Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee
Minutes
June 6, 2013

Present: Linda Ishem, Diane Kinder, Janice Laakso, Lauren Montgomery, Doug Wills, Nita McKinley (Chair); Jennifer Sundheim, ex-officio (Library); Patrick Pow, ex-officio (IT); Lynda West, ex-officio (Advising); Lia Wetzstein, Joyce Dinglasan-Panlilio, Jane Compson, and Turan Kayaoglu (visitors)

1. Consent Agenda
   a. Minutes 5/9/2013
   b. Course proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Course Proposals</th>
<th>Course Change Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TECON 470 Economics of Health and Health Policy</td>
<td>TWRT 211 Argument and Research in Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 450 Labor Economics and Policy</td>
<td>TPSYCH 400 Psychology of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECON 210: Ethics and Economics</td>
<td>TESC 201 The Science of Environmental Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECON 370 Economics and Social Mobility</td>
<td>TEDUC 471 DIVERSITY AND EQUITY IN SCHOOLS AND CURRICULUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCOM 484 Opinion Writing</td>
<td>TEDUC 482 Foundations of Education: Policy, Ethics, and Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESC 436 Systems Biology</td>
<td>TEDUC 490 Service Learning Practicum in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPOLs 348 Gender and Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIAS 396: Internships and Career Development (2 cr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lauren Montgomery made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Doug Wills seconded the motion. The consent agenda was unanimously approved.

2. Announcements

Faculty Oversight Policy Proposal
EC voted to approve the Faculty Oversight Policy with the addition of a requirement for bylaws (see policy attached to this agenda. As mentioned in the last meeting, Global Honors has a one-year temporary approval for a faculty council and must write their by-laws before full approval for their council will be given. EC is in contact with the Office of Undergraduate Education for their plans for putting this policy in place.

3. TPOLs 317 The Politics of Race and Ethnicity in the US (Turan Kayaoglu attending)
Linda Ishem reported that there are some concerns from a number of people about overlap between this course and other courses on campus. Half of the course is on social construction, which is covered in many other courses, so this seems duplicative rather than taking the notion of race and ethnicity any deeper. She wondered why the course was not a temporary course as it is intended to be taught by a person replacing Charles Williams during the year.

Turan Kayaoglu reported that the person replacing Charles Williams teaches this course on the Seattle campus and that no one in IAS raised this objection. He was not aware of how this courses overlaps with other courses. He said that the course could be made temporary as the instructor is here for one term or suggestions could be offered about how to change the materials to add to the content, or perhaps cross-list it with another course. Or another class could be found for the instructor to teach.

Linda Ishem questions why the IAS folks in Ethnic, Gender, and Labor Studies didn’t bring this up. Why is the instructor not just teaching Charles’ courses?
Turan Kayaoglu said they are looking for someone to replace some of the lower division core courses, but then allowing the instructor to teach in an area of their specialty for upper division electives.

After Turan Kayaoglu left the meeting there was discussion of how much overlap there was in the courses. Linda Ishem stated that for 6 weeks, there was 100% overlap in the course. The IAS Faculty Council did vote for this, but it’s unclear why the issue wasn’t raised there. The person who has been teaching for Emily Ignacio did raise this issue. She had emailed Turan Kayaoglu with suggestions for areas where the course could have more depth. There is no reason to duplicate the courses except that the instructor has taught this particular course before.

Lauren Montgomery pointed out that there was overlap among Psychology, Social Work, and Criminal Justice courses and that’s not necessarily a problem. We can’t avoid some overlap. Linda Ishem asked whether 60-70% overlap was acceptable. This is especially a concern when there is so much we should be covering, but current courses don’t cover. There was also some concern that the instructor was told that he could just teach whatever he wanted once the course proposal went through. Janice Laakso affirmed that courses need to be taught with the learning objectives as proposed, not just whatever the instructors want to teach.

Lauren Montgomery moved that the course not be approved. Janice Laakso seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

4. **TEST 295 Ecological Economics (Lia Wetzstein and Joyce Dinglasan-Panlilio attending)**

Doug Wills stated that he objects to this course which calls itself “economics” and compares paradigms in economics, but doesn’t require students to have taken any economics courses. If the students don’t have this background, the course cannot be rigorous. He reported that Katie Baird had told him that when she made the same objection she was told that students didn’t need to know economics for the course. But Doug Wills believed that from reading the course title and description, the sense is that students do need this information.

Lia Wetzstein stated that the course is designed around the Daley textbook. Daley is an economist, so students are learning neoclassical economics in parallel with learning ecology. Doug Wills stated that learning that would take 10 weeks of an economics course. The course description, then, is incorrect. He also argued that the textbook sets up straw men to critique, which is relatively easy to do when students don’t know anything about economics. Lia Wetzstein said that the course materials come from an economics text.

Janice Laakso asked if adding a course prerequisite would solve the problem. Doug Wills said that this would help, but that it might be impractical to have a 200-level economics course as a prerequisite for this course.

The committee agreed that Doug Wills and Lia Wetzstein meet to work out the concerns with this course.

5. **New IAS Minor in Religious Studies (Jane Compson attending)**

Janice Laakso pointed out that many of the courses in the minor aren’t taught regularly and asked if they would be being taught more. Jane Compson said that they are hoping for future hires that will teach these courses more often. Turan Kayaoglu added that IAS is in the process of hiring another person and
at this point, it’s unclear what that person’s specialities might be. Janice Laakso asked then if these
courses should be taken off the books. Nita McKinley stated that IAS often needs courses for lecturers
to teach and because these hire are often last-minute, it’s necessary to have courses available for them
to teach. Jane Compson stated that the proposed new courses are being taught this summer.

Janice Laakso asked whether there were students who wanted this minor or faculty who wanted to
teach it. Jane Compson said there were both students and faculty interested in the minor. Turan
Kayaoglu reported that when Politics, Philosophy, and Economics was being developed, they
considered religion as a track, but decided on international studies instead. There are students who
want to study religion as a minor.

Doug Wills asked what they expected students with this minor would be majoring in. Turan Kayaoglu
suggested they might major in religion, psychology, and other majors.

Janice Laakso made a motion to approve this new minor. Diane Kinder seconded it. The motion was
approved unimously.

6. **New IAS Minor in Sustainability (Lia Wetzstein and Joyce Dinglasan-Panlilio present)**

*Note:* Although this minor is “trans-disciplinary” it will be administered through Environmental Sciences
and IAS.

Janice Laakso questioned why the minor was described as transdisciplinary rather than
interdisciplinary. Lia Wetzstein stated that this was because there were courses in the minor that were
outside of IAS and also because it was intended to serve majors campus-wide.

Janice Laakso asked why is the minor was in IAS and the major in Urban studies. Lia Wetzstein said
that the minor needed a home and that Jim Gawel had started the process. When it got to the point of
where it would be house, IAS became the spot. Linda Ishem stated that there has been a history of
tension between Environmental Sciences and Urban Studies and that there were politics involved of
which she was not aware. She didn’t understand why the minor was in IAS. Lia Wetzstein said that
students want this minor, that Urban Studies already has a major, so having the two gives students
more options. Students who had other majors would have the option of getting this information. Janice
Laakso questioned whether the overlap with the major would be an issue as the minor goes through
other approval processes. Lia Wetzstein said that the minor is not just a mirror to the Urban Studies
Major. The point was to have a minor that would serve students in all majors. Lauren Montgomery asked
if sustainability wasn’t a broader issue than just urban studies. Lia Wetstein repeated that the minor
doesn’t replicate the major.

Nita McKinley asked if all the programs with courses that count in the minor had been part of the
discussion and Lia Wetzstein replied that they had. Yonn Dierwechter had written an email of support.
She reiterated that this minor would be good for students and allow more education on sustainability on
campus. Janice Laakso expressed a concern that there were not letters of support from the other
programs.

Diane Kinder suggested that we need to put this discussion on hold and that there needs to be a
conversation with Urban studies to clarify the politics involved and the strength of support among all the
faculty in that program.
Lia Wetzstein reiterated that the students want this and that we need to give them access to this minor. There was a UW-wide survey about the need for sustainability education and a committee convened by the Provost to study the need. The committee was jealous that UWT already had the minor in process.

At this point, Lia Wetzstein and Joyce Dinglasan-Panllilio left the meeting.

Lauren Montgomery asked Linda Ishem if Urban Studies wanted to have this minor. Linda Ishem stated that it should be in Urban Studies because they have the major, but that there were multiple perspectives on this in the Urban Studies program and that they were not prepared to take on this battle. Patrick Pow stated that the director of Urban Studies should have been involved in the process.

Nita McKinley asked what would be necessary to resolve the concerns about the minor. Linda Ishem brought up the issue of whether there should be a major in one program and the minor in another. Lauren Montgomery said that it made sense to her that ES should have a stake in a minor for sustainability. Linda Ishem said that if ES had a major before Urban Studies, then that would be the case. The concern is that it has been difficult to get answers about how decisions were made, who was involved in them, and how were people able to raise questions. Doug Wills asked if they ever consulted with Urban Studies. Linda Ishem said that Yonn Dierwechter did write a letter in support, but that the person who created the Sustainability Major did not know about the minor. Patrick Pow asked if there should be cross-department approval of the minor. Laurent Montgomery asked if you approved the minor whether that would lead to another major. Janice Laakso questioned whether IAS or Urban Studies could come up with cross-program minors and whether it would need to go through the committees of the other programs for approval. Doug Wills questioned whether we could approve the minor when we haven’t approved one of the courses for the minor.

Doug Wills suggested that we could reconsider the proposal if all the programs involved had reviewed and voted on the minor and if this were documented, along with information on any issues that came up and how they were resolved. D

DK: Procedural issue?
DW: SHould give other people a chance to object? We should ask to check with them? We can reconsider if: all programs involved reviewed and voted and this were documented and any issues that came up and how they were resolved.

Doug Wills moved that APCC not approve this new minor; Linda Ishem seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. **Change to the Education Minor**
Janice Laakso moved to approve this change in the Education Minor, Doug Wills seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. **Request for New Prefix and New Course TAMST 201 American Cultures**
Diane Kinder moved to approve this request; Doug Wills seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. **New Graduation Diversity Requirement**
Nita McKinley reported that we need a committee to decide criteria for this new requirement and that we
should have to have courses approved actively rather than simply having faculty designate their own courses. Doug Wills pointed out that this has been a problem with Quantitative and W (Writing) courses; there has been no oversight of the designations. This might be a good time to get some system in place for all of these. Linda Ishem pointed out that the D requirement needs to be in place by 2014. Andrea Coker-Anderson reported that Ginger MacDonald has already reached out to the registrar about implementing this requirement. Nita McKinley said she would report to the EC that APCC wants to take the implementation of this requirement on.

10. Meeting during the summer
We need to have one meeting during the summer primarily to review program/course proposals that come through at that time. I expect there will be at least two new program proposals (adding an on-line BA degree in Criminal Justice and an MS in Environmental Science) plus course proposals are likely to come through. We can either vote to designate a subgroup to review these, or we could have an asynchronous online meeting.

The committee agreed that an online meeting would work for the summer.

11. Plans for Next Year
   a. Recommend chair. The committee can’t vote on a chair for next year. This must be done by the new committee. However, it would be good to identify a person who would be willing to run for chair. No one was identified.
   b. Goals
      Some goals for issues to work on for next year include the Diversity Requirement and setting a policy for how much a program can change once it has been approved by APCC without having to come back to APCC. Doug Wills particularly mentioned a new program in business that changed from a semester to a quarter system. It changed from instructors teaching it as an overload to being part of the regular teaching schedule. Andrea Coker-Anderson pointed out that they had to change to the quarter system to give access to a UW degree and VA Benefits. Patrick Pow pointed out that these post-approval changes affect the ex-officio units as well.

Submitted,

Nita McKinley, Chair
Class B Legislation Concerning Faculty Oversight of Academic Units

DATE: May 10, 2013

TO: Executive Committee (EC) of the Faculty Assembly

FROM: Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee (APCC)

RE: Faculty Oversight of Academic Units

The APCC recommends that the EC adopt the following policy to ensure that academic units that set admissions, develop and manage curriculum, or set graduation requirements have appropriate faculty oversight. This faculty oversight should be longterm, have expertise appropriate to the unit, and be faculty who have voting status in some academic program.

Faculty Oversight of Academic Units

Any academic unit that does not have faculty permanently associated with it (like Global Honors or OUE) and that has responsibility for setting admissions requirements, developing and managing curriculum, or setting graduation requirements (hereafter referred to as “the unit”) must have a standing council of faculty and a set of by-laws detailing the procedures and processes for faculty oversight.

This council must consist of faculty who:
- are voting faculty in a UWT program;
- have expertise in the area(s) of importance to the unit; and
- are regularly associated with the unit

The faculty council should have responsibility for approving any decisions related to admissions, curriculum, and graduation requirements.

Passed by Executive Council on May 15, 2013
DIVERSITY REQUIREMENT

New Legislation on Diversity Requirement

1. The requirements for graduation shall include:

   ... 

   d. No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural, political, and economic diversity of human experience at local, regional, or global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on topics such as power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.

Note from Background

“The faculty of each school, college, and campus will recommend and approve courses to meet the requirement.”

Note from Letter from Senate on approval

“The Provost will now work out the process of implementation. This version leaves it to each college to approve courses and gives them a broad definition of diversity to work with. Hundreds of current courses will likely qualify. Expect to be invited to submit course descriptions during the coming year. The requirement will not affect current students, only those admitted in the years ahead.”