

University of Washington, Tacoma
Curriculum Committee
Minutes
Thursday, October 05, 2006, 12:45 p.m.

Present: Kent Nelson, Sam Chung, Tom Diehm, Kären Landenburger, Emily Ignacio, Bobbe Miller-Murray (*ex officio*). **Absent:** Jose Rios, Patrick Pow (*ex officio*), Brian Coffey.

1. Introductions

Kent Nelson introduced himself as the interim chair of the Curriculum Committee for Autumn Quarter, 2006 pending Jose Rios' return in Winter.

2. Submission and Meeting dates for Autumn Quarter

Submission dates for course applications during Autumn Quarter are:
October 20, 2006 (last day for Winter 2007 quarter courses)
November 10, 2006

The Committee will meet on October 31 and November 22, 2006 from 12:45 – 2:00 pm to review course applications. Kent will get Room CP 206C for the meetings.

Kent will put together the submission dates for the remainder of the year, based on Seattle Curriculum Committee deadlines, and communicate all of these dates to Jamie Kelly for inclusion on the UWT Curriculum Committee webpage. Meeting dates for Winter and Spring quarters will be determined after the submission deadlines are set.

3. Library representative to Committee

Kent will talk with Charles Lord about appointing one of the librarians as an *ex officio* of the committee, as has been the practice previously.

4. Use of Share Drive for New Course submissions

Program Administrators will be notified by Kent that submission for the November 10 deadline should be placed in a Share Drive folder for the Curriculum Committee. Kent will work with Jamie and/or Patrick to get this folder set up. Committee members will then be responsible for accessing the forms from the share drive for review prior to our meeting. This will result in a dramatic decrease in paper consumption.

For the October 20 submission deadline, we will continue to use hard copies, which will be distributed to committee members for review.

5. Minimum Standards for Application Packets

Application Form

The committee reviewed the existing new course application form and discussed the expectations for each section, as well as problems encountered previously in various areas.

- a) Course Title and Identifying Information – Kären pointed out that the course title needs to have some connection to the Catalog/Course Description
- b) Justification – this area needs to address why a course is needed, not be a description of course content. This has been an ongoing issue. The justification should include how the course relates to other courses in the program and the UWT campus, perhaps how it fills a gap in the existing curriculum. Where accreditation issues or relationships with Seattle programs are part of the reason for offering the course, it should be so stated.
- c) Catalog Description – be sure the general education categories (VLPA, I&S, NW, & QSR) are correctly filled out. Descriptive words indicating a course is an “introduction” or “survey” should be limited to 100 and 200 level courses. Upper division courses should describe how they build on previous learning. Bobbe noted that there is no standard glossary for the Catalog subheading category, and asked whether we might want to develop one for UWT.
- d) Credits and Hours – we will keep with the 2:1 ratio recommended on the form. Variable credit courses have not been an issue in the past. Faculty should be reminded that when describing how students will be evaluated (section 4c) that they are best served to simply name the assignment and the weight it will be given (e.g., exam, 25%; paper, 50%). These assignments do not need to be described on the form. The total weighting must equal 100% and must match what is in the syllabus. Also, a reminder to faculty that attendance cannot be used as a grading criterion.
- e) Students – this section is self-explanatory.
- f) Resources – again, this is self-explanatory
- g) Joint Course – per Bobbe, this area has not been a problem for the registration process in the past.
- h) Other Colleges, etc. – Individual departments will need to monitor how they get Seattle-based signatures on the forms, especially if we are now using electronically submitted forms/syllabi. Members of the Curriculum Committee are responsible to watch for courses in other departments that might overlap with courses in their own departments, and recommend getting the appropriate signatures.
- i) Approval – Again, signatures related to electronic submission will need to be addressed.

Syllabi

Kent presented the following as the minimum requirements for a submitted syllabus based on a conversation with Jennifer Payne in Seattle. It was generally agreed among the committee members that keeping syllabi as simple as possible for the Curriculum Committee process was preferred.

- 1) Prefix Number and Course Title (consistent with Catalog Description on the application form)
- 2) Program Name
- 3) Number of credits
- 4) Instructor's Name (and contact info if available)
- 5) Course description
- 6) Course learning objectives
- 7) Course assessment methods and weights (consistent with section 4 of the application form)
- 8) Required materials (texts, supplies, etc.)
- 9) A course outline and weekly schedule, including readings and assignment due dates
- 10) Course policies – we can refer students to the UWT website for most of these policies (e.g., inclement weather, disability accommodation, etc.)
- 11) Bibliography – there was some question as to whether this is required and Kent will follow up with Jennifer about it.

There was discussion about whether to include a FERPA statement on the syllabi, but we decided to leave that out until we are told to put it in. The above is the minimum required for the course to be considered by the Curriculum Committees of Tacoma and Seattle. Again, we discussed emphasizing simplicity of design to faculty for this submission.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Diehm, PhD, MSW
Committee Member