

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
Minutes Faculty Assembly: Academic Policy Committee
January 13, 2010
GWP 215 12:30-1:30

Attendees: Deirdre Raynor, Chair; Charles Emlet, Lisa Hoffman, Greg Noronha, George Mobus

Guests: Marcie Lazzari, Vice Chair Faculty Assembly, Jose Rios

Synopsis:

1) Approve the Minutes from December 7, 2009

2) JCEPP: Greg Noronha

3) Guidelines for Assigning Course Numbers at UWT: Jose Rios, Chair Curriculum Committee

4) Foundations of Excellence: Process, Deirdre Raynor

5) Adjourn

-
- 1) The minutes from December 7, 2009 were approved.
 - 2) Joint Council on Enrollment Planning and Policy (JCEPP), Greg Noronha
 - a. Report on financial aid and funding: There are potential cuts to financial aid, which shows very high cuts for transfer students, in the highest need category. Marcie Lazzari, Faculty Assembly Chair, advised that the report comes from the Seattle campus.
 - b. Lazzari discussed Admissions, Grading, and Requirements. Lazzari is researching APC's role in admissions and student appeals issues.
 1. At UW Tacoma, a former committee, ending in 2006-2007 addressed student appeals. At Bothell and Seattle, a subgroup from their version of the APC responds to admissions, grading and other requirements. These issues might be handled in Student Affairs (Derek Levy).
 2. George Mobus noted that APC addressed a particular student's case. Bobbe Miller-Murray updated the APC about this appeal. However, there is no uniform policy in existence at UW Tacoma. So, at the time APC agreed to take on the case, in the meantime of developing a campus wide policy.

Action: Deirdre Raynor, APC Chair advised the committee that this will be addressed at the February APC meeting.

- c. Noronha discussed his role as an APC/ Faculty Assembly member on JCEPP.
 - 1. Lazzari noted that Noronha's faculty voice encourages and develops mechanisms for shared governance.
 - 2. Raynor recalled Johann and Marcie direction to APC about what roles this committee takes.

Action: APC would like Noronha to represent faculty voice for this committee.

3) Guidelines for Assigning Course Numbers at UWT, Jose Rios Chair, Curriculum Committee

- a. The Curriculum Committee approved to adopt the "[Assigning Course Numbers](#)" rules, which come from UW Seattle. Rios asked APC to consider approving these guidelines.
- b. After Noronha noted concerns in differentiating between undergraduate and graduate level courses, Rios suggested that expectations and differences must reflect a qualitative difference. Rios explained that quality of assignments for graduate level courses must emphasize scholarship. Rios offered to work with faculty to develop the appropriate number of hours in class, depending on the undergraduate and graduate level courses.
- c. The Curriculum Committee may start asking for justification for new courses, to ensure that they fit in the program.

Action: The APC unanimously approved to forward the Assigning Course Numbers document to the Curriculum Committee.

4) Process: [Foundations of Excellence](#) (FoE), Deirdre Raynor

- a. FoE is a 1st year self study of freshmen experience at UWT. This study focuses on institutional behavior. Deirdre Raynor and Beckie Etheridge worked together as co-liaisons, with the dimension committees and/or the dimension committee chairs and met regularly with the Policy Center advisor in the study. They identified common themes running throughout the dimension committee reports, and this is how they came up with the institutional imperatives. The dimension committee chairs provided feedback for revising the final report, and incorporated their suggestions for revision in what was sent out to the campus community.
- b. The focus of the FoE study was institutional behavior and not student behavior. This study was designed to allow UWT to look at what the campus is doing well and what it must improve upon, in terms of work with first year students.

- c. The participants were 66 UWT students, faculty, and staff served on the nine dimension committees. The steering committee was made up of faculty, staff, and administrators. The dimension committees played the most important role in the entire FoE Process.
- d. The Faculty were approached for this study. Raynor met with Michael Forman, Chair Faculty Assembly 2008-2009, asked at the Faculty Assembly Retreat in 2008, solicited via email on the Faculty UWT email list in 2008-2009, and asked Student Affairs to be involved.
- e. [FoE Dimensions](#) include Philosophy, Organization, Roles and Purposes, Learning, Transitions, Diversity, Faculty, All Students, Improvement. Each dimension has a set of questions, but each group had the option to develop their own questions. The report is over 230 pages.
- f. Evidence Library: This includes data from the Governor's office. The Dimensions Committee shaped this study. Surveys were open to all faculty, staff, and students. Also, the Office of Institutional Research was involved. The evidence library includes the documents gathered by those involved in developing the first year program at UWT, early correspondence about UWT becoming a 4 year institution, reports from individual programs on work related to the first year, surveys, etc. The dimension committees reviewed this evidence and gathered some of it in order to conduct the self study. Some dimension committees conducted focus group discussions.
- g. Raynor explained that the FoE report is complete and will not be revised. This has been communicated to Faculty Assembly. Possible implementation is based on recommendations from the report (i.e. Bridge Programs and Advising).
- h. This report is 230 pages, with individual reports from each dimension. There are common themes, which come from each dimension report. The purpose is to improve process, communication across units, organization (i.e. Student Affairs, General Education) and dialogue; increase accountability; increase commitment to 1st year experience and programs, and enhance success. FoE is a learning community model, which enhances the 1st year Core Curriculum, both in and out of the classroom.
- h. Lisa Hoffman asked for the FoE conversation to continue, so that APC may address current situations for faculty voice.
- i. Regarding the Action Plan, which is part of the [Executive Report](#), each dimension committee made recommendations; rated high, medium, and low, p. 18.

- j. Administration was not involved in the results from these reports. Raynor was assured from Administration that the study would not have influence from any particular entity.
 - k. Raynor received positive feedback from participants who said this was a valuable experience.
 - l. Star Murray, Faculty Assembly Office Assistant, was instructed by Faculty Assembly Chairs to pass out copies of the Action Plan, which came from the Executive Report.
 - a. Charles Emlet asked about the bolded parts in the Action Plan. Lazzari explained that this version can from a meeting where Beth Rushing is focusing on these specific areas first.
 - m. George Mobus asked for the Chair of the Learning Committee. Raynor explained that this information is available [online](#). Phil Heldrich chaired the learning dimension and there is a full listing of all FoE committee membership in the appendices of the report.
 - n. Raynor explained the next steps. The immediate next steps include developing this philosophy and design courses for the 1st year students. For example, an Undergraduate Advisory Council will focus on the first year, p. 10.
 - o. Lazzari explained that there was not official communication with Faculty Assembly. Raynor explained that she met with Michael Forman, Chair (2008-2009) last year and that Johann Reusch, Vice Chair (2008-2009) could not attend that meeting.
- 5) The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m.