



Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee  
September 23, 2015, WCG322, 12:30-2:00pm

Minutes

I. Consent Agenda – Minutes: 7/29/15

The minutes from the July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015 meeting were accepted.

II. Program Change Proposals

- Non-profit Management Minor, IAS (SHS Division)
- Health and Society Minor , Nursing
- Healthcare Leadership Major, Nursing

Discussion

For the Non-profit Management Minor the program needed to differentiate between the minor and the graduate level so that any undergraduates who took the minor could go into the masters without repeating classes. Other differentiations are the degree of rigor and the entry level. They worked on the minor to make it line up with the graduate program’s requirements. Question: Are the certification and the minor used interchangeably or is it actually a certification program? Answer: It was designed with a certification so that people in the community (who had a BA) could come in and add the certification. The minor and the certification are the same in terms of program and requirements.

The Healthcare and Leadership major seemed straightforward; little to no discussion. For the Health and Society minor the committee asked why one faculty member had voted “no”. Answer: It was a point of principle for the person voting; they questioned if this course should be taken care of in Nursing or in Health and Society. The person was eventually satisfied with the result of it passing at the department level. Question: what does it mean in the justification that they made the “decision to align”? Answer: “Align” benignly meant that what they provide in Health and Society is congruous with the Healthcare Leadership Program; that those two programs aren’t redundant. Question: Why align? Why is that desirable? Why get rid of certain course? Answer: Nursing representative will ask for a more explicit explanation and come back to APCC with that rationale.

Vote

Non-profit Management Minor, IAS (SHS Division): Jane Compson motioned to approve; Steve DeTray seconded; approved – 7 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no

Healthcare Leadership Major, Nursing: Robin Evans-Agnew motioned to approve; Jane Compson seconded; approved – 7 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no

Health and Society Minor, Nursing was returned with questions for clarification.

### **III. New Course Proposals**

TNPRFT 231 Introduction to the Nonprofit Sector

#### **Discussion**

A committee member noted that the tests are weighted heavily. IAS representative will suggest adjustment.

#### **Vote**

TNPRFT 231 Introduction to the Nonprofit Sector: Steve DeTray motioned to approve; Robin Evans-Agnew seconded; approved – 7 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no

### **IV. Course Change Proposals**

TNPRFT431 Community Organizations and the Nonprofit Sector

TNPRFT451 Essentials of Grant Writing

#### **Discussion**

No questions.

#### **Vote**

TNPRFT431 Community Organizations and the Nonprofit Sector: Steve DeTray motioned to approve; Robin Evans-Agnew seconded; approved – 7 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no  
TNPRFT451 Essentials of Grant Writing: Steve DeTray motioned to approve; Robin Evans-Agnew seconded; approved – 7 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no

### **V. Other Business**

Distance Learning Policy recommendation

#### **Presentation**

Chair, Lauren Montgomery, reminded committee that they had discussed drafts of the policy in June and July of 2015. She explained that the Executive Council desires more campus-wide conversation because it is an issue affecting everyone. EC requested that APCC draft questions to be taken back to the units by each APCC representative. She then clarified why UW Tacoma needs to form a DL policy: UW Tacoma used to have the same policy as Seattle (more than 50% in person considered DL), but APCC was notified in May 2015 that Seattle's policy was switching to more than 1% in person to be considered a DL course.

#### **Discussion**

- What was Seattle's rationale?
- Do we want the DL policy to be UWT-wide or unit-wide?
- Do Hybrid courses have special review? Answer: Yes, as long as it's less than 50% in class according to the old policy. We need to decide whether we want to add a review process to hybrid courses with less than 50% online content.
  
- With the new Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedule, some units want to make Friday an online day. Do we need to review all of those changes? Noted: It could create a processing issue

- Students need to know what they're signing up for
  - Part of our mission to use technology innovatively
  - Faculty need to find a balance between freedom to instruct as they choose in using technology, etc., and having accountability to students and their needs
  - It is essential to have training to teach a DL course
  - The Education unit uses a lot of part-time lecturers who may have online classes without training
  - There is a difference between the quality of instructor and the quality of a course proposal
  - With Quality Matters, one creates an entire course online and then puts it through the QM review
  - Student member asked committee to consider student population in this decision
  - Who is the DL policy benefitting?
  - Who may it be keeping out?
  - There is a population of students who need to find access to computers on campus; who may not have access at home
  - Endorsement for the QM review process to be institutionalized
  - We need to show the community how to use technological tools; we need to bring the community with us
  - Do students know the difference between DL and Hybrid courses? Answer: there is confusion for them. They are not as familiar with these terms. They need guidance and transparency
  - Is it true that some online courses are helpful, but that they need to be quality? Answer: yes, and also on-campus involvement is how students here succeed the most.
  - The Hybrid distinction is vague
  - Should we hear from students in various disciplines?
  - Are we discussing the merits of online education? Answer: No, we are asking what constitutes a DL course and how it should be reviewed
  - We should also consider the merits of online education for UW Tacoma and the access issues around online education for our student population
  - If you designate something as an online course, we have a process that has to be followed to insure that there is some sort of quality
- 
- If something is considered a Hybrid course, it seems, at the moment, that it's just a free for all; you can just do what you want and no one has to check on that
  - Are we trying to facilitate letting people do Hybrid courses, or are we trying to guarantee some kind of quality to a Hybrid course?
  - We're a bureaucracy and we're trying to remove impediments to innovation if we can, but at what point do we make sure we're safe-guarding the quality of our product?

## **Decision**

Administrative coordinator will find the copy of Seattle's DL policy and the meeting minutes from when they approved it and send those out to committee. Committee will work in collaboration on drafting questions to take back to their units. Committee will review set of questions in two weeks (Wednesday, October 7, 2015).

## **VI. New Program Proposals**

Master of Arts in Community Planning, Urban Studies

### **Presentation**

Ali Modarres explained that this new Master's degree will sit between the professional degree and the world of planning; making it not exclusive to "planners." It will build on what undergraduates have already learned in Urban Studies: skills, social consciousness/justice, how to communicate planning, and technical training. He explained that Urban Studies scales their programs and has equity and distribution of thesis programs. He said that the MA in Community Planning will be a two year program that builds on the undergrad in Urban Studies.

### **Discussion**

Question: how is this MA different from the MS? Answer: the MS is more technical, with courses using geo-spacial technologies, and a community engagement piece. Whereas, the MA is more comprehensive and provides empowerment to action; the community engagement comes first. They have hired a new person in Urban Studies who specializes in housing. One member observed that there wasn't a course on methodology, though the objectives are methodology heavy. Answer: that won't be a concern for undergrads from Urban Studies continuing into this program because they had previous courses on methodology. As others come into this graduate program who came from a different undergrad program, there may end up being more need for methodology courses. The committee commented and agreed that it was a very well written program proposal. Ali also made a note that he thinks APCC's input should be more at the front of the graduate program proposal process.

Response: we are currently figuring out the graduate program proposal process so that it does have a more logical flow. One member was a very recent addition to the committee and did not get the chance to review the program proposal. Therefore, she abstained from voting.

### **Vote**

Master of Arts in Community Planning, Urban Studies: Steve DeTray made a motion to approve; Jane Compson seconded; approved - 6 yes, 1 abstain, 0 no

## **VII. OIP Re-structure Recommendation**

*Postponed till next meeting due to time constraints*