

# Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee

Agenda

April 11, 2013

**Present:** Linda Ishem, Diane Kinder, Janice Laakso, Lauren Montgomery, Doug Wills, Alexis Wilson, Nita McKinley (Chair); Lynda West, ex-officio (Advising); Ginger MacDonald, visitor.

## 1. Consent Agenda

- a. Minutes for 2/14/2013
- b. Minutes for 3/14/2013
- c. Course proposals

### **New courses**

TEDLD 574: Evaluation in Educational Systems  
TSOC 534 Women, Race, and Class: Identity and Intergroup Relations  
TSPAN 315 Business Communications in Spanish  
TSPAN 374 Hispanic Culture through Film  
TSPAN 425 Advanced Communication Skills  
TSPAN 451 Hispanic Women Writers  
TSPAN 480 Contemporary Spanish Culture  
TFILM 499 Special Topics in Film Studies  
TPSYCH 209 Fundamentals of Psychological Research I  
TPSYCH 309 Fundamentals of Psychological Research II  
TPSYCH 352 Judgment and Decision-making  
THIST 499 History Capstone Course  
TCOM 498 Study Abroad in Communication  
TCOM 499 Special Topics in Communication

### **Course Changes**

T CRIM 374 Human Trafficking/TSOCWF 374 Human Trafficking  
TURB335 Community Development  
TMGMT 474 Entrepreneurship: Idea Development  
THLTH 520 Health and Human Rights  
TMATH 120 Precalculus  
TPSYCH 312 Mental Illness across Cultures

Correction to 3/14/2013 minutes. Linda Ishem requested that the minutes be corrected to show that she had pointed out that the Education proposals had borrowed language directly from ASU syllabi and that this should be changed. Diane Kinder had agreed to seeing that Education fixed this issue. Linda Ishem moved to approve the consent agenda with minutes corrected. Alexis Wilson seconded the motion. The consent agenda was unanimously approved.

## 2. Announcements: Chancellor's Medal Recommendation

Nita McKinley said that Andrea Coker Anderson reported that the materials for the Chancellor's Medal would be available soon. To speed the review process, these will likely be made available in electronic form with a Catalyst survey for APCC members to rate the applications.

## 3. Change to Criminal Justice Major

Diane Kinder moved that the change to the Criminal Justice Major be approved; Linda Ishem seconded this motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

## 4. Change to Psychology Major

Nita McKinley reported how the changes to the Psychology Major would help prepare students for more advanced work through the 2-course sequence in research design. This would also allow the UWT 200-level course to align with research design courses taught at community colleges and in Seattle. The changes in the course distributions will allow students the flexibility to specialize in a particular area of psychology and also allow some credit towards the major for internships or other independent studies. Diane Kinder pointed out that one of the syllabi for the research design courses had the learning objectives beginning at #5. Nita McKinley said she would bring this to the attention of IAS. Diane Kinder moved that the change to the Psychology Major

be approved; Janice Laakso seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **5. Student Graduation Petition**

The committee considered a student petition to allow an exception to the final year residency requirement (45 of the last 60 hours must be at UWT). The student had taken courses at 22 credit hours in the last year at Highline Community College and in Seattle. Lynda West reported the student has 98 credits from three institutions and the rest of her credits are all from UWT and UWS. She hasn't spoken with the student about her motivations, but the student petition shows she wanted to complete a minors in Math and Asian Studies to make herself more competitive in her career goals. Doug Wills questioned why the student was only figuring out the problem at this point. Lauren Montgomery said that she didn't have a problem with the issue and asked if there was an issue with setting a precedent.

Alexis Wilson wanted to know if getting to this point without sufficient numbers of credits at UWT had to do with the student not understanding the advising process. Lynda West reported that academic advising is not mandatory. Students have to come in to apply for a graduate application. It's up to the student to make sure they meet requirements. Advising does outreach, but unless there is a hold on registrations, students don't have to come in and no educational plan is required. There's also the problem that on this campus, there's no published regular schedule of when courses will be offered, there isn't support for this type of planning.

Lauren Montgomery asked if an advisor was likely to advise a student to take courses elsewhere. Lynda West said they might if the student's progress was going to be compromised, but that advisors don't usually advise students to go out of the system. They have to balance the student's needs with the needs of the institution.

Lauren Montgomery asked if credits from Seattle counted towards the residency requirement. Lynda West said they did not. She said the "spirit" of the rule is that the student has a degree from UWT and so the coursework should reflect this. There is more of a concern with transfers from Highline CC and not as much from UWS. We should think about how we would want UWS to think about courses from UWT.

Diane Kinder said that because of our size, we can't offer some pretty basic course every quarter. So it seems that some of this problem is our problem. She should have been planful, but if she was, would she have had to graduate a year later? She didn't believe the student was trying to play the system or look for an easy way out given her course of study.

Linda Ishem asked whether we knew what the PPE faculty thought of the petition. The petition did not go to the PPE faculty, just to APCC.

In terms of setting a precedent, Lynda West said that UWS is usually accepting of exceptions to residency requirements if the coursework reflects the standards of the university.

Lauren Montgomery moved that the APCC should approve the student graduate petition; Diane Kinder seconded it. The vote was 5 in favor of the motion, 0 against the motion, and 1 abstention. The motion passed.

Alexis Wilson said it would have been important to hear from the PPE faculty about the petition. Lynda West said that when advisors were housed in the individual programs, there was more a perception that they were representative of the programs. With the centralization of advising the perception is that advisors don't represent the programs. But advisors are in good communication with and liaise with programs.

## **6. Proposal to EC regarding faculty oversight of programs**

Nita McKinley reported on the online discussion of the proposal to EC that they enact a policy regarding faculty oversight of units that don't have faculty regularly assigned to them (see Appendix A for copy of memo). Some edits were made. Alexis Wilson moved that we send the memo to EC for consideration. Linda Ishem seconded

the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

**7. Proposal for Global Honors minor**

Based on discussion via email and information gathered, Nita McKinley suggested that APCC reject the proposal for a Minor in Global Honors based on 1) lack of institutionalized faculty oversight of program, 2) concerns over whether a unit that does not offer majors can offer minors, and 3) concerns over whether the Honors Committee approves of this minor. Nita McKinley offered to write an email to Divya McMillan, Director of Global Honors conveying this information and saying we would reconsider if these issues were resolved.

Janice Laakso moved that APCC reject the proposal for the Global Honors Minor; Doug Wills seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

**8. New program approval process (Ginger MacDonald, Associate Vice Director for Academic Affairs)**

Ginger MacDonald reported on changes in how courses and programs are getting approved. The Seattle Curriculum Committee will have less power over the academic integrity of course proposals. They will only evaluate impact on accreditation, numbers, titles, description, house, equivalency, assessment plans. The review for academic integrity is now in the individual programs, so program units need to ensure their review processes are rigorous. Alexis Wilson said APCC is no longer review courses. Ginger MacDonald said this puts even more responsibility in the academic unit. We need to make sure everyone understands. Nita McKinley said that APCC is checking whether faculty are reviewing curriculum proposals and APCC chair is also sending a notice to all faculty about upcoming reviews. Ginger MacDonald said the only time the Seattle CC will look at content is when equivalency is requested. SCC will ask if you have checked with other faculty and won't approve this without agreement. So the charge of CCS has changed.

There are also changes afoot in the approval of online versions of already existing courses. These will be approved on the UWT campus and will not use the current DL form, but rather the Quality Matters rubric being used by the Technology Fellows for evaluating online courses (you can find this rubric on the Teaching Technology webpages). The changes in online course proposals are still in process.

For program proposals, the HECB review was eliminated last year. The only report to the state is to the committee that maintains lists of what degrees are offered in all Universities and Community Colleges for informational purposes (ICAPP). Undergraduate programs at UWT will be approved on this campus. The only system-wide review will be the blast email that Tri-Campus Council sends out to all three campuses for feedback. The Tri-Campus Council will review whether the issues brought up have been addressed, but they do not have approval power for these proposals.

Fee-based programs (those that are funded solely through fees) must be proposed through the UWEO office (UW Educational Outreach). The UWEO will manage these and assume risks of the programs (for example, if it fails, the faculty must still be paid). The Milgard School does not have to go through UWEO as they will assume this risk themselves. Any online degrees will also have to go through the UWEO.

These processes are still in development. APCC is included at the final stages of approval for program proposals. Ginger MacDonald asked if APCC wanted to review proposals at an earlier stage in the process as well. APCC will be discuss this at the next meeting.

**APCC 2012-2013 Meeting Schedule with Proposal Due Dates**  
***Meetings for 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
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					

## Appendix A

**DATE:**

**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 requirements, develop and manage curriculum, or set graduation requirements have appropriate faculty oversight. This faculty oversight should be long-term, have expertise appropriate to the unit, and be faculty who have voting status in an academic program.

***Suggested policy:***

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 permanent council of faculty.

This council consist of faculty who:

- are voting faculty in a UWT program;
- have expertise in the area(s) of importance to the unit; and
- are permanently associated with the unit

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