

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee

Minutes

March 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); Divya McMillan and Paul Carrington, visitors.

1. Consent Agenda

- a. The minutes for 2/14//2013 were not available for this meeting.
- b. The following course proposals were reviewed.

New Prefix and Courses	New Courses	Course Changes
T FLL (Tacoma Foreign Language Learning T FLL 101 Foreign Language Learning 101 T FLL 102 Foreign Language Learning 102 T FLL 111 Elementary French 1 T FLL 112 Elementary French 2 T FLL 121 Elementary German 1 T FLL 122 Elementary German 2	THLEAD 496 Internship	TBECON 420 Intermediate Microeconomic Theory Note: Prereqs were changed from TQS to TMATH. TBECON 421 Intermediate Macroeconomic Theory TBECON 422 Econometrics TBECON 423 Financial Markets and Institutions TCOM 258 Children and Media TEDUC 563 Cultural and Linguistic Contexts for Instructing English Language Learners TEDUC 569 Testing and Evaluation for English Language Learners TEDUC 565 Research and Methods in Mathematics and Science Instruction for English Language Learners

Diane Kinder moved that we approve these proposals. Doug Wills seconded. The course proposals were approved unanimously.

2. George Mobus moved that we approve the change to the Finance Option of Major in Business Administration. Diane Kind seconded this. This proposal was approved unanimously.
4. Proposal for new Minor in Global Honors
Divya McMillan, Director of Global Honors, and Paul Carrington, Program Administrator of Global Honors, joined the committee for this discussion.

Nita McKinley brought up the question of whether Global Honors (GH) as a unit that does not have faculty permanently associated with it could award a minor or other degree. She said she has contacted several people on the Seattle campus has not gotten an answer yet. Divya McMillan said that Ginger MacDonald believed that GH could do this. She believed there were UWS programs that do this.

Andrea Coker-Anderson contacted Tina Miller in Seattle to clarify whether GH could offer a minor. Tina Miller replied that having a minor in Global Honors would be odd; that honors are usually something that is added to a degree, not a degree itself.

Diane Kinder asked what an affiliated faculty is. Divya McMillan said that affiliated faculty are those that teach in the program but that affiliation is not a formal appointment. Divya McMillan said she believed the decision is up to APCC. She said that GH was already operating as a minor and that this would just be a formalization of what they are doing.

Janice Laakso asked whether there was a big need for this minor. Divya McMillan said that some students may want to get as many majors or minors as they can. But others cannot complete Global Honors because they have to have a minor for the program they are in and that would add too many hours for them to complete it. .

George Mobus pointed out that the volume of students was not large. Divya McMillan said it is small now; they have up to 40 juniors and seniors. But having a minor would open it to other majors.

Janice Laakso asked how this would show on the transcript. Divya McMillan said rather than "Global Honors" the transcript would say "Global Honors Minor."

Lauren Montgomery asked what the Global Honors currently requires. Divya McMillan said that it is 24 credits including a capstone; so it is very rigorous. Diane Kinder asked if all students are eligible for the minor. Divya McMillan said students must have a gpa of 3.5 or above, plus they have to submit references and have demonstrated global interests. Diane Kinder said then that it is not an open minor. Divya McMillan said minors have to be accessible to all majors, but they still have to apply and fit the entrance requirements.

Paul Carrington added that most students that are lost because it's too many credits are from Business, Healthcare Leadership, and IT. They would like to return and having a minor would help them. George Mobus pointed out that if there were courses in the professional programs that would fit GH and could replace some of the GH core, then it might be more doable. Divya McMillan said that they have identified some equivalencies in other programs. She also said that studying abroad is no longer a requirement.

Divya McMillan said that the proposal was approved by the GH advisory board. The GH advisory board is well-structured and the members serve a 2-3 year term. She said that the proposal has also been endorsed by the IAS Faculty Council.

Nita McKinley said that the advisory board didn't vote on this, that it is advising. She said she was supportive of the minor, but was concerned that there be clear faculty oversight. She expressed concern about expansion of programs without faculty oversight and APCC needs to discuss this.

At this point in the discussion, Divya McMillan and Paul Carrington left the meeting.

Alexis Wilson asked how other programs do a minor. Nita McKinley said they propose it to APCC using the 1503 and it is voted on by the faculty in the program before coming to APCC. George Mobus said that he had less concern for oversight of GH curriculum because there is more latitude of what it can be about providing it has a global aspect and is interdisciplinary. The faculty that teach in the program have this expertise and these are 300-level courses. The CORE courses are different. They are lower division, which means they need a stronger emphasis on Areas of Knowledge and the faculty that teach are not necessarily qualified to ensure this emphasis because they are whoever volunteers.

Alexis Wilson said that GH should go through the same process any other minor goes through. She asked if GH was in IAS. Nita McKinley said it was not and George Mobus said that they are under the VCAA and are treated as a program.

George Mobus asked if we could solve the problem by having those who have taught in GH be their voting faculty? The advisory board is more about advising. Janice Laakso asked why the proposal went through the IAS Faculty Council? Diane Kinder said there was no official way to approve the proposal because GH is not under IAS. Doug Wills said there were concerns with programs without faculty offering degrees. Nita McKinley noted that GH is like the Office of Undergraduate Education in that respect. They are both cross-program units.

Nita McKinley summed up the discussion by noting that the committee needs several questions answered: 1) What is "affiliated faculty?", 2) Is it even possible for a unit like GH to offer a minor, 3) What would faculty oversight of this type of program look like? She noted that it might be appropriate to put the onus back on global honors to come up with a formal procedure for faculty oversight.

5. Faculty Oversight of Undergraduate Core Program and Global Honors.
(Attached informational documents from George Mobus and Jill Purdy.)

Nita McKinley noted that there is a mandate from the code that faculty must oversee admission criteria, curriculum, and graduation requirements. The Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) doesn't do graduation requirements, but does oversee curriculum. GH does have entry and graduation requirements and oversees curriculum. George Mobus pointed out that oversight of how well the courses in the OUE fit the Areas of Knowledge (AoK). For example a core course that is Natural World (NW) should cover some of the basic concepts of scientific inquiry, yet it might be taught by someone who doesn't know this information. This hasn't been restricted because of the difficulty of finding faculty to teach in the Core. Janice Laakso said that curriculum shouldn't be driven by who can teach.

Nita McKinley argued that we need a broader policy than just one about AoK that covers any program that includes curriculum or any of the other areas of responsibility for faculty. This oversight should include those with expertise that is specific to the program being overseen. So for the Core, experts in the AoK might be important, but not so much in GH.

The committee reviewed how OUE was started and the discussions around trade offs between having faculty teach in Core who are dedicated to Core versus faculty from across campus teaching. George Mobus noted there are currently two faculty members with expertise in writing who are permanently assigned to Core because of the emphasis on writing. But AoK and math are less well addressed.

Janice Laakso asked what do we think a well-rounded student should be able to do? Are there places where this is being discussed? George Mobus said this is what the Core should be doing. Linda Ishem noted that there needs to be Core competencies that are related to the AoK. When she taught in the Core, the I&S instructors did this. Using language like this might help understanding this.

Nita McKinley suggested APCC come up with a policy that was general to any unit or one specific to OUE. For example, we could suggest a policy that any unit that fulfilled faculty responsibilities (admissions requirements, curriculum, graduation requirements) must have a permanent council of faculty with decision making power and whose expertise fits the needs of the program. This faculty council would have to be approved by the APCC. Doug Wills wondered if this type of policy might unleash other degree-granting programs that weren't connected to the regular programs. But Nita McKinley said this can already happen. Diane Kinder said she liked having a policy that is broadly applicable. Patrick Pow noted that both GH and OUE originally had a set of faculty assigned to them, but that this oversight went away over time.

Janice Laakso asked who would approve such a policy? Nita McKinley the APCC would recommend it to the EC and the EC would decide whether it could be voted on there or if it needed to go to the Faculty Assembly.

Nita McKinley will write up a draft proposal and put it on a GoPost website for committee comments.

6. Meeting was adjourned.

APCC 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
4/11/2013	12:30-2pm	3/28/2013	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					

Faculty Oversight of Lower Division Areas of Knowledge and Freshman Core Courses Proposal for an Oversight Committee

Suggestions for items in this document were provided by Dr. Jill Purdy and consideration for the CUSP documents from the Bothell campus. Other considerations came from a review of similar programs in which successes and problems were noted in terms of the governance structure. This committee will face challenges that are unlike any of the other standing committees and so the proposal reflects a different approach than has been used to constitute and operate previous ones.

Background

In academic year 2009/10 the APC determined that the faculty code required regular faculty oversight of the lower division freshman courses (general education) and in particular the Core courses required of all freshmen. The APC started to investigate the possibility of a general faculty committee that would be formed to take on this responsibility, acting as a curriculum committee would in vetting and approving course proposals for the Core classes and providing oversight for ensuring that the areas of knowledge (AOK) indicated on lower division courses were meeting the intent of general education.

Core courses are categorized into the main AOKs, e.g. Introduction to Science as satisfying Natural World requirements. But individual faculty, who volunteer to teach these courses, are not given any specific guidelines regarding conformity to what a 100-level AOK is supposed to cover in its role in general education. The Tacoma campus had no prior history dealing with these issues since it started out as an upper division/transfer campus. 300-level courses were assigned AOK coverage in a haphazard fashion and probably would not have been seen as fulfilling the spirit of general education as it had evolved on the main Seattle campus. The intent of general education in the lower division courses is that they give students a broad sampling of the subjects studied and some depth into aspects of those subjects. A typical example is a Biology 101, or Psychology 101 course that provides a survey of the topics covered in those disciplines with a little exposure to some of the more interesting details (e.g. a lab section for biology).

The faculty code requires that curriculum be vetted by a committee of peers in order to assure various aspects of quality are being met when new courses are proposed and created. Within programs this is handled by the faculty in that program who are most familiar with their overall field and curricular needs. The Core is a little different in that the actual content of courses is left up to individual faculty who may or may not understand the intent of general education in the AOKs. Additionally, Core courses are supposed to involve interdisciplinary components and the term may not mean the same to all faculty. Members of the APCC and various faculty, including those working in the OUE and teaching Core classes have expressed a concern to have a committee of faculty fulfilling the role of oversight for the Core and for lower-division general education requirements. This document outlines a proposal for such a committee.

University Requirements and Explanation of AOKs

Here are the descriptions of the Areas of Knowledge from the UW web page. Note that the examples departments are not meant to be exhaustive, only representative.

Visual, Literary, & Performing Arts

VLPA courses focus on the history, interpretation, criticism, and practice of the arts. The requirement is meant to help the student develop a personal appreciation of the creative process and how it promotes a willingness to investigate the unknown as well as the commonplace, and thus a willingness to constantly debate and refine its modes of expression. Examples of departments that offer such courses include art history, classics, dance, drama, English, music, and foreign languages. Most rhetoric (speech, now part of the communication department) courses also count in this Area.

English composition at the freshman and sophomore levels is considered a skill rather than a literary art, and all the composition courses were deliberately excluded from the VLPA list. Creative writing, verse writing, and advanced composition courses in which prose style is treated as an art form do count toward VLPA, and do not count toward the English composition or additional writing requirements.

Individual & Society

I&S courses include a wide variety of options for the study of human beings and societies. Courses focus on the history, development, and dynamics of human behavior, as well as social and cultural institutions and practices. Departments that offer such courses include American ethnic studies, anthropology, economics, geography, international studies, political science, psychology, sociology, and women studies. I&S includes, from departments such as history, philosophy, and religion, courses traditionally grouped with "humanities" at other colleges.

Natural World

NW courses focus on the disciplined, scientific study of the natural world. The intent of this requirement is to teach students the current status of our understanding of the major concepts in the physical, biological, and mathematical sciences, and the methods by which we have arrived at that understanding. The Area can be divided into three broad categories: the mathematical sciences, the physical sciences, and the biological sciences. Departments that offer such courses include astronomy, biology, chemistry, fisheries, forest resources, mathematics, and oceanography.

The Key Concern

General education is meant to provide primarily lower-division students with a breadth of view of the major disciplines and to help them learn about more of the world than they would otherwise do only taking courses within their chosen major discipline. To that end AOK courses are meant to have a consistent quality with respect to exposing students to the major ideas of various fields along with some exposure to practices in that field. The OUE Core courses are assigned AOK categories and the courses are meant to give entering freshmen a balance of AOK exposure not unlike the survey courses provided by traditional disciplinary departments in 100-level course. At this juncture our campus faculty governance body, and in particular the APCC, cannot attest that this intent is being fulfilled. The faculty should be in a position to attest that lower division courses, both Core and other 100- and 200-level courses that claim AOK coverage are meeting the goal with consistency.

In addition, an oversight committee could be in a position to offer support and guidance to newer faculty who are designing these courses. It is probably advisable that committee members be more experienced in designing AOK courses, for example within their own disciplines, and in treatments that have an interdisciplinary perspective. The culture of UWT governance is to form committees based on representation from programs without regard for special knowledge or talents. It is argued that because this committee is overseeing a particularly important aspect of curriculum that a different strategy for membership ought to be considered.

Name of the Committee

The committee shall be named the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC).

Charge to the Committee

The GEOC will become a standing committee of the Faculty Assembly.

The committee shall (based on CUSP at Bothell):

- Have authority over the development of curriculum for the OUE Core classes,
- Review all lower division course proposals that are intended to cover one or more of the general education areas of knowledge,
- Ensure the consistency of courses that are meant to fulfill the requirements of general education in the areas of knowledge,
- Advise the staff of the OUE regarding the content of Core courses as needed.

Alternative wording (Jill Purdy):

- To provide oversight and support for the first year core including review and approval of curriculum, course offerings, staffing of courses, student learning objectives, teaching evaluation, assessment of learning, and recommendations for improving educational quality
- To ensure coherence of all lower division course offerings to support university educational requirements and objectives and upper division degree offerings
- To support interdisciplinary collaboration across academic units and the effective use of resources

The Chair of the GEOC shall sit as a member of the Executive Council and report to the EC on its activities.

Composition of the Committee

Due to the breadth and interdisciplinary nature of Core courses and the coverage of AOK lower division courses, the committee should have at least one member but preferably two, from each discipline that is in the AOK categories (see the above descriptions for an idea of what disciplines are ordinarily considered within each AOK). For example, ideally the committee would have one member from math and one from a physical science (e.g. biology) to represent the interests of Natural World courses. Similarly, for the other AOKs, the committee should have representation from the included disciplines. This would tend to shift the composition from a typical UWT committee having interests represented by program presence to representation of AOK categories in the interest of the Core and lower division courses.

Additionally, the committee members should have experience designing, developing, and teaching lower division courses within their disciplines so that they are attuned to issues inherent in lower division subject courses such as those involving freshmen students and their problems acculturating to the university. Until the campus has developed a history of providing lower division courses, it would behoove us to seek some of our most experienced faculty for the startup of this committee. It is recommended that qualifications include that the faculty member will have been teaching at least three years prior to appointment, with a strong recommendation that the faculty be tenure-track[1].

With that in mind, the proposed composition would be:

- Two faculty for VLPA
- Two faculty for I&S
- One faculty for Math in NW
- One from a lab-based physical science in NW
- One faculty from each program that offers an undergraduate degree at UWT, preferably people who are engaged in interdisciplinary scholarly activities.

The first six members would be expected to review and comment on courses that are put forward as covering their particular area of knowledge. The latter members would be expected to provide broader perspectives including interdisciplinarity and other issues regarding lower division courses. The ideal composition would include about one third of the members be teaching or have taught in the Core. It would likely be advisable that no more than half of the faculty members be in this category. It would be good to have fresh or other perspectives involved as well.

In addition to the voting faculty on the committee (from Jill Purdy):

- Ex-officio OUE director and/or assistant director
- Ex-officio representation from appropriate staff – how many(?)
- Ex-officio student membership(?) – current or past lower division student(?) Core student(?) More than one(?)

Selection of the Committee Members

Committee members (for the above composition) will be selected by:

- AOK faculty nominated to the EC by academic units providing AOK/Core courses – Representatives then chosen by the EC from the candidates
- General Faculty – elected by program units (those that have undergraduate degrees)
- OUE staff – assigned by the Director of OUE

· Student member(s) by ASUWT or self-nominations to the committee

Terms

All faculty representatives will serve three-year terms, except at the inception of the committee, in which case one third will serve one year, one third two years, and the rest a full three years. Thereafter each new appointment will be for three years. This allows for the staggering of membership to help continuity.

Leadership

It is recommended that this committee be co-chaired by two committee members elected by the committee and one from the AOK faculty, the other from the General faculty. The initial co-chairs should be selected from the one third group that will have 3-year terms.

Action

The APCC will develop a policy recommendation to the EC that incorporates the above proposal (as modified by the committee). Ideally we should have this done in time for the EC to take its action necessary to adopt the policy prior to the end of this academic year. The policy could then be put into effect at the beginning of the 2013-14 academic year.

[1] The purpose of this recommendation is to try to get some of our most experienced faculty engaged in the lower division and to help ensure that committee members will have a breadth of experience and be thinking long-term.

Faculty Oversight of the Lower Division

Below is a rough draft that lists some categories and items to consider based on what was discussed at the APCC meeting on February 14, 2013. The text is purely a starting point for discussion, not a suggestion for what the final proposal from APCC should include.

APCC recommends that a faculty curriculum committee be formed to oversee lower division courses offered by the Office of Undergraduate Education and other academic units at UW Tacoma.

Charge

- provide oversight and support for the first year core including review and approval of curriculum, course offerings, staffing of courses, student learning objectives, teaching evaluation, assessment of learning, and recommendations for improving educational quality
- To ensure coherence of all lower division course offerings to support university educational requirements and objectives and upper division degree offerings
- To support interdisciplinary collaboration across academic units and the effective use of resources

Membership

- Representation from each campus unit that offers undergraduate degrees
- Representation mixed between faculty currently teaching in the Core and those not teaching in the Core
- Ex-officio OUE director and/or assistant director
- Ex-officio representation from appropriate staff – how many?
- Ex-officio student membership? – current or past lower division student? Core student? More than one?

Selection

- Faculty members elected by their academic units in winter and begin service in spring (supports work related to core but prevents new fall faculty from service in their first year)
- Staff member – linked to particular staff positions such as OUE and advising?
- Student member selected by ASUWT or self nominations to the committee

Term

- Members serve three year terms to support continuity but provide new insights
- Members may serve consecutive terms (any term limits needed?)
- Initial committee members terms staggered

Leadership

- A Faculty member elected by the committee?
- Term of service 1 or 2 years?

