" mindset. Program budgets will be evaluated relative to the campus portfolio of academic programs, and not every program must quickly become self-supporting. A comprehensive presentation of the budget will be required only in the full proposal.

Indicate in the following categories both any ***new*** resources that will be necessary, as well as how any ***existing*** resources will be utilized to meet the program's goals. You do not need to assign dollar values to the resource needs identified in the PNOI. These will be provided by Finance and Administration in step 4 of the PNOI Process (which is to meet with Finance and work on preliminary budget together).

* Faculty and type of position(s) (tenure-track, lecturer)
* Academic Staff - include program staff as well as campus-wide staff (Academic Technology, Library, Teaching and Learning Center)
* [Library Resources and Collections](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/library-resources)
* Equipment and Software
* Facilities/space needs: labs, classrooms, student study/work space, offices, studios, computer classrooms

 **Funding Sources:** The PNOI should reflect the source of intended funding for the degree program.

* For state funded programs, indicate the tuition tier in the narrative.

 See the [Office of Planning and Budgeting website](http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/opb-tuition.htm) for information on tuition schedules:

* For fee-based programs, include anticipated fee schedule for the program, as well as any possible or committed outside sources of funding

**UW Tacoma New Program Development & Review Process**

Once the content of the PNOI has been written (STEP 2) continue with soliciting stakeholder feedback (STEP 3).

For your reference, use the [Narrative Steps & Flowchart.](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/node/43111#Curric%20Dev)