

Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee

May 9, 2018, GWP 320, 12:30-2:00pm

**Minutes**

**Present:** Evelyn Shankus, Jutta Heller, Justin Wadland, Andrea Coker-Anderson, Menaka Abraham, Serin Anderson, Patrick Pow, Jane Compson, Anthony Falit-Baiamonte, Jeff Cohen, Lauren Montgomery, Emmett Kang, Jill Purdy, Robin Evans-Agnew**. Excused**: Jarek Sierschynski, Lorraine Dinnel. **Guests:** Sarah Hampson, Ben Meiches, Charles Williams

**I.** **Consent Agenda**

The 4/11/18 meeting minutes were approved.

*Discussion around 50 minute hour – with new time matrix, losing 5 min over a week in that – do we care? No university requirement. Include resolution of discussion – we don’t have one, because there is no requirement.*

**II. New Program Proposals – N/A**

**III. Program Change Proposals**

Law & Policy Major

Updated Capstone: TLAW 496 to replace TPOLS 496

Minor in Public History

Revised requirements (updating course lists and streamlining credits to be on par with other SIAS minors) and updated name from Public History to History. APCC recommends putting the elective list on a website and including “see approved list” on the 1503 form instead.

Psychology Major

Revised Program requirements: add TPSYCH 349 to the Social/Applied Core Course list; remove the Advanced Topics Course list from the catalog so that future updates can be done more easily and efficiently.

**VOTE:** The above program change proposals were approved this month by APCC: Jeff Cohen moved, Robin Evans-Agnew seconded: 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 absent/late, (9 eligible to vote).

**IV. Course Change Proposals – N/A**

**V. New Course Proposals**

**Discussion:**

T LAW 496

* Under General Education Requirements the W for Writing should be checked instead of the C for Composition
* Under Grading/Evaluation it indicates 10% from a supervisor evaluation. This needs clarification – can an external supervisor grade them?
* There is a typo in justification – take out “us”
* There is a typo in the SLOs – remove parenthetical note
* Issue discussed: internship management – what are best practices?
* UWT should share best practices on internship advice. This is not APCC’s purview

T LAW 300 - Course proposers, Sarah Hampson and Ben Meiches, attended to discuss their courses, providing clarification and asking questions about feedback given so far:

* They are proposing T LAW 300 and T POLS 210 together – coupled, supportive, designed to be taught in tandem, but don’t need to be; designed to be iterative, different content and purpose each time, but teaching same skills.
	+ Can be taken once or repeated
	+ Skills: civic engagement; research; communicate about various issues in civic and political life
* APCC had asked for a more specific example syllabus
	+ The final project will depend on iteration and the topic student wants to pursue
	+ A mock trial was used as a sample in the syllabus because it would require a partnership between UWT instructor and local school
	+ Students and instructor will decide what the area of interest is; different every time
	+ Different styles, organizations, scaffold according to needs of class
* APCC recognized that it is a Special Topics course, but asked to see more, in the syllabus, about how students would be assessed; needs to be outlined so they’re not assessed on showing up, for example
	+ Show how assessment is connected to SLO – spelled out clearly in syllabus
* These courses have no prerequisites
	+ They are ready for freshmen
	+ These courses are attached to a Strategic Initiative Fund project addressing:
		- fostering civic engagement
		- the difficulty in creating engaged, sustained conversation on a commuter campus
		- Classes are for all students; skills for all, not just in major, i.e. want to grab random IT person that just needs two extra credits; give students a forum that they wouldn’t have otherwise; by design
* HOURS: They are intentionally flipping in-class and out-of-class time – want more in class time than out of class
	+ APCC asked them to add some explanation by the hours section in UWCM
	+ Very little writing; more speaking; therefore need more in class time
* Grading: APCC warned that anything more than 15% participation would need a thorough explanation
* Have revised syllabus ready to re-submit
	+ Include information on potential readings; examples; requirement to list readings
* The Street Law curriculum is pre-existing – used in high schools – great program; website; work within communities
	+ It focuses on one area of the law at a time
	+ Issue of how broad it can be done so quickly – Street Law curriculum has guidelines for narrowing focus
* It’s important to include in proposal that this course is built on an existing framework
	+ Just describe what framework you’re using – so next instructor knows
* APCC offered “Kudos” to course proposers as they are moving into different style of content and delivery; APCC wants this to be solid because others will look to it in the future; this will become a guideline
	+ Setting up community partnerships – beyond us – want others to be able to do this too
	+ Students can work with Library to look for resources that would support understanding law structure and jargon; accessible materials at an appropriate level
* There is a sweet spot between letting students lead with passion and helping them to not get overwhelmed and “spin out”
	+ Students won’t be picking topic out of the air – they’ll choose between a few choices
* T POLS 210 has already been approved pending the rewording of the participation section of the syllabus

**VOTE:** The T LAW 496 new course proposal was approved this month by APCC: Jeff Cohen moved, Robin Evans-Agnew seconded: 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 absent/late, (9 eligible to vote). The course proposers of T LAW 300 will work with APCC’s feedback and resubmit.

**VI. Graduation Petitions – N/A**

**VII. Policy Issues & Other Business**

**Double Formal Options Committee – Appendix A**

The group met to find out what different academic units allowed/criteria for double formal-options:

* Information Technology does it
* Urban Studies would like to
	+ They have three options
	+ Each would need 20 unduplicated credits

Advisors – noticed some issues:

* Some students have to change majors 3 times in order to add an option
* The transcript doesn’t currently reflect both options taken
* There are some mis-understandings among students; confusing, would like clarity

This group decided it should be up to units about what to do. The group’s mission thus far has merely been fact-finding; no recommendations yet. The Registrar informed APCC that they can make it work on to include double options on a transcript, but would like for it to be formatted/standard.

Fact finding was the first step – What’s the next step?

* How to resolve issue?
* Figure out how to formalize transcript?
* Send findings back to IT and US – make them aware of the issues and highlight discoveries

**Academic Plan Review**

* This is the first time faculty and leadership attempted to think campus wide and coordinate our academic program offerings
* Trying to put in hands of faculty more often
* Previously, programs get through or not based on budget and administrative decisions
* We need to coordinate with VC for Finance and Administration
* The planning team simply sequenced the new programs based on their readiness
	+ 16 new
	+ 12 were ready to move forward – more than what could be done in 3 year plan
	+ Only sequencing – not about approval
	+ APCC is faculty body that gives approval (in conjunction with other administrative bodies)
* Q: How are we factoring in support for General Education Requirements?
* A: It’s not factored into the skinny academic plan. That is part of the approval process these will have to go through; this was only big picture
* Q: Did all of the proposals come out of faculty initiatives? Are there things we’re missing as a campus because there are not faculty who are interested in it (music, for example) right now? How should faculty have a conversation around that?
* A: Adding a new discipline would be mostly impossible because hiring faculty is so limited. But, faculty do need to define their aspirations. We need to have a list of aspirations to include them in conversation. The Strategic Plan was more of a set of values than a plan. We haven’t yet had a conversation to imagine what we want/need here. Let’s build it into the academic planning process!
* Some demands will come from outside of us…
	+ “community/student/market demand and impact” and “campus wide balance of academic disciplines and programs are building on our existing expertise and interdisciplinary emphasis” works in tension with it
	+ Demand gets created – “if you build it they will come” – example of music because we know it has intrinsic value
	+ Both. Not either/or
* There was agreement that this 3 year plan is about consolidating who we are and there is also need to include aspirations for following plan cycles
* Useful to have a picture of the whole campus ask
* Q: Is the process a conveyor belt? What happens if Business proposes a new degree that is not in this plan? Will it be put in the back? Or can it jump the line?
* A: Yep – put in the back. No jumping the line.
	+ This needs to be communicated loudly and broadly if there are 4 years of back up before even considered
	+ Exceptions to this will be programs dictated by the Legislature or if UWT is given large amount of money for a particular program
* The process implications for APCC: your job is to be the gate-keeper – don’t need to hustle through – need to take a good hard look at each
* APCC will need to make decisions about what to invest in, program-wise, and consider balance; use criteria
	+ APCC should have all of the proposals at once before we make decisions about this program over that program
	+ The new PNOI has references within it to calculate demand; proposing faculty have to refer to these data bases to show demand
	+ Programs that come to APCC later would be disadvantaged - how does staging and sequencing work out?
	+ If this program a good fit relative to programs coming along? Lots of considerations – ask smart questions and give good feedback
	+ This gives APCC a lot of power; the way it’s worked over the years was the APCC worked on helping to facilitate curriculum development – that’s different than gatekeeping – even if it’s in line with the code, faculty have not thought of APCC in the gatekeeping way, yet
	+ Faculty need to understand APCC’s role to make it meaningful and democratic process
	+ An APCC member offered a tool to determine positive and negative indicators on a matrix for criteria
	+ Need evaluative criteria so that we can all use them for reference
	+ APCC has struggled under its charged because it feels like it can’t do it without an overarching view; now that it has that view, there is change in function; bringing it into alignment with charge
	+ This makes meaningful representation from academic units all the more important
		- Many faculty are not sure what it means to be serving on these committees – the culture, process, around these important roles – they don’t know how/why these matters
		- Voting meaningfully doesn’t currently happen in many instances
		- EC needs to talk to all programs about how important that is
* Non-voting members on APCC who know about resources – how can they have a voice in the plan?
	+ Need to have a mechanism to ensure resources are factored in

**WAC Update:**

* Finished data collection
* Emmett Kang, ASUWT representative and University Affairs Officer, worked so hard to get student responses -176 students responded!!! Cheers!!!!
* Presented analysis this Friday to WAC – bring to APCC in June and then final report
* Recommend some next steps for another group
* In work plan there are a few things didn’t get to – take report and move on with it – assign another group
* Director of University Writing Program, Asao Inoue, has expressed that he would love to have a committee like this – advisory – representative – can advise him on his work – quarterly
	+ Not sure if we need it to be a standing or Ad Hoc committee – maybe APCC can do it?
	+ Opportunity to connect to person who has administrative responsibility for writing

Due to time constraints, the following agenda items were tabled till the next meeting.

* **UWCC update**
* **Chair Approval Policy - VOTE**
* **Principles that govern APCC (time permitting) – focus on New Course Proposal**

Appendix A:

**Double formal options summary:**

1. **No formal options at all:**

Milgard, Social Welfare and Criminal Justice, Nursing and Healthcare Leadership.

1. **One formal option allowed:**

School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences (SIAS)

SIAS does **not** allow students to double option in their majors. Students must select **one** option of the available formal options for the following majors:

* **Environmental Sustainability**
	+ Environmental Policy and Law, Environmental Communication
	+ Business/Nonprofit Environmental Sustainability
	+ Environmental Education
* **History**
	+ United States History
	+ European History
	+ Asian History
	+ Global History
	+ Self-Designed
* **Politics, Philosophy and Economics**
	+ Politics and Philosophy
	+ Economics
	+ International Studies

SIAS requires that students who choose to double major in two SIAS majors must complete 45 unique credits for each degree. These are manually tabulated and updated in DARS by the major advisors.

1. **Double formal options**

**Information Technology**

The Institute has one degree program, the BS in Information Technology,  that has two formal options or “tracks” that can be followed/earned by students. There is an option called Information Assurance and Security and one called Mobile Digital Forensics. Each option is 20 credits and consists of three elective courses and one core course that is required of all IT students. These options are listed as follows on a student’s transcript:

BS Info Tech.

BS Info Tech: Mobile Digital Forensics

BS Info Tech: Info Assur & Cybersecurity

**Information Assurance and Security Option** (20 credits): T INFO 310 and a minimum of 3 additional courses from approved IAC list. Additional senior electives to total 20 credits can be:

* [**TINFO 441 Network Security**](http://www.washington.edu/students/crscatt/tinfo.html#tinfo441)
* [**TINFO 442 Computer Security**](http://www.washington.edu/students/crscatt/tinfo.html#tinfo442)
* [**TINFO 443 Digital Forensics**](http://www.washington.edu/students/crscatt/tinfo.html#tinfo443)

**Digital Mobile Forensics Option** (20 credits): the mobile forensics series (shown below) and 5 additional credits in senior electives

* [**TINFO 444 Mobile Digital Forensics**](http://www.washington.edu/students/crscatt/tinfo.html#tinfo444)
* [**TINFO 445 Mobile Digital Forensics II**](http://www.washington.edu/students/crscatt/tinfo.html#tinfo445)
* [**TINFO 446 Mobile Digital Forensics III**](http://www.washington.edu/students/crscatt/tinfo.html#tinfo446)

The students have to request a major code change in order to have these options show on their transcript. They can earn both options, but only one will show on their transcript. The major without the options is posted to their transcript like this:

**Problems with the options.**

First, the students have to literally change their majors to add an option. So we have to submit a change of major request to the Registrar’s office if a student decides to pursue an option. If they change their mind, they have to change their major again. This happens as many as three times for a student and it is very cumbersome for everyone involved.

Second, the way the options read on the transcript doesn’t really reflect what they are. They are literally only 3 classes in a particular subject area, added to what is otherwise a diverse curriculum. It looks like a student majored in Mobile Digital Forensics which is not accurate. It also reads like a vocational degree which it is not because the degree incorporates quite a bit of computing theory and not just application-based knowledge.

Third, students often feel they have to choose an option. This is not the case and David and I have to tell students all the time that they can take any electives that interest them and that there is a lot of value to having a diverse group of electives rather than concentrating on one field.

**Urban Studies (proposed)**

**No policy yet, but want to do double formal options.**

**Three options are**

* + Community Development & Planning
	+ GIS & Spatial Planning
	+ Global Urbanism

Coursework for each option has at least 20 unduplicated credits.  The table below shows the total major & option specific credits required and the amount coursework that is unique for each.  Given, this information the policy would likely stipulate a minimum number of credits (perhaps 15 or 20) be taken that do no overlap with another option.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CD&P | GU | GIS&SP |
| TOTAL CREDITS REQUIRED | 63-64 | 61-64 | 86-89 |
| Unduplicated courses (credits) | 20 | 23 | 57 |
| Unduplicated courses (% of total) | 31% | 36% | 64% |
| Unduplicated courses (count) | 4 | 5 | 10 |