

Annual Report from Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee (APCC) 2016-2017

Submitted by Jeff W. Cohen, Chair May 17, 2017

Committee members:

Voting Faculty

Anthony Falit-Baiamonte (Urban Studies); Evelyn Shankus (Milgard School); Menaka Abraham (Institute of Technology); Jarek Sierschynski, (Education); Eric Bugyis, Lauren Montgomery & Jane Compson (SIAS); Robin Evans-Agnew (Nursing); Jeff Cohen (Social Work and Criminal Justice)

Ex-Officio

Andrea Coker-Anderson (Registrar); Patrick Pow (IT); Justin Wadland (Library); Lorraine Dinnell (Advising); Johnny Chen (ASUWT).

Faculty Assembly Administrative Coordinator

Ruth Ward

In 2016-2017, the work of the APCC consisted of:

- 1) Monthly reviews of the curricular and program proposals and graduation petitions that constitute the main activity of the committee. (See chart below for numbers and comparison to last year)
- 2) Development of formalized Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI) form and process.
- 3) Required 3-year review of Diversity designated (DIV) courses.
- 4) Formation of Ad-hoc Writing Advisory Committee as adjunct to APCC

Each of these will be briefly summarized below.

1) Proposal Reviews – September 2016 to May 2017¹

<i>Type of Proposal</i>	<i># Reviewed 2015/16</i>	<i># Reviewed 2016/17</i>	<i>Change</i>
New Graduate Program/Options	4	2	-2
Changes to Graduate Programs/Options	0	0	0
New Undergraduate Programs	2	5	+3
Changes to Undergraduate Programs	35	36	+1
New Courses	87	82	-5
Course Changes	28	43	+15
Diversity Designations	6	5	-1
Graduation Petitions	12	5	-7

This academic year saw an increase in new undergraduate programs and a decrease in new graduate programs, which is opposite of the trend from the previous academic year. Also unlike last year, there was a slight increase (n=1) in changes to undergraduate programs this year. Last year there was a significant increase in undergraduate program changes from the prior year. In terms of course proposals, there was a decrease in new course proposals, which is consistent with the prior academic year. Unlike last year, this year saw an increase in course change proposals.

¹ The deadline for proposal submissions for the June 7th meeting of the APCC has not yet arrived. Therefore, the totals listed in the below table do not include proposals to be reviewed at the June meeting of the APCC.

Diversity designation proposals continued to decrease, as was the case last year. Although slightly different from last year, these trends continue to be consistent with a picture of slowing growth in our undergraduate offerings. We are also seeing signs of refinement of existing undergraduate programs through course changes. We have yet to see a significant change in the graduate program opportunities for students. As predicted, the impact of the enforcement of the residency requirements in relation to Distance Learning (DL) courses has decreased. We saw a significant drop in graduation petitions overall and in relation to the residency requirement in particular.

2) The APCC was charged with developing a more formal Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI) form and process. An ad-hoc subcommittee of the APCC worked on the new PNOI form and process. Evelyn Shankus chaired the subcommittee, with Lauren Montgomery, Jill Purdy, and Justin Wadland serving as members. The PNOI Subcommittee has completed their work. The proposed PNOI coversheet and instructions (see Appendix A) have been reviewed and approved by the APCC. We ask that EC conduct a review and vote on the documents at their earliest convenience.

3) As articulated in the Diversity Designation Policy, the APCC was required to conduct the first 3-year review of Diversity Designated courses (DIV). An ad-hoc subcommittee of the APCC was formed to conduct this review. Robin Evans-Agnew chaired this subcommittee, with Menaka Abraham, Anthony Falit-Baiamonte, Jane Compson, and Eric Bugyis serving as members. The final report from this subcommittee was submitted to the APCC. The APCC reviewed the report and has recommended it be passed on to the EC for consideration (see Appendix B). Please also note that the subcommittee and APCC as a whole recommend that this report be shared with members of the Faculty Affairs Committee and other relevant parties on campus so that conversations regarding the Diversity Designation can be facilitated next academic year.

4) Based on feedback from faculty across campus, the Executive Council voted to create a representative faculty body to revise the existing W-course policy on campus. The APCC was charged with overseeing the formation of this ad-hoc committee. APCC members are currently recruiting faculty from their respective units to serve on the reconstituted Writing Advisory Council (WAC). Our plan is to have the WAC begin and complete their work during the 2017/18 academic year. The WAC also includes ex-officio members with relevant expertise related to the work of the committee and to ensure representation from across campus. As of the writing of this report, the following individuals have been elected and/or asked to serve on this committee:

Asao Inoue (Ex-Officio)
Rikki Thompson (Ex-Officio)
Justin Wadland (Ex-Officio)
Jim West (Institute)
JW Harrington (Urban Studies)
Jennifer Heckman (Milgard)
Rich Furman (SW/CJ)

Recruitment of faculty from the remaining academic units on campus should be finalized by October 2017.

Finally, Menaka Abraham was voted in as Chair of APCC for the 2017/18 academic year.

APCC strongly recommends amending the Bylaws to create a 2-year Vice-Chair/Chair position similar to that followed by the Faculty Assembly so that individuals are better prepared for the Chair position and there is continuity and consistency in the work.

Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, TACOMA
NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW PROCESS
PLANNING NOTICE OF INTENT (PNOI) COVERSHEET

Program Information

Academic Unit/Division:

College/School: Enter name of school or program

Campus: Seattle Bothell Tacoma

Proposed Degree Title: Enter degree name

Proposed Degree Option(s): Enter if applicable

Proposed CIP Code: Enter CIP code

Minimum Credits Required: Enter number of credits

Proposed Start Date: Enter Quarter and Year

Length of Program: Full time Enter number Part time Enter number

Projected First Year Enrollment: Enter first year FTE

Full Enrollment by Year: Enter year with FTE of Enter FTE at full enrollment

Funding Source: State Fee-Based (PCE) Fee-Based (non-PCE)

Proposed New Funding: Enter number

Tuition Tier (if state funding): Enter number

Locations and Mode of Delivery (check all that apply)

Campus Delivery: Enter location(s)

Off-site: Enter location(s)

Distance Learning: Enter format(s)

Other: Describe if applicable

Choose yes or no Program will be offered online only

Choose yes or no All coursework will correspond to the regular academic calendar

Choose yes or no Students will be able to enroll in a full-time course of study each quarter
A/W/Sp

Contact Information (Academic Department Representative)

Name: Click here to enter text.

Title: Click here to enter text.

Address: Click here to enter text.

Telephone: Click here to enter text.

E-mail: Click here to enter text.

Endorsement by Dean

Date Enter date

Endorsement by Executive Vice Chancellor
date.

Date Enter

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, TACOMA
NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW PROCESS

PLANNING NOTICE OF INTENT (PNOI) INSTRUCTIONS

[Once passed in APCC, this will be labeled, “to be ratified by EC” or “DRAFT pending approval from EC”]

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](#)

Coversheet: 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](#)
- 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](#) to search for curricular overlap
- [UW Tacoma General Catalog](#) for overview of undergraduate programs offered
- [Find Program Tool in MyPlan](#)

- [Maps of UW Tacoma undergraduate programs](#) offered, including enrollments
- [UW Tacoma Undergraduate Majors list with Major codes](#)

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](#))
- The current degree production by Institution within Washington State ([National Center for Education Statistics with IPEDS DATA](#))
- 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](#))
- The intended college major data as detailed in data collected by the [College Board Search Services](#)

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](#))

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](#) ; [Occupational Outlook Handbook](#))

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](#)
- 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](#) 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](#).

Appendix B

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:
 - a. 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.
 - b. 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