

**Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee**  
**University of Washington, Tacoma**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
 October 23, 2013

**Present:** Kathy Beaudoin, Linda Ishem, Janice Laakso, Doug Wills (Chair), Jenny Sheng, Alexis Wilson; Jennifer Sundheim, ex-officio (Library); and Patrick Pow.

**1. Consent Agenda**

The consent agenda included minutes for 8/6/2013 and minutes for 09/23/2013, as well as two new course proposals and diversity designation courses. After brief review, amendments included correcting the course title TURB 212 to TURB 210; also, TARTS 403 was removed from the consent agenda for further discussion. Janice Laakso moved to approve the consent agenda with amendments; Kathy seconded; Unanimous vote.

New Courses	Diversity Designation
TEDUC 528 TEDLD 573	TPSYCH 312, 320, 400, 403 TRELIG 310 TSOC 265, 266, 434, 435, 455, 460 TARTS 403 TCOM 444 TFILM 486, 488 TGEOG 420 THISP 238, 267, 355, 462 THIST 220, 221, 222, 416, 417, 420, 440, 441, 459 TLIT 320, 324, 388, 425, 431, 476 TPOLS 317, 348, 410, 452, 456 TNURS/THLEAD 407 TEDU 471 TCRIM 225 TSOCWF 354, 404 TURB 212, 312, 316

**2. Diversity Designation Courses for further discussion**

An onslaught of courses for diversity designation came to APCC in October. Linda Ishem was asked to convene a sub-committee to review, but due to the last minute onslaught, she did not get this assistance. She reviewed the courses using the memo sent to Academic programs on the diversity requirement that Nita prepared in August. A key issue recognized in which APCC will have to address is that so few of the proposals had any kind of indication that programs had a discussion, or vote. Other concerns discussed included 1) Making it clear to departments that new and designated course proposals both have to be voted on by the units; 2) Designating a course as diversity if there are no course objectives; without objectives, each time someone new teaches (i.e. adjunct professors), the course can be changed; this violates the diversity designation criteria; 3) The current designated diversity courses do not cover the UWT student body (i.e. Milgard or Institute students). After discussion the proposal was made to send the course proposals submitted on the non-consent agenda back to the departments with comments and requesting clarification and a vote/discussion from their unit. Linda Ishem moved to accept the proposal, Kathy seconded; Unanimous vote.

**3. PNOI—Urban Studies**

This is the first Planning Notice of Intent (**PNOI**) APCC has reviewed in quite some time. This information is an FYI to inform APCC that they are in the early part of the process of starting a program, as well as alert what they are planning. The floor was opened for members to give any comments, or concerns, etc., that need to be sent back. The concern was raised that when completing the process for a PNOI for Healthcare Leadership, there was a recommendation made to complete a community assessment to document the need for the program; this PNOI for Urban Studies doesn't have anything referencing a community assessment being done, which indicates possible inconsistency in the process. This issue will be sent back in the comments as well as discussed with Harlan Patterson.

#### **4. Subcommittees for Program Evaluation**

Over the Summer Nita McKinley and Doug Wills attended a meeting with Ginger MacDonald, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. A big change was made in which UWT programs no longer go to Seattle for approval; APCC will be taking full responsibility in the final evaluation of graduate programs, and reviewing all aspects of the programs. After discussion with the Executive Council, it was determined that APCC may appoint a sub-committee to review these proposals and make recommendations to APCC. The subcommittee may consist of people not on the APCC, but they should be graduate faculty if they are reviewing graduate proposals. Such a subcommittee is needed because (1) the review is more extensive than typical curriculum review, (2) not all APCC members are graduate faculty, and (3) members don't vote on proposals from their own programs.

Another issue related to this topic was raised related to the MCO program. APCC completed an extensive approval process for that program, in which it has since been changed dramatically without APCC review. The concern is how much can a program change in the course of a year without being reevaluated and re-approved by APCC. Doug contacted Ginger MacDonald requesting if there are policies or criteria in place, so that going forward APCC can be ensured that programs won't be completely changed after the approval process. Ginger has set up a meeting with JW Harrington to discuss this issue. Doug will report back to APCC next meeting on the outcome of the meeting.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:25 pm.**