1. Kerry Naish presented a proposal for changes to the B.S. in Marine Biology, UG-MARBIO-MAJOR:  
https://uw.kuali.co/cm/#/programs/view/5fd7a2822e176e002668e8b8

Marine biology has different categories of classes; for some of these categories, the MB faculty propose changing the requirements to assist advisors in tracking:

- Core STEM courses of the MB major are intro physics, chemistry, biology. Remove general chemistry series requirement, 142, 152, 162; add chemistry 223 to the existing organic chemistry requirements. The MB curriculum committee still has not determined the optimal introductory chemistry route but sees this change as an improvement and is not anticipated to negatively affect student recruitment/retention.
- Formally recognizing and accepting BIOL 220 as an alternate to FISH/OCEAN/MARBIO 270: “Aquatic Ecophysiology,” to improve pathways for transfer students or students declaring an MB major in their third year.
- Removing OCEAN 430 from the list of approved courses (course is being replaced and will no longer be offered).
- Removing MARBIO 479: “Research in Marine Biology” under the integrative field experience requirement. Students earn credit for independent research under MARBIO 479, but research does not necessarily meet requirement for field work. Student can still petition for specific FHL courses to count towards the filed requirement.

The committee approved the proposal with no suggested revisions.

**ACTION:**

- Hall/Straus will approve the proposal in the Curriculum Management system.

2. The Committee discussed recruiting a new Curriculum Committee chair and new undergraduate student members for next year:

- Current graduate student members will continue but will need 1-2 undergraduate recruits. We typically ask for recommendations from the Curriculum Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum
Directors, and Student Services staff. The committee suggested modifying the request for nominees by encouraging units to do a pre-filter to carefully examine a fewer number of applications. Units should share opportunity widely with their students, but forward up to two names maximum to be considered by the College Curriculum Committee.

- Need a new Chair because Kristi will be stepping down. The Chair works with Michelle, through a short pre-meeting, series of emails, to set up meeting agendas, and facilitates 3 meetings/quarter.

**ACTION:**
- Michelle will send out undergraduate member recruitment language.

3. Online Teaching Team (OLT) updates:

- Ended winter quarter with several pop-up workshops – limited attendance, but very valuable to those who attended. Started spring quarter with a TA training – well attended. For autumn quarter, leaning toward a multi-day training open to all grad students who expect to be teaching in AY21-22. For winter, spring we will lead shorter, 1- or 2-day pop up workshops. Considering a college-wide C/NC seminar course where students and faculty mentors co-create topics; students do observations of evidence-based teaching methods.

- Discussing how to facilitate a workshop on microaggressions and microaffirmations – what to do when a student, guest lecturer, or instructor says something that might be interpreted poorly. Theater of Equity actors role play, and participants are asked to respond and role play themselves.

- Still discussing what the OLT becomes when campus goes back to in-person learning.

**ACTION:**
- Remind your faculty of weekly OLT office hours

4. Julia Parrish, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, presented a proposal to initiate the process for eliminating the Master of Science in Science for Teachers (MSST) program

- **Background:**
  Almost 2 decades years ago, Helen Buttemer started a master’s degree for biology teachers (MSBT). This was always a very small program, sometimes 1-2 students. The goal was to have teachers gain biology knowledge and skills in service of deepening their ability to teach. The program started in the formal, K-12 education space, then stretched to informal teaching and learning. As Helen was about to retire, a group of faculty, largely in the College of the Environment, requested that the College take on administration of the program. MSBT became MS in Science for Science Teachers, MSST. Liz Nesbitt (ESS) and Tansy Clay (OCEAN) took over the role of creating this new degree granting program. However, there were changes in demand for such a program by Seattle City School teachers and the tuition costs were a barrier. The decision was made to suspend admission to the program before any students ever enrolled. In the intervening years, no one has risen to the fore to restart this program.

- A recent conversation with the College of Education has indicated that although they remain excited about partnering with the College of the Environment, they have no interest in this particular program.

- Parrish received feedback from Martha Groom that UW-Bothell (UWB) might be interested in taking over the program; however, there would have to be budget proposal that came with it.
The College does not currently have the funds, does not expect to get new funds, and the loss of the program will not generate unspent funds.

- If the College does not receive a proposal from a unit to fund and administer MSST, the College will initiate the RCEP process to close the degree program.
- Under the process outlined in the Faculty Code for eliminating degree programs (i.e., Section 26-41: Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures (RCEP)), a Dean’s proposal to close a program must result from “detailed discussion with the affected program(s), and with appropriate faculty advisory committees and students in the school, college, or campus.” The remaining members of the Faculty Steering Committee for MSST will meet on April 8 to vote on whether to proceed with the RCEP process. Parrish requested that the College Curriculum Committee also make a proviso vote to close the program, barring a clear budget proposal to fund MSST.

**Motion:** If another unit does not propose a plan to fund and administer MSST, the program will be eliminated. Committee members voted as follows:
  - Yes: 9; No: 0, Abstentions: 0. Unanimous to close the program pending final discussion with the MSST Faculty Steering Committee.

5. The committee continued the discussion (with Julia Parrish) of a proposed new draft policy on evaluating requests to add the Diversity (DIV) designation to College of the Environment courses:

**Resources:**
- Draft policy statement (see attached)
- Survey created by the ASUW and Black Student Union (BSW) sent to all students to collect student input on the diversity credit requirement: [https://tinyurl.com/DivCreditFeedback](https://tinyurl.com/DivCreditFeedback)
- Presentation on DIV requirement history, current reality, and options for change created by ASUW and BSW: [https://tinyurl.com/UWDiversityCredit](https://tinyurl.com/UWDiversityCredit)

Parrish offered additional context and background:

- There were some questions in the last discussion of the proposed new policy surrounding the need to create a rubric for DIV and not for other general education requirements. While there is value in creating standards for other general education requirements, for DIV, it is imperative at this moment in time that the Curriculum Committee is very serious and critical about assigning DIV within the College. Students are calling for leaders to pay attention to diversity issues, and not lure students into classes with minimal DIV content. The DIV designation has a higher standard because of the social/socio-political/socio-cultural landscape. There is strong support for infusing DIV within many CoEnv courses, even if this does not rise to level of DIV designation. The proposed DIV criteria before the committee are based loosely on the criteria developed by the original DIV implementation task force that developed the requirement
- Unlike other general education requirements, college/school level committees are making this decision/determination, without additional oversight from the University Curriculum Committee. Colleges variably assign DIV, and CoEnv should be out in front of this issue.
- There are student demands for the DIV requirement to be more rigorous, more credits. CoEnv’s thinking can move in parallel with that demand.
- Parrish asked the committee to adopt or amend the proposed rubric.
The committee offered the following questions and comments:

• Will the committee be asked to apply the rubric retroactively? Parrish voiced a preference to critically review all courses that have the DIV designation currently, to understand whether the committee would ask for shifts in content or descriptions/title.

• The title requirement seems overly restrictive. Some existing courses have a considerable amount of DIV content, but JEDI content is not in the title.

• As written, the rubric indicates that each habitat or policy covered in the course should have explicit JEDI material attached to it, which seems overly restrictive; suggestion to amend “each” to “most” or “majority” or “vast majority” or define a percentage. Parish noted that this suggested requirement comes from a course where one case study was DIV-focused, and the rest of the cases were not.

• The DIV requirement is only 3 credits, so it should be restrictive. If students are only taking 3 credits, what do we want them to be exposed to? Where is average student going to go to get DIV requirement fulfilled? Will they have a poorer experience in CoEnv than if they took 3 credits entirely devoted to JEDI?

• The College may not want to be more stringent than UW if the UW is not saying these courses must have exclusively DIV content to count for the designation.

• The UW is allowing for students to earn DIV credit in a course that also counts for general education requirements (e.g., NW). As such, it seems that the DIV requirement is currently designed to support learning about the natural world while simultaneously learning about DIV content.

**ACTION:**

• Committee members will share the proposal with unit-level curriculum and JEDI committees for feedback and suggested amendments before the final Curriculum Committee meeting on June 3; the committee will review suggested amendments and decide whether to adopt the new rubric at the June meeting.

• Hall will prepare an email for committee members to send to unit committees.

Meeting adjourned: 3:52 PM