

Department Faculty Meeting

January 26, 2016

Noon – 1:20 Gould 208J

Agenda items

12:00 — 12:05	Vote: To approve 1/12/16 meeting minutes	Campbell
12:05 — 12:15	Vote: To appoint Richard Conlin to Affiliate Instructor	Campbell
12:15 — 1:10	Update and Discussion: Revisions to the MUP curriculum – proposal review	Abramson & curriculum committee
1:10 — 1:20	Updates: Other business	Campbell/others

Present

Christopher Campbell, Larissa Maziak, Jan Whittington, Phil Hurvitz, Rachel Berney, Don Miller, Bob Freitag, Himanshu Grover, Bob Mugerauer, Sofia Dermisi, Diana Siembor, Kelly Hostetler, Dan Abramson, Christine Bae

PSA Reps: Michelle Yellin, Ariandne Brancatpo

Vote to Approve 1/12/16 Meeting Minutes

Phil motions, Dan seconds

8 yes 1 abstain 0 no

Vote to appoint Richard Conlin: He would be lead instructor for an upcoming spring quarter course on community development and we would like to appoint him as an affiliate lecturer

Discussion:

Happy to see that he is paired with Jim Diers

His teaching experience is quite dated but he would be conscientious in this role

Letters of reference were pretty light...in the future the relationship of the person providing a reference for ALL potential hires, should be made a bit clearer

Don Miller moves to appoint Richard Conlin as an Affiliate Instructor for spring quarter

Dan Abramson seconds

Vote 10 yes 0, 0

Revision to the curriculum

When departmental committees submit any proposals of change at a faculty meeting, faculty should spend time discussing during the meeting then vote on proposed change in a future meeting

The current proposed changes are in the form of a memo (**below*) rather than a formal proposal and today are meant to be a discussion but is not a formal change proposal

Qing sent out an email with concerns to the proposed changes to the curriculum, which the attached memo addresses

Discussion:

Is it possible to have one studio requirement, then, based on advising and what their specialization is, that a second studio would be on a case by case with the choice to opt out?

If we were to use this model (opting out) how does that bode for planning future studios...ensuring we have enough students

The idea of Individual Study Plan (ISP) is interesting...but is this for all students or only those who opt out of the second studio

How do we handle providing the level of practical learning and technical skills...do we need to re-define what a "studio" is

The current studio requirement is worrisome in that the second one is merely an elective...do we need to be more aggressive in our advising?

The proposed model that would include ISP's would require aligning MUP's with advisors in the first year and would require students to make a specialization/cluster very early on

It would be nice to have a second studio as a requirement with options

For technical focus on transportation...there are many options outside of our department at UW.

What is the target year once we make a decision...fall 2017?

Is it possible to require two studios for all specializations except transportation? Infrastructure as well??

Is it that students are wanting to avoid the studio to avoid high number of credits?

Learning how to work together in a team is part of the professional world. Studios can be helpful in providing this experience.

One concern is that students often don't make final decisions until the last minute. It may be possible to push that decision to the end of the first year and it would make planning the second year earlier.

What are the core things that all planner need to know...how do we implement the more technical, specialized skills to augment these core skills.

If there are more specific tracts available...students will be more likely to decide what one to choose by the end of the first year

If it doesn't make sense for the Transportation tract/specialization to take two studios, can we require two studios for all specializations except transportation?

Additional Information

We will be looking at budgets at the next meeting...what this will look like for the department if the proposed faculty tier system is voted in.

***Memorandum**

To: UDP Faculty

From: UDP Curriculum Committee

Date: January 26, 2016

Re: Proposed Changes to Curriculum, Especially Regarding Studio

The curriculum committee has been discussing possible changes to the current core, specializations, and studio requirements. The review of our departmental studio model is also required based on the faculty decision in AY 2013-14 to try a one-studio requirement for the MUP degree. While this experiment was opposed by some design faculty, that decision was predicated on several factors:

- A shortage of instructors for studio courses, based on teaching allocation and retirements, decreasing the supply of studios offered;
- An increase in the number of students over the previous several years, increasing demand for studio (especially in the second year);
- An administrative challenge to plan for and mount enough second-year studios with the necessary subject variety to support the strong suggestion (if not requirement) that the second studio be in the student's specialization.

In response, the faculty decided to test a model in which students were required to take only one studio, but would be advised to take two. This would, in theory, reduce the number of students in the second-studio group, and better match faculty resources to

student demand.

With two years experience, and after general discussions with students, the Professionals' Council, and faculty members, the curriculum committee notes the following:

- The studio pedagogical approach is a strength of our college, department, and provides high utility to the field of practice, through exposure both to complex, professionally realistic problem-solving tasks and environments, as well as to actual professional career development opportunities;
- We now likely have, especially when a possible curriculum restructuring is considered, enough faculty to teach enough second studios to meet student demand (solving the problem that necessitated the test period of a one-studio requirement);
- There is debate among the faculty about the need or appropriateness of two studios for all students (this is coming from particularly but perhaps not uniquely the Transportation specialization): curriculum flexibility is highly desired.
- The PC was unanimous about supporting the two-studio requirement, and made clear that this included transportation planning;
- Most students other than those in Urban Design, regardless of whatever advising they may (or may not) be receiving, are currently opting for a single studio.
- There is difficulty in projecting demand for second studios due to the lack of a requirement--this has led to studios being cancelled due to lack of enrollment, which is disappointing and inconvenient to students who did enroll as well as clients who support the studio, and damages the faculty's relationships with those clients as well as the department's reputation;
- It may be possible to meet the flexibility desired by transportation faculty (and other faculty, and students generally) through the broader proposed curriculum changes that rely on a student Individualized Study Plan and faculty advising;
- It is possible that students in different specializations could have different requirements (not based on an ISP), though this is administratively and practically problematic;

Taking those points into consideration, the curriculum committee proposes for discussion among the faculty that:

1. The studio decision be made in conjunction with (but perhaps prior to) the larger curriculum changes; this brings more points of flexibility and negotiation to the faculty decision on studio/curriculum;
2. The Individualized Study Plan is implemented as a navigating tool for students and faculty, regardless of the larger curriculum changes;
3. The department returns to a two-studio requirement as a default, while also investigating if it needs to hire outside faculty for studios in some specialized subjects and recognizing that the ISP provides an outlet for students and their advisers who feel strongly about opting out of a second studio.