

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee

Minutes

February 14, 2013

Present: Linda Ishem, Diane Kinder, Janice Laakso, Lauren Montgomery, George Mobus, Doug Wills, Alexis Wilson, Nita McKinley (Chair); Andrea Coker-Anderson, ex-officio (Registrar); Beckie Etheridge, ex-officio (Teaching & Learning Center); Patrick Pow, ex-officio (IT); Jennifer Sundheim, ex-officio (Library); Lynda West, ex-officio (Advising); Katie Baird, Jill Purdy, Nicole Blair, and Buck Banks, visitors.

1. Consent Agenda

Consent agenda included the minutes for 1/17/2013 and the new courses and course changes below.

New Courses	Course Changes
TEDLD 570 Leadership I: Theory & Research TEDLD 580 Research and Systematic Inquiry in Education I TNURS 556 Quality and Safety in Health Care Settings TFILM 350 Screenwriting TRELIG 350 Philosophy, Religion, and the Environment	TEDSP/TEDUC 583 Response to Intervention: Academic Intervention Seminar TEDUC/TEDSP 584 Response to Intervention: Social, Emotional, Behavioral Supports and Intervention Seminar

Committee members asked about the course changes for the EDD program (TEDSP 583 and TEDUC 584), including who reviews these changes and what criteria are used for reviewing them. Diane Kinder stated that the course changes were reviewed by a committee that included faculty from Nursing and Education. She said the criteria for these courses are other EDD programs.

Alexis Wilson moved we accept the consent agenda; Diane Kinder seconded this. The committee voted unanimously to accept the consent agenda.

2. Change to Hispanic Studies Major

Diane Kinder moved that APCC approve the changes to the Hispanic Studies Major; Linda Ishem seconded this. The change was unanimously approved.

3. Change to Information Technology and Systems Major

Note: TINFO 240 was withdrawn from consideration and proposal will be modified to remove this course.

George Mobus moved that APCC approve the changes to the Information Technology and Systems Major; Diane Kinder seconded this. The change was unanimously approved.

4. Process for resolving concerns about courses.

Nita McKinley reported that she has been sending out notice to all faculty about the course and program proposals being considered by APCC. This has generated some feedback from faculty and has raised concerns. For example, the TINFO 240 course originally proposed in the change for the Information Technology and Systems Major was contested by the Math faculty from IAS. The involved faculty met and resolved the issue among them and TINFO 240 was withdrawn from the proposal. Nita McKinley asked if wanted to establish any particular process for resolving issues if the faculty involved could not resolve the issues.

Alexis Wilson said that the APCC can serve as the last stop for resolving any issues that come up. Linda Ishem said it would be good for the APCC chair to be copied on any interactions about proposals. Patrick Pow asked if APCC needs the details of the interactions and Alexis Wilson said we really only need the outcome.

The committee agreed we should continue monitoring this.

5. Discussion on Faculty Oversight of Undergraduate Core Program and Global Honors. (Attached history of discussion in Faculty Assembly, EC, and APC)

Currently, the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) and Global Honor (GH) have develop and administer curriculum which is the responsibility of faculty. There is no institutionalized mechanism for faculty to oversee these areas of the curriculum.

Diane Kinder asked about whether committees have existed in the past for these units. Becky Etheridge said that there have been committees, but they have never gotten off the ground. George Mobus said that there had been a subcommittee of the APC that took on the issue for the OUE. They visited the Bothell campus to see how Core courses were being administered there. But then the new chancellor came and it was taken out of the hands of the committee. He noted that GH does have an active Board of Advisors, but it's unclear what role this group of faculty and staff play. They are not currently tasked with curriculum oversight. They are more involved in strategic planning. At Bothell, the faculty who are teaching Core courses have responsibility for oversight.

Diane Kinder asked if there were any learning outcomes for the Core courses. Linda Ishem reported that when she taught in the Core, there were learning outcomes. Jill Purdy said there is a Core "camp" where faculty are trained on outcomes, but they are not involved in curriculum decisions.

George Mobus said we don't know whether the Core courses are covering the Areas of Knowledge (AoK). Janice Laakso pointed out that faculty are told they can teach whatever they want in the Core. There needs to be some articulation of how particular courses are addressing the learning outcomes. We need to think about what **should** we be teaching in the first year. She questioned whether courses about zombies or Michael Jackson would address these learning outcomes.

Diane Kinder pointed out that there is no one doing continuous assessment of OUE or GH, such as was done for OUE with the Foundations of Excellence. There is no one from these units on the assessment committee. No one is looking whether we are meeting our goals. Janice Laakso said this is also important to retention.

Linda Ishem stated that during Core "camp" for the introduction to social sciences they did agree on a set of core competencies. So there should be some commonalities across courses, including some core social sciences readings. There was also agreement about number of pages of reading and numbers of assignments so that there was parity across classes. She didn't know if this happened for the other AoK. The titles of courses are created to draw students to the classes. But she noted that there was no curriculum oversight outside the social science camp group.

George Mobus noted that in the introduction to science core, some of the instructors were not scientists. The group couldn't agree on on what the core competencies should be, such as knowing what counts as evidence. He argued there needs to be subcommittees by AoK to monitor Core classes.

Jennifer Sundheim said that literacy needs to be integrated into the Core classes. She was uncertain if there were shared informational competencies included in the classes.

At this point Buck Banks (Director, OUE) and Nicole Blair (Assistant Director, OUE) joined the conversation. Buck Banks stated that OUE needs a more routinized and transparent faculty oversight and that OUE needs help getting this to happen. Nicole Blair said that this had been recommended on the Foundations of Excellence study, but nothing happened on this. Buck Banks said one of the challenges has been to get buy in from all the programs. He said what needs to happen is to constitute a committee that would include faculty and staff. There needs to be some systematic buy in. Faculty are interested in teaching courses that they want to teach,

but there needs to be more. The topics need to be more deliberate and this needs to be seen as part of a 4-year curriculum.

Jennifer Sundheim asked what can get faculty involved? Buck Banks said he didn't know what would get faculty involved. George Mobus said that the institutions he looked into were 4-year institutions. On this campus, there is conflict with instructors who are used to teaching junior and senior-level classes and who are not experienced with students in the first year. Buck Banks said instructors teach in the Core for a couple of years and then rotate out. Writing instructors must teach in the Core all the time because the classes are writing intensive. Nicole Blair said the incentive for her is that she enjoys the fall writing course. She knows it will build an early foundation for writing for the students. Buck Banks said another incentive could be potential research collaborators. Students entering in their first year have longer horizon for collaborating than students here for the last two years. For different faculty, different incentives may get them involved.

George Mobus said there needs to be specialists in each of the AoK who look at Core courses and determine what the foundational ideas need to be. Buck Banks said the AoK are tied to Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The content of the courses is flexible, but the SLOs should be linked up to campus SLOs in a seamless way.

Janice Laakso asked how the topics in the Core classes connect to foundational knowledge and whether there is any assessment of these. Diane Kinder pointed out that there is no representative of OUE on the Assessment Committee. Buck Banks said they need to remedy that.

Katie Baird said that one problem is the fragmentation of the curriculum, not just in the Core, but across programs. IAS has 100- and 200-level courses, but they are often not connected to the upper division coursework. She argued that there needs to be Core competencies rather than proselytizing to get students into courses. There needs to be critical reading and writing. Buck Banks said the evangelical part was more about incentive for faculty to teach in the Core, not about SLOs. He agreed that the SLOs were important. He also pointed out that interdisciplinary inquiry was not taught in other 100-level courses and the Core can do this. Many of the courses are interdisciplinary. Nicole pointed out that classes often have a theme, such as what it means to be human, then the course can address it from three different points of view. These are "university" courses where students learn what a discipline is and how knowledge is connected. Doug Wills asked how we know if this is the appropriate time to teach about interdisciplinarity. Katie Baird pointed out that to do interdisciplinary work, you need to know disciplines. Buck Banks stated that the organization of Core camp suggested disciplines and they believe this is a good practice.

Janice Laakso asked about the relationship of first year seminars to retention. Buck Banks said retention is not good nation-wide. The OUE is trying to improve retention by working with recruiters to target students who would benefit most from our program and with advisors to ensure advising is solid. They also have other initiatives like the Sophomore Summit. The sophomore year is now the big issue in programs. There's a big gap between the Core and then the next year in the programs. Lynda West pointed out that there needs to be touch points in the sophomore year that include transfer students. These include admissions open houses and a pre-major launch. Buck Banks mentioned the new initiative to map academic pathways may help provide a roadmap into the majors.

Janice Laakso asked how we could establish the needed faculty oversight. Nita McKinley said that APCC could send forward a recommendation to the EC regarding oversight. Katie Baird said that connecting to existing structures would help with the issue of faculty workload. Or it could be rotated among programs. Jill Purdy said that a proposal from APCC would be great. The proposal could include who the members would be, how they would be selected, what the term of membership would be and should address continuity across time as well as representation across programs, and where the leadership would reside. Nicole Blair said it would be better if it

were not just people teaching in the Core. Katie asked if there were an existing committee that could do this. Jill Purdy said it needed to be a new committee.

Jill Purdy and George Mobus agreed to come up with a recommendation for the committee to consider at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Submitted,

Nita McKinley, Chair

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
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					

NOTES ON FACULTY OVERSIGHT OF OEU (CORE PROGRAM)

Note: These notes on oversight of the first year program were compiled by searching all Faculty Assembly documents on the share drive. I searched for "core," "freshman," "freshmen," "Undergraduate Advisory Council," "UAC," and "OUE" between 2005 and the present. I've cut and pasted relevant sections and indicated the source. I didn't edit so there may be irrelevant sections, duplications, or omissions (if it didn't come up in my search).

UWT Executive Committee Minutes

April 14, 2005

Patricia Spakes mentioned that she, Bob Jackson and Josh Tenenberg had had a meeting to start getting to know one another earlier in the week. On the top of both her list and that of the faculty leadership was how to plan for going to a four year campus.

This is an issue that we need to address now. Backing the time line up from when we have to start admitting freshmen, and considering what we need to do in order to be ready, we are working with a compressed timeline.

Patricia's working metaphor for the planning process is an accreditation self-study. She envisions a structure for planning that includes a Steering Committee, and then working subcommittees for the main issues that need to be addressed. She also believes that we can exploit the use of technology to provide more transparency and feedback (e.g. using the web to post drafts and to solicit and collect input).

The Steering Committee would be broadly representative across campus. Its charge would be: establishing a timeline, overseeing the entire process, coordinating the working subcommittees, and being responsible for the final report. She sees three subcommittees: Curriculum, Student Services, and Facilities. Coordination of and linkage between the committees is provided by the Steering Committee.

One step must be taken before any of the committees can do their work. And this concerns determining the parameters for the discussion: when are we going to admit freshman, how many, what are our assumptions that provide a common set of guidelines for everyone. We need to get these developed quickly, get feedback from the campus community, and then use them as a common set of assumptions and constraints by the subcommittees.

The final report needs to be completed by May of 2006 so that there is time for feedback before everyone leaves for the summer.

Patricia then went over a handout that reflected the results of a meeting on April 13 with Jack Nelson, Bob Jackson, and herself. This handout included a draft set of working assumptions, key tasks, and the committee structure defined above. She then discussed her rationale for many of the choices (e.g. of chairs, of membership) on the "structure" chart. She also discussed the working assumptions. The assumptions will shape the kind of programs that we design, and having different ideas about them initially could derail us.

This spring we need to get the assumptions worked out, the committee memberships need to be determined, and the Steering Committee needs to begin its work. Some of the work will need to be done over the summer.

Patricia asked first if we are in agreement about the general shape of how to go about planning as she has outlined. And second, are we in agreement with the specific tasks, assumptions, and structure? If so, she would like to release the tasks, assumptions, and structure to the general campus for feedback.

Jack Nelson indicated that the 2707 report website will be devoted to this process.

Michael Kalton inquired if there is funding for faculty time for the workload of being involved in task force work? Spakes responded that, by analogy, in doing a self-study each committee works differently. So it is hard to make resource commitments in advance. We might not know in advance what each committee's resource needs will be. She stated that there will be staff and administrative support from the Chancellor's office.

Emlet followed by asking if a greater weight will be given to service at Promotion and Tenure for doing this kind of work. Nelson stated that carrying out this kind of service will not obviate the need for faculty to have excellence in teaching and research.

Spakes mentioned that a greater emphasis on advising will begin to appear because the care of freshman is higher than that for transfer students in a major.

Kalton stated that this assumes that work is done over the summer. Nelson said that ideas have to be on the table by fall, so there will need to be some form of compensation for faculty working on it.

G. Mobus asked what kind of campus are we going to be 20 years from now? Do we have a niche? Nelson stated that the 2707 report doesn't go that far out. But the report talks about being a "metropolitan university". Spakes added that we cannot look 10 years out (strategic plan stuff) and also do the work of the task force. If we were doing this right we would be doing the strategic plan first, but in this case we are responding to a specific charge.

Barsness stated that thinking long-term suggests that we would build a curriculum that leaves us the freedom required to develop strategically in the future in a variety of directions. We should develop a curriculum that has the flexibility to change and adapt for several years.

Primomo mentioned that the *Recruitment and Admissions* Subcommittee might also have Retention as a goal. She also suggested that some from the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology be on this committee. For Curriculum, we also need ongoing professional development for faculty.

Stein commented that this collaborative faculty/administration process for the task force is both different and important. Spakes concluded by stating that if anyone has further thoughts to please share these with Bob Jackson.

UWT Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

October 6, 2005

- Barsness inquired about the role that the Faculty Committee on Academic Policy will play, especially with respect to the implications of admitting freshmen. She suggested that they will need to set the policies for such things as grading and academic honesty. Perhaps this committee can stimulate and spearhead this discussion within the different academic programs in the same way that the T&P committee headed this discussion on program-specific guidelines for T&P.
Tenenberg indicated that if we want the committee to undertake this, then the EC needs to ask them specifically to do this.

Executive Council

Policy Retreat Minutes

March 9, 2007

What department does T-CORE fall under? The faculty for T-CORE come from all disciplines, not just one.

I believe this is from the Foundations of Excellence report. It is dated 2009.

Imperative #2: We must *increase accountability* of ourselves, our governance and procedural systems, our instruction, and course content to support first year student success.

During the past several years our assessment efforts have advanced. UW Seattle has required increased assessment of our programs and productivity. We have hired our first director of institutional research, produced our first institutional strategic plan, and articulated our institutional, program, and curricular outcomes. We have been focused in this effort and have advanced our institutional assessment capacity, albeit only recently.

This past year's Foundation of Excellence initiative reflects our growing commitment to programmatic assessment and accountability. As an academic community we understand the importance of being proactive, informed, and reflective in our decision making.

We have advanced our institutional capacity to evaluate our work and create change. Yet there may be no place in our community in which there is greater ambiguity relative to student success and individual responsibility than our first year programs. The success of our first year students and our success in the creation of an exemplary UWT education is reliant upon an increase in our individual and institutional accountability. As we work to refine and improve our students' first year experience the importance of evidence based decision making becomes critical. We must use current information of high quality to advance the FY experience. UWT's Foundations of Excellence initiative suggests the following strategies to achieve this goal:

- 1) *Identify who is responsible*—individuals, programs, offices
 - a) Develop accountability measures for responsible parties
 - i) Make explicit the expectations for contributing to the FY experience
 - (1) Include these expectations in position descriptions, program operational plans, our campus strategic plan
 - (a) Annually evaluate performance of FY contributions and encourage improvement with rewards
 - b) Annually identify FY courses with high rates of DFWI (drop, fail, withdraw, incomplete)
 - i) Develop interventions to decrease non completion rates in these courses
 - ii) Annually assess effectiveness of these efforts
 - c) Assess the effectiveness of advising for FY students
- 2) *Establish undergraduate council*
 - a) With responsibility and governance authority for FY experience
 - i) Responsibility to integrate the FY experience within the entire undergraduate program
 - ii) Focus on assessment of FY programs (human, budgetary, physical); propose reallocation as needed
 - iii) Evaluate all university programs relative to their potential to contribute to the FY experience and Core
 - (1) Our institutional expectation should be that all Tenure Track faculty and all academic programs contribute to the FY experience and Core
 - iv) This Council must identify and hold accountable persons and programs for FY program effectiveness
 - (1) The Office of Academic Affairs must support these efforts in providing incentives for the level and quality of contributions
- 3) *Institute continuous FY assessment*
 - a) We must improve the quality and collection of data for our FY programs
 - i) And increase our accountability for the effective use of data in FY program decisions; we must create a culture of evidence based decision making
 - b) We must assess our FY learning outcomes
 - i) Is the Core effective in producing our desired learning outcomes?
 - (1) Investigate the effectiveness of team taught v. linked course v. other curricular models
 - ii) Evaluate our FY learning outcomes relative to student recruitment and marketing of our undergraduate program; is our program attractive to potential first year students?
 - iii) Develop FY diversity outcomes
 - iv) Develop FY co-curricular outcomes
 - c) Assess our FY recruitment, retention, and degree completion rates
 - i) What are measurable outcomes of FY student success at UWT?
 - ii) Develop annual performance metrics and publish results
 - iii) Use results of this assessment to enhance FY program
 - d) Align our FY assessment with larger institutional assessment initiatives and goals
 - i) We must manage our FY assessment activities to promote the evolution of initiatives, and diminish our inclination to forget and redo

January 13, 2010

Raynor explained the next steps. The immediate next steps include developing this philosophy and design courses for the 1st year students. For example, an Undergraduate Advisory Council will focus on the first year, p. 10. [Foundations of Excellence Action Plan]

Faculty Assembly Academic Policy Committee (APC)

Monday, March 1, 2010

1. Undergraduate Advisory Council (UAC) and Structure - Draft:

Beth Rushing explained that this council comes from the Foundations of Excellence (FoE). The idea came from the FoE report on the first year experience, plus the experience of students as a whole. The UAC is guided by questions that started with academic policy and procedures for freshmen. The UAC addresses the undergraduate experience outside of programs. This attends to a more holistic view. This includes the co-curriculum. This is not a policy making body. This group makes recommendations to other councils, committees, or units on the UW Tacoma campus.

- a. APC discussed faculty membership on the UAC. Rushing explained that she prefers not to have units represent programs, since this is an extra-program body.
- b. Bobbe Miller Murray this committee might be a place for the registrar to be included.
- c. Lisa Hoffman asked if there are other major transitions to be addressed besides the FoE. Rushing explained that the UAC may address issues for transfer students along with freshman. Rushing explained that the UAC applies to all undergraduates. Rushing explained that future conversations could include transitioning from Colleges to Schools. Or, UAC might address accommodations for international and study abroad students.
- d. Cathy Tashiro asked who the UAC informs. Rushing clarified that the UAC informs Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, which under “the Chancellor’s authority.”
- e. Rushing noted that other tasks for the UAC? might be drafting a document to rename General Education, other work with non-academic programs, and Study Abroad programs.
- f. Lisa Hoffman asked whether that is a mechanism for the wider faculty to effect the recommendations on the FoE. **Rushing responded that appropriate recommendations that fall to the UW Tacoma faculty code go to the Faculty Assembly Executive Council.** Deirdre Raynor added that the FoE report, under the action plan status and responsibility, includes a list which refers groups who should address various issues. Tashiro asked if the UAC **was in response to** the FoE report. Rushing responded that this body was recommended by FoE.
- g. Rushing explained that the UAC is for undergraduates. There is a graduate council which is a policy making body. The graduate council is analogous because it is policy related.
- h. Greg Noronha raised a concern about the UAC and future committees, which impact faculty and staff time. Rushing responded that if there was another body to manage the scope of this work she would appoint one to the FoE recommendations. Rushing added that if a committee which can operate with trust and transparency, the size of the UAC could change. Miller Murray asked if the UAC can apply members for FA EC, Curriculum, and APC committee reps in the place of the 3-5 extra FA EC appointed faculty members. Charles Emler asked if the UAC can be reviewed regarding the structure and importance after 2-3 years. Emler added that the review can address the UAC’s function and its constitution.
- i. Tashiro asked about the proposal for **giving chairs** of the standing committees **course releases**. Rushing responded that she waiting for the proposal on the Standing Committee Chairs.
- j. Raynor explained the importance of the 70 participants who worked on the 9 dimensions of FoE. Their work justifies UW Tacoma following through on this campus effort.
- k. Hoffman asked if the UAC can be named a taskforce. Noronha added that a taskforce gives the impression that the UAC is temporary and this addresses UWT’s immediate needs. Rushing responded that she will change the UAC taskforce and after three years review the membership structure and

function.

- l. Marcie Lazzari suggested that faculty have representation. Rushing responded that communication is not ensured by programmatic representation. Hoffman suggested that programs should be represented. Tashiro added the purpose of the UAC is to come up with a more integrated approach. Depending on the program it may not be easy to get people to serve on the committee.
- m. Lazzari asked for clarification on draft, under **Purpose**. It read: "Its scope includes the formal academic curriculum and the co-curriculum, as well as student academic support services." Rushing responded that this refers to all four years. Emlet suggested that the vagueness may give the UAC purview over something they do not have. Rushing explained that the UAC (taskforce) must have permission to work and if groups feel like this is not under their purview this should be communicated to the UAC. Rushing explained that the UAC should not be looking at programs.

Action: Rushing explained that the UAC council operates it will modify its scope. The FoE is the primary thing this council will work on, for all UW Tacoma students. Rushing agreed to change the UAC to Undergraduate Advisory Taskforce (UAT) and after three years Academic Affairs will review the membership, structure, and function.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC)

Tuesday, June 15, 2010

Thompson asked the process for OUE reviews of curriculum for students' first two years. Rushing responded any changes would go to the Academic Policy Committee, observing shared governance. Tracy Thompson noted the faculty resolution asks that faculty have a mechanism to provide feedback. The challenge now is to develop a relationship between programs and APC. Marjorie Dobratz noted that one concern is that the new position will focus on undergraduate advising. Rushing clarified the coordinator position is not a director position, but will have the coordinating responsibility. Rushing offered Marcie Lazzari and Zoe Barsness to be on the search committee, provide feedback, or have some other member of the FA sit on the search committee.

Lazzari volunteered to serve.

Faculty Assembly Actions 2009-2010#

Undergraduate Advisory Task Force

On March 30, 2010, Johann Reusch and Marcie Lazzari received a request from Beth Rushing to ask the EC to appoint a member of the EC and 3 to 5 additional faculty members to serve on the Undergraduate Advisory Task Force. Johann agreed to serve and noted that the main charge of the Task Force was to facilitate the implementation of the FoE Plan in support of the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE). Additional faculty members other than academic leadership (I. Walker: OUE & CORE and D. Raynor: Bridge Program) were unavailable to serve. Academic administration is aware that some FoE recommendations will need to be reviewed and approved by the relevant FA Standing Committees and EC. A question remains as to whether or not the FoE was appropriately vetted last year among APC members and EC.

Executive Council and Faculty Senators

Minutes

Faculty Assembly Retreat

September 27, 2010

Faculty oversight of the Undergraduate Core, Global Honors, and International Programs

- a. Jose Rios, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, explained that they get questions about the needs from the Undergraduate Core. Jose Rios and Ingrid Walker have met informally. Faculty turnover is one issue for the Core. Barsness suggested the EC invite Ingrid Walker to the next meeting.
- b. Divya McMillin from Global Honors and John Banks from International Programs will also be invited to a future EC meeting.

c. Marjorie Dobratz raised the issue of Program Assessment and the Undergraduate Core Rushing explained that the Assessment Committee, chaired by Ginger MacDonald was formed last year. Faculty were appointed by their programs. The Assessment Committee will work on establishing documentation of the current procedures, processes and mechanisms in place at UWT to assess all undergraduate curricula. The focus of this committee will be to establish a system to act on the current assessment procedures and processes for all undergraduate programs.

d. Student Conduct Code. UWT has brought itself into compliance with the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). A memo was sent to faculty which includes changes to the Informal Hearing process, the member composition to include faculty members in the University Disciplinary Committee Undergraduate Advisory Council (WAC 478-120-085), and the Faculty Appeal Board (WAC 478-120-100). Please reference attachment A for details about these changes.

e. Chancellor Spakes announced that UW Tacoma students have developed their own **Honor Code** and are asking the faculty to put this on the syllabus. Students are interested in asking the faculty to also develop an honor code.

f. Undergraduate Advisory Taskforce: Three to five faculty members are needed to serve on this committee. Students and staff also serve on this committee. It was suggested that representatives from the Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee serve.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC)

Thursday, October 7, 2010

Discussion of the roles and responsibilities related to the CORE and lower division curricula, Ingrid Walker

a. Ingrid Walker sent out several documents via email to the EC members (attached). Walker met with Lazzari and Barsness. Faculty and staff worked on the learning objectives. The biggest changes are included in the cohort model, with building the concept of the learning community, and encouraging that students need should be connected to UWT. These changes are meant to ensure students will be more accountable and faculty will be better informed. Added the core lab – are things like the TLC, SHAW, and the library.

b. The Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) has also been response to programs. Last year they worked with writing faculty who decided they wanted an improvement at UW Tacoma in writing and reading skills. Now there are two writing cohorts and this is similar with the new science cohort.

c. OUE faculty has also worked hard on the learning objectives, thus the twenty credits for the pilot cohorts. The larger issue is the other 40 undergraduate credits. Other issues such as working students, for example class availability, where students are not getting what they need, in the sequence they need it. Walker expressed this as an example of the 60 general education credits and the total of 90 credits before an undergraduate enters into a major.

d. Programs are needed to contribute their recommendations about the Core and undergraduate credits in order to consider how the area of knowledge courses are understood and function. Linda Dawson noted that faculty input will depend on their willingness to volunteer their area of expertise. Thompson suggested developing an independent advisory board which might include a representative from each program to look at the 100-200 level non-core courses.

e. Some EC members were concerned about what problems exist and what should be addressed. Emily Ignacio asked about the course attributes such as VLPA and whether this consider the UW system course requirements, which Walker confirmed it had. Ehsan Feroz noted that Tacoma look at both Seattle and Bothell's organizational structure.

f. Barsness referenced UW Bothell's General Faculty Organization. AT UW Bothell, there is a steering committee that acts in lieu of program faculty, and fulfills the same role as a program committee. The Center for University Studies & Programs (CUSP) has the responsibility for developing the curricula, oversight, responsibility, and accountability. They discussed this in the context of the Core. Walker noted that all of Bothell's lower division courses are launched out of CUSP. EC should be concerned with the remaining 40 credits in addition to the 20 Core credits. Program advisers can provide information regarding high demand undergraduate courses.

g. There was a lengthy discussion about undergraduate education, which included questions about infrastructure, administration, credits, faculty approach, criteria and models, what counts as a problem, and what type of new committee can address these issues appropriately. Here are some highlights from that discussion:

George Mobus, Chair, Academic Policy Committee added that faculty need to be concerned with the quality of the courses. Faculty Assembly should oversee this, and look at Bothell, Seattle for organization. APC is supposed to look into OUE, Global Honors and International Programs. Mobus said he will meet with Walker and prepare to bring their discussion to the EC. Lazzari and Barsness agreed that they will continue to work with OUE to address the holes regarding undergraduate credits. Beth Rushing suggested that assessment should be addressed. Ignacio noted that it will be helpful to get the academic advisers involved so faculty can understand how to advise the students about moving into particular majors and address transfer students to the junior level. Charles Emler suggested that faculty might sit on a taskforce/committee without teaching in the Core. Walker noted that the OUE is also looking at the different needs of sophomores and agreed with Ignacio, that advisers must be involved in that conversation.

h. Donald Chinn noted that UW Tacoma faculty should be representing the university. Thompson added that with growth, there are new challenges for university faculty which are important to consider, they are resources, directors' input, funding, allocation, freeing up staff for more work. So faculty must interface with Academic Affairs and Beth Rushing.

i. Director of Global Honors, Divya McMillin noted that the Global Honors Advisory Board (GHAB) can give some history, to provide oversight on curriculum issues, academia, and scholarships. In the past, the GHAB has worked with a senior global honors student and has contacted faculty when developing new course proposals.

j. Barsness noted that the input from the advisers will help show what it looks like from the students' perspective. This input will relate to tuition, student credits and their knowledge of graduation requirements, and is important for addressing issues at the institutional level.

Action: Lazzari, Barsness, and Mobus will continue this discussion with Walker and report back to EC. In the meantime EC members should communicate with their programs to encourage feedback. Walker would like feedback about whether new courses are offered.

Executive Council and Faculty Senators Minutes

Faculty Assembly Retreat

September 27, 2010

5. Carry over issues/initiatives from last year

C. Faculty oversight of the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) – how to implement faculty oversight control of the curricular and other faculty responsibilities that reside in any program which has no faculty accountable for making curricular decisions and assuming other faculty responsibilities

Annual Faculty Assembly Retreat

Monday, September 27, 2010

How to have faculty oversight of the undergraduate core, global honors, and international programs:

Jose Rios: we have had conversations, usually with questions from the Core. We get questions about the needs from the Core. Jose and Ingrid have met informally. We have communication but turnover.

Emily Ignacio: there no consistent faculty in the core.

Zoe: suggested to ask Ingrid to come to the next EC meeting.

Rushing: this year the core faculty have worked to address the learning outcomes of the core, that every cohort needs are addressed, faculty have been engaged in these conversations.

Pendras: Is UWT Faculty assembly the reason why there is no oversight for the UWT OUE? Office of Undergraduate Education are how UWT

Rushing: our general education learning outcomes are the UW learning outcomes.

Marcie: Issues: Core and Faculty Governance would like to improve the situation.

Rushing: thinks it will be helpful to invite Divya and Hanks – global honors and international programs. Action: Marice and me will invite them

Faculty Assembly (FA) Executive Council (EC) Minutes

Thursday, March 31, 2011

Academic Policy Committee – George Mobus

The Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) ad hoc committee will contact UW Bothell in preparation for a policy recommendation for oversight of the OUE. The members are Rich Furman, George Mobus, Jose Rios, and Ingrid Walker.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING Minutes

January 28, 2011

Curriculum Committee (CC), Tom Diehm

- ...
- Quality Assurance in the Core (mentioned by Mobus) - CC will work with APC on the OUE committee to make sure courses are being evaluated for quality assurance.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC) Minutes

Thursday, February 10, 2011

Academic Policy Committee - George Mobus

The Oversight Committee for the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) has not been able to get faculty volunteers. APC recommends that they take on the responsibility of setting the structure for this oversight committee.

Action: EC approved that APC should explore this structural work as an alternative to oversight committee for the OUE.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING

Wednesday, May 25, 2011

Executive Council Report – Marcie Lazzari and Zoe Barsness

Faculty Assembly has strengthened communication across campus. Regarding the core curriculum, a subcommittee will meet through the summer to develop a plan for faculty oversight of the curriculum. Faculty Assembly needs to elect one more faculty senator (there are 2 meetings per quarter). Faculty should send feedback for the Faculty Assembly Retreat to zib@uw.edu. Faculty should also send feedback on topics for a Friday Roundtable Day that will focus on academic student conduct

Faculty Assembly (FA) Executive Council (EC) Minutes

Wednesday, June 8, 2011

APC - George Mobus announced that the oversight committee for the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) will continue meeting over the summer.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council Actions 2010 – 2011

DRAFT

(to be completed prior to the 09-26-11 Faculty Assembly Retreat)

Office of Undergraduate Education

The EC was asked by Ingrid Walker, the Director of the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE), to engage in a discussion of the UWT Core Program as well as one-and two-hundred level courses. Since the OUE does not have a designated faculty, the question arises as to faculty's responsibility for curricular oversight. The EC passed a resolution (January 5, 2011) tasking the Academic Policy Committee (APC) to develop an oversight plan for the Core. Discussions have been held throughout the year, but to date a structure and process for faculty involvement has not been determined. A small sub-committee to continue this exploration has been formed (Ingrid Walker,

Jose Rios, George Mobus, Rich Furman, Zoe Barsness and Marcie Lazzari). Also, George Mobus, chair of the APC, will visit UW Bothell to learn more about their Center for University Studies and Programs (CUSP), which has responsibility for developing and approving lower division curricula. Over the summer months it is the sub-committee's goal to identify a set of possible models that might serve to guide the development of policies and procedures in regards to faculty oversight of the Core. These models will be presented to the EC in autumn 2011 for their consideration and vote to recommend for adoption. The recommended oversight model will then be reviewed and approved through appropriate administrative and faculty governance bodies. Once a model is formally adopted, the Academic Policy Committee will be tasked with developing the specific guidelines and procedures for implementing the oversight model in regards to the Core.

Faculty Assembly (FA) Executive Council (EC)

Thursday, January 5, 2012

This topic brought discussion to a previously discussed topic and concern:

Where is oversight for this curriculum going to reside? Currently oversight resides with the IAS Program (stewardship). It was discussed and agreed that CORE and lower division/general education curriculum should be a campus-wide responsibility. How oversight should be handled/structured in the future was discussed, as it currently resides within IAS.

Some concerns were raised regarding way in which IAS is currently perceived to be stewarding this program

1. IAS was administratively appointed as steward of OUE/CORE, yet responsibility for curriculum resides with faculty.
2. What mechanisms within IAS have been established to assure review of courses in CORE/lower division general education curriculum? What is the extent of faculty involvement in such review? What is the extent of CORE faculty involvement in such review?
3. Where and how are we assuring that other programs have input in to the process? Oversight of the CORE/lower division general education curriculum should be responsibility of the campus as a whole – all have stake – under current IAS stewardship how is such input solicited/assured? Oversight of CORE/lower division general education curriculum has been a concern for some time and pre-dates current administrative solution. With so much change in the works there may be too much focus on the efficiency side vs. the pedagogical.

Discussion continued regarding what is the right mechanism to make decisions, and what are the student learning objectives in the general education curriculum. What do we expect UWT students to have a mastery of at the end of 4 years? Some competencies that were suggested included: critical thinking, quantitative literacy and writing. Discussion ensued as to the pathways that are required to build towards these ends. Should task forces be formed?

It was suggested that B. Banks do a roadshow for faculty who are taking students from the CORE – so they have an idea and information on how to proceed from there within their own disciplines/programs.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting

June 6, 2012

1. APC-CC Task Force Report (Kent Nelson)

...

A discussion took place over whether this committee (APCC) might oversee the CORE.