1. The minutes from October 20, 2010 were approved after minor revisions.

2. Report on EC actions/discussions (incl. Student Credit limit vote)

The Executive Council voted to approve APC vote on student credit hours, that they remain the same, limited to 210 credits.

3. Student conduct undergrad advisory committee - Greg/Janice

Janice Laakso attended the Undergraduate Advisory Committee, along with another Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences faculty member. They discussed concerns with Cedric Howard, that UW Tacoma Faculty do not understand the process for Student Conduct and the Undergraduate Advisory Committee. They suggested that Howard find a way to explain this to faculty.

Greg Norohna noted the original concern was that faculty were not included in initial Student Conduct cases. The initial Student Conduct files are sent to Howard and Julie Draper. Ruth Rea will meet with Draper to discuss the initial processes regarding student conduct.

Bobbe Miller Murray will follow up with Julie Draper to update the website with the new Student Conduct processes along with a chart showing the process for complaints.

Ruth noted that most decisions regarding complaints are among Draper, Howard, and herself.

Action: Rea will provide feedback to APC after the meeting with Draper.

4. EC/Directors Budget meeting report - Janice/George

Janice Laakso attended the three hour Budget meeting with the Executive Council, Directors, and Beth Rushing in place of George Mobus. The purpose of this meeting was to figure out campus priorities, considering the 20%-25% budget reduction, and the probable 10% tuition increase. Other things considered were revenues, e.g. summer classes, non-resident, and graduate tuition. There was
acknowledgement that quality of instruction will go down because of increased class sizes.

The group divided into smaller groups and developed a report. Out of those groups, one group suggested zero-based budgeting, where nothing is assumed. They also asked for specifics on accountability, class sizes, room capacity, over enrollments, and new programs. For example, the question was asked: Should we grow in our existing programs?

Two other groups mentioned distinguishing between academic life and student life. Some groups asked for more emphasis on instruction and support.

Each program will develop an evaluation. This will help UW Tacoma keep with the campus core values. These Budget meetings are intended to encourage participatory leadership and a clear understanding of the rationale behind decision making.

**Student Evaluations**
Ruth Rea asked for a campus discussion about the mandated course evaluations. Rea referenced the flaws of using the data collected from student evaluations when faculty go up for tenure. Mobus explained the Code only requires faculty to have at least one course per year evaluated, but that tradition UWT has been to evaluate every course. Faculty coming up for tenure probably do want many evaluations when making their case for teaching effectiveness. FA will probably work with Jim Posey. Mobus pointed out that more emphasis should be placed on peer evaluations and the use of Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID).

**FTE**
Miller Murray noted that fall 2011 it is expected that there will be an increase of 280 FTE. Mobus referred to Chancellor Spake's plan to increase FTEs in over-enrollment. He was concerned about associated operating costs that could increase proportionally, e.g. personnel. He also mentioned that tuition increases cannot go on for long to provide revenue. Other revenue options might include expanding summer offerings and possibly reimbursements to reward programs for making them.

**Semester System**
Julia Aguirre asked if the UW system has consider transition to a semester model. Aguirre heard that UMN restructuring to a semester model reduced the budget. Washington State Universities are also mostly on semesters.

**Structural Reorganization**
Mobus suggested the UW Tacoma campus consider their internal assumptions. The decisions UWT makes now that will affect the future, depends on these assumptions.
Non-academic Programs
Non-academic programs will also conduct self-evaluations.

5. Other items

APC will review the “Resolution for the Academic Policy Committee to develop a Faculty Oversight Plan for the Office of Undergraduate Education” draft. Any suggestions should be emailed to George Mobus.

New Courses Form: Areas of knowledge
On the New Course form some writers have checked off the Areas of Knowledge box without knowing if it meets university requirements. Mobus suggested that the form include a justification field for the Areas of Knowledge as a way to assure that programs make these choices conscious of the University requirements. This may be part of the oversight review in the previous topic. Mobus also noted that every year there is a joint meeting of the Curriculum committee and APC to raise a number of issues.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.