

**DRAFT**

APCC Meeting

Minutes

November 8, 2012

Present: Linda Ishem; Diane Kinder; Janice Laakso; George Mobus; Alexis Wilson; Nita McKinley, Chair; Andrea Coker-Anderson, ex-officio (Registrar); Charles Lord, ex-officio (Library); Patrick Pow, ex-officio (Information Technology); Lynda West, ex-officio (Academic Advising Center); Katie Baird, guest.

1. The minutes for the 10/11/2012 meeting were approved by acclamation.
2. Nita McKinley reported that the changes to the Politics, Philosophy, and Economics Major (IAS) were approved by Catalyst vote: 7 approve, 0 disapprove, 0 abstain, 0 needs more discussion.
3. Nita McKinley reported that because we are now meeting for the first time as the newly re-structured Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee, we need to elect a chair.

The committee elected Nita McKinley chair by acclamation.

4. Combining committees and APCC tasks and procedures.  
This item was postponed until the arrival of Katie Baird. Charles Lord and Patrick Pow said that it would be important for any procedure to include review by the Library and IT to ensure resources were available for the proposed classes.
5. Set meetings for winter and spring  
The following days were selected for Winter and Spring 2013:  
January 17, February 14, March 14, April 11, May 9, June 6.

Katie Baird said APCC would need to make arrangements to approve curriculum that came in during the summer. The committee agreed to visit the decision on how to do this in the spring.

6. Graduation Petition (Andrea Coker-Anderson)  
The committee considered a petition where a student had taken courses in a summer quarter on a non-matriculated basis and wanted permission to count one of those courses towards the student's degree. The student will have all other course completed by Winter 2013 and wanted to graduate in March due to a heavy load on the job in the spring.

Nita McKinley said that the student's desire to finish in March due to job workload was not convincing, but that the fact that the student had actually already done the work was convincing. The rest of the committee agreed.

Diane Kinder moved that we approve the exception; George Mobus seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

7. Combining Committees and APCC tasks and procedures  
Katie Baird reviewed for the committee the reasoning behind restructuring the APC and CC. Having faculty edit proposals did not seem a good use of time. The intent of the CC was to have someone across campus programs review course proposals for academic quality, but not to edit them. Individual

programs should have processes for faculty review of the proposals. She argued that the new process for reviewing curriculum could be viewed as a work in progress and the APCC could revisit this at the end of the year to see how it is working.

She said that she sees the role of the APCC is to communicate to faculty what curriculum is being developed. She recommended that after the curriculum deadline each month that APCC send out an email to the faculty. The committee could decide whether or how they would like to solicit specific comments. Then she recommended that the proposals be put on the APCC agenda as a consent agenda, meaning they would be voted on without further discussion unless someone thought they needed discussion.

Katie Baird also recommended that the APCC could appoint a subcommittee (perhaps 2 people) to look at the proposals each period. This committee would review the proposals for overall issues to be addressed campus-wide, rather addressing issues with particular proposals. (Issues with particular proposals would be handled at the program level.)

This all depends on programs having a robust process for reviewing course proposals. The course proposal Catalyst site requires that Program Administrators affirm that the proposal has passed a faculty vote. The APCC is delegating this to the programs, but may want to know what procedures programs are following.

George Mobus said we need a real policy on faculty responsibility for this and asked whether we should formalize some policy. Diane Kinder affirmed that this has been an issue.

The question was raised about courses that might overlap in content with each other and how that would be dealt with in this new system. Katie Baird reported that the old system would not necessarily catch overlaps because no one knows all the curriculum. She said that notifying all faculty of new courses had more potential for catching potential overlaps. George Mobus said that previously other program heads had to sign the curriculum form, which Katie Baird said was still true, but may still not address potential overlaps. She suggested that the email to faculty have instructions for what feedback the committee want from the faculty.

The committee then discussed whether the faculty should just be sent a list of courses, a list of courses with course descriptions, links to course proposal documents, or be given access to the curriculum proposal website. Katie Baird said that the latter could be done, but the previous CC was wary the faculty might try to micromanage the process. Linda Ishem said she didn't think that was likely to be a problem. Janice Laakso said that someone needs to be looking at whether new courses duplicate other courses already on the books. Katie Baird said it was up to the APCC to come up with the policy. Janice Laakso reiterated that it would be important to evaluate the policy at the end of the year.

Diane Kinder said that program administrators now will have more responsibility on making sure proposals conform to the formats required by the Seattle committee. She asked if there were any resources to help them. Katie Baird reported that Jennifer Payne from the Curriculum Committee in Seattle had come to Tacoma to train program administrators a few weeks ago. So all administrators know this is coming. She also reported that the Chancellor's office is hiring someone who will be responsible for curriculum, including the curriculum website where resources could be posted. After APCC approves a proposal, it would be sent on to this person who would send it to Seattle. This person would also attend Seattle Curriculum Committee meetings.

She also mentioned that this person would be doing work on program development and vision on where UWT is going for new majors and programs. She reported that this issue had been raised with JW Harrington about how this intersected with faculty responsibility for academic issues. She said the committee might want to talk to him to get more information about this. Diane Kinder said this person might help walk people through the hoops. George Mobus expressed concern with how this intersected with faculty responsibilities. Janice Laakso agreed that we should ask JW Harrington to come and talk with APC about the role of this new hire and how that intersects with APCC and faculty responsibility.

Katie Baird also suggested that APCC survey programs to see what new programs/majors were in the works so that APC would not be surprised by new programs.

Janice Laakso asked Katie Baird what our official name is now. Katie reported it was “Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee (APCC)”.

The committee continued discussing the specifics of the curriculum review process. The committee requested that we get information from the Executive Council that they collected on the procedures of different programs so that we can review this. Nita McKinley will request this from EC.

The procedure agreed upon was:

- a. Programs will post proposal documents on the current Catalyst site.
- b. APCC chair will send an email to faculty with the name of courses and the catalog description.
  - A clear subject line is needed. We agreed “New Course Proposals” was sufficient.
  - George Mobus and Patrick Pow will work on another system that will allow us to send links to syllabi with to faculty.
  - The new hire in the Chancellor’s office could potentially do this step.
- c. The full APCC will review the proposals for now and we’ll revisit whether we want to form a subcommittee in the future.
- d. The proposals will be added to the APCC agenda as a consent agenda.

Alexis Wilson suggested that we send the program administrators this information so they will know what is happening. We also discussed how the webpages for APC and CC would need to be merged. It was also suggested that this be reported at the next Faculty Assembly meeting.

Submitted,  
Nita McKinley, Chair