

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee

Minutes

January 17, 2013

Present: Linda Ishem; Diane Kinder; Janice Laakso; George Mobus; Doug Wills, Alexis Wilson; Nita McKinley, Chair; Andrea Coker-Anderson, ex-officio (Registrar); Patrick Pow, ex-officio (IT); Jennifer Sundheim, ex-officio (Library); Lynda West, ex-officio (Advising); Katie Baird, visitor.

1. **Consent Agenda**

Minutes for December 6, 2012 were corrected to change “Agenda” to “Minutes” and to add TGEOG 321 to the course proposal list. Diane Kinder moved that we approve the consent agenda (including minutes for 12/6/2013 and course proposal for TURB 370). Doug Wills seconded this motion and it was passed unanimously.

2. **Computer Engineering & Systems Program Changes and new courses.**

Diane Kinder moved that we approve this program change. Janice Laakso seconded this. The proposal was unanimously approved.

3. **Discussion with Katie Baird on Undergraduate Education.**

Katie Baird outlined the problems with administering the Undergraduate Education “core” classes and Global Honors. These programs offer classes and set admissions and graduation requirements, processes that fall under faculty governance. However, these programs are outside of any particular academic unit and so there have been no mechanisms for faculty oversight of these programs. A few years ago the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) was placed in IAS to serve that function, but when the Faculty Assembly EC had Larry Knopp and Buck Banks come in to talk, it seemed this was not working well.

Katie Baird and Jill Purdy had a conversation with Buck Banks where he said that IAS shouldn’t oversee the undergraduate core program because this program is supposed to be across programs. Currently, those faculty who happen to be teaching in the CORE classes oversee the the program for that year. There is no general guidance, faculty vetting, or even much communication. The same is true for Global Honors (GH).

For example, GH and OUE have proposed an honors degree program than is going through without faculty vetting.

The directors of GH and OUE do not represent the faculty. According to the code, representatives must be elected by the faculty to represent the faculty.

Katie Baird suggested that APCC could find out more about the specifics of the situation and recommend to the Executive Council (EC) any policy changes the committee deems necessary.

George Mobus said that he was now teaching in the Core. There was administrative oversight, but no faculty oversight. He noted GH used to have an advisory board and asked if that was still there.

Diane Kinder asked for more information about the Honors program being proposed. Katie Baird was uncertain of the particulars; just that JW Harrington, Debra Friedman, Buck Banks, and Divya MacMillan had been in conversations about this as a means to retain first year students from the Core. This would be a four-year pathway through GH, rather than the current junior/senior year program in GH.

Jennifer Sundheim stated that IAS has been working on defining “interdisciplinary” for the campus, so wouldn’t they have this connection to the Core curriculum? Katie Baird said that we should be asking these questions and

what good academic policy would look like.

George Mobus said this is the third time this has come up in APC. In the past, they had looked at what Bothell did. Alexis Wilson said we should ask the Chancellor about this and find out what the plan is. George Mobus said we need to know what she is thinking, but the faculty is responsible for curriculum and we need leadership to help deal with this.

George Mobus said that Ingrid Walker (former director of OUE) has reported that she was uncomfortable with how OUE worked. In Seattle and Bothell, faculty are responsible for setting these policies. We keep kicking the can down the road. Janice Laakso said that teachers in the Core are told they can teach anything they want. How are they showing students are getting what they need? George Mobus said students often report they didn't know what their Core class was about. Doug Wills said this is a classic problem with the Core idea. After a few years, there is a drift in the mission. At that point, you have to give it up or strengthen the original idea. George Mobus said other universities, such as PSU, have gone to a specific Core faculty. So then there is faculty oversight. Janice Laakso affirmed that our program includes new and part-time faculty all the time which doesn't help with continuity. George Mobus reported that over half of the faculty in the Core this year have taught before and enjoy it.

Janice Laakso asked about how the honors program retains students. Nita McKinley said the idea was to retain the top students that would have choices to go to other institutions.

Doug Wills asked about Bothell and George Mobus said they have been successful in running it with faculty oversight as the code requires. Nita McKinley pointed out that a problem with OUE being in IAS is that it shouldn't just be under IAS. Faculty across programs should have oversight. Linda Ishem reported that the push to get other programs and more tenured faculty involved has not been successful. There needs to be a requirement for faculty to work in the Core and GH.

Jennifer Sundheim said it would be important to understand how writing across the curriculum fits into this. George Mobus said there was lots of writing in the courses, but reading was not pushed. Doug Wills asked whether there was much Quantitative work done in the core. George Mobus asked if there the faculty fellows group on Quantitative Literacy was addressing this and Doug Wills affirmed that it was.

Nita McKinley asked if APCC were to take this on, what tasks would we need to undertake to accomplish it? What do we need to know to evaluate this problem?

Diane Kinder said we needed to know what was the current level of faculty involvement in oversight and whether this meets the code. Janice Laakso said we needed to know the history of the courses and George Mobus added we need to know the history of the Core up to this point. Diane Kinder added we need to know the goals of the program. Janice Laakso said we need to know what information we have on retention. The committee discussed interviewing current and past directors, but decided it would be important to look at the written history to figure out where to go next and what questions to ask the directors. George Mobus said the website has a lot of documents on the original mission. The Faculty Assembly has addressed this before; Nita McKinley said she would check with Katie Baird about this history. Everyone agreed to look at the OUE website.

Submitted,
Nita McKinley, Chair

APCC 2012-2013 Meeting Schedule with Proposal Due Dates

Meetings for Winter and Spring 2013 will be in CP 206

Meeting Date	Time	New program proposals, program changes, and curriculum must be received by	Deadline for Seattle Curriculum Committee	Seattle Curriculum Meeting Date	Quarter for Course Changes without memo of responsibility
1/17/2013	12:30-2pm	1/3/2013	2/1/2013	2/15/2013	Summer 2013
2/14/2013	12:30-2pm	1/31/2013	3/1/2013	3/20/2013	Autumn 2013
3/14/2013	12:30-2pm	2/28/2013	4/1/2013	4/17/2013	
4/11/2013	12:30-2pm	4/28/2013	5/1/2013	5/15/2013	
5/9/2013	12:30-2pm	4/25/2013	6/3/2013	6/19/2013	
6/6/2013	12:30-2pm	5/23/2013	7/1/2013	8/21/2013	
Summer TBD					