Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to Order
2. Review minutes from October 26, 2018
3. Chair’s report
4. Review and edit revised language in FCAS Syllabus Guidelines
5. Areas of Knowledge language
6. SCAP report
7. Good of the order
8. Adjourn

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Review minutes from October 26, 2018

The minutes from October 26, 2018 were approved with one correction to the attendance.

3. Chair’s report

The chair announced that the council approved the “1503 Instructions for Substantial Program Proposals” (Exhibit 1) via electronic vote. However, a member moved to make an additional grammatical change to the document under Additional Required Elements for All Direct Freshman Admissions Proposals (sec. ii, pt. 2). The second point stated, “No need to reapply to the University of Washington shift to a new major, save for program-specific students...” The council edited the point to say, “Students must not be required to reapply to the University of Washington to change to a new major, save for program-specific students...” The chair requested that the council vote to approve this change, and the council approved by majority vote.

The chair reported that the College of Arts and Sciences is still working on a direct to division proposal. There are some mixed communications around the proposal’s status and content. The chair will provide more information when it becomes available.

The chair provided a brief update on the enrollment workgroups. All workgroups have submitted their recommendations and the chair has seen three of the four reports, and they present similar recommendations. The chair asked Phil Ballinger, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment, what initial reactions the recommendations have produced. Ballinger responded that the Provost is just now seeing these reports, so no sense yet. He further noted that there will be a response, but it is still in process and development. Additionally, he offered to organize presentations for units as a way to provide additional context.
The chair asked the council to consider again setting term limits on X-grade designations which were discussed in the October 26 meeting. The chair said that the council will discuss and vote on this next meeting.

The chair asked Helen Garrett, University Registrar and Chief Officer for Enrollment Information Services, to speak on the current academic probation period at the next meeting (November 30, 2018). The recommendation is to move academic probation from a 2.5 to a 2.0 which is in line with what other peer institutions use.

The chair also mentioned that the council must establish a formal cut-off for credit/no credit (CR/NCR) designation. Several members agreed having no cut-off was problematic. Members noted that there is clear distinction between satisfactory/non-satisfactory classes, and any formal designation for CR/NCR should follow this. A member asked if this would be the same cut-off for graduate students. The chair and Garrett responded that it was not in FCAS purview.

The chair announced that the council will draft a Class C resolution by winter as a way to publicize new guidelines for student medical notes.

The chair attended a luncheon hosted by the Faculty Senate Chair, George Sandison. At the luncheon, Faculty Council chairs discussed student course evaluations. The chair noted that there was unanimous desire to revise the current evaluation form. A member noted that other institutions have reframed the evaluation as a self-evaluation of a student’s learning. The chair also noted that the chairs will discuss whether student course evaluations should be required for promotion and tenure. Radhika Govindrajan will represent FCAS on the task force.

Lastly, the chair asked the council to consider revising how University reviews Native American and Alaska Native admissions. Currently, the University has certain exemptions for these students, but there are verification steps that may be too burdensome for some students. The chair will check with the Washington Attorney General if this verification process can be amended.

4. Review and edit revised language in FCAS Syllabus Guidelines

D. Shores presented several edits and offered suggestions for how to reorganize the document (Exhibit 2). Lauren Hatchett, Council Analyst, will send the most recent revised document. Shores will revise/reorganize and send back to the chair and Hatchett. Hatchett will resend the revised document to the council for an electronic vote.

5. Areas of Knowledge language

The chair shared that defining Areas of Knowledge is complicated, but the council will continue discussing. Janice DeCosmo, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs and Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Research, provided additional context. With ABB some units are exaggerating the Areas of Knowledge that their courses cover. The council should discuss and define what constitutes covering an Area of Knowledge in a class. DeCosmo suggested that one recommendation or guideline might require at least one course goal include the area of knowledge or that a percentage of the course materials must relate to that area.

6. SCAP report
Non-routine Business

#1 – Anthropology

The request is for a new Bachelor of Science degree in Anthropology.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#2 – Computational Finance and Risk Management

The request is for a new Minor in Computational Finance.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#3 – Neurobiology

The request is for changing the name of the program from Neurobiology to Neuroscience.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#4 – Health Services

The request is for revised admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Health Informatics and Health Information Management.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#5 – Social Work

The request is for revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Social Welfare.

The Department is proposing removing Human Biology and Economics prerequisites, and eliminating early admission.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#6 – Asian Languages and Literature

The request is for revised requirements for the Minor in Japanese.

The request was approved by majority vote to be forwarded for tri-campus review.

7. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

8. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst

**Present:**
- **Faculty:** Sarah Stroup (Arts & Sciences) (chair), D. Shores (Business), Lynn Dietrich (Education), Radhika Govindrajan (Arts & Sciences), Dan Ratner (Engineering), Joel Thornton (Environment), John Sahr (Engineering), Zhi Lin (Arts & Sciences)
- **Ex-officio reps:** Jennifer Payne, Meera Roy, Conor Casey, Angelia Miranda, Dan Feetham
- **President's designee:** Philip Ballinger
- **Guests:** Robert Corbett, Michaelann Jundt, Tina Miller, Robin Neal, Janice DeCosmo, Helen Garrett, Emily Leggio, Scott Fallgren

**Absent:**
- **Faculty:** Phil Brock (Arts & Sciences), Champak Chatterjee (Arts & Sciences), Ann Huppert (Built Environments), Mike Lockwood (Naval ROTC)
- **Ex-officio reps:** N/A

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – FCAS 1503 Substantial Changes_Revised 11618.pdf
Exhibit 2 – FCAS Syllabus Guidelines -- November 9 -- rev 16.docx
FCAS /SCAP 1503 Instructions for Substantial Program Proposals
Prepared by S. C. Stroup 2017; updated 2018

Substantial Program Proposals Include:

- New programs (major, minor, etc.), colleges, or schools;
- Significant changes to the structure of a program, college, or school;
- Significant changes to the admissions process of a program, college, or school, including DtX proposals (see II below)

I. Recommended Order of Contents for All Substantial Proposals

A) 1503 Form, w/ rationale (a brief paragraph is appropriate here; details are to be provided in the Proposal proper), current catalogue copy, and proposed catalogue copy.

B) Proposal, including (in this order)

Preface with Table of Contents

a. General Overview of new or changed [Major, Minor, Program, etc.]
b. Relationship to College [School, Program, Dept., etc.] mission and priorities of both the College [etc.] and the University; include discussion of how the new or changed [Major, Minor, Program, etc.] may affect any other units on campus
c. Demand for new or changed [Major, Minor, Program, etc.]
d. Relationship to Other Campuses (or Colleges, Universities), if such exists
e. Curriculum (as applicable)
   i. Gen. Ed. Requirements
   ii. Admissions Requirements and Process
   iii. Program Requirements, Core Courses, Electives
   iv. Continuation Policy
f. Transfer Students—general policies
g. Faculty Governance—how will faculty oversee the major
h. Student Services—administrative home, services such as libraries, advising, and outreach
   i. Transition Plan—if necessary
   j. Accreditation—if necessary
   k. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
   l. Program Assessment and Monitoring.

Appendices as Needed
II. Additional Required Elements for All Direct Freshman Admissions Proposals

1. Direct Freshman Admissions proposals must include plans for transfer students and currently matriculated UWS students.

2. No need to reapply to the University of Washington shift to a new major, save for program-specific students:


3. Colleges and schools must include a section detailing structure for advising, assistance, and mentoring a student who wants or needs to transfer out.

4. In adherence to Faculty Senate guidelines, selection of applicants must use the University's holistic review criteria.

5. Proposals must include consideration of the impacts of the change on and consultation with the other campuses, as well as communication with Washington State high schools and Community and Technical colleges.

For questions, contact the UW Curriculum Office: https://registrar.washington.edu/curriculum/
DRAFT: Faculty Council on Academic Standards Syllabus Guidelines

Statement of Intent for these Guidelines

The general principal behind providing a syllabus is to provide a clear statement of course content and performance expectations from the beginning of a class. This statement should be available in a durable and accessible form, whether on paper or online. The guidelines below are intended to assist faculty in developing that statement in particular for new and revised course proposals. The first two sections of these guidelines address expectations that reviewers will have concerning a syllabus that is a part of an application for a course. The guidelines are also intended to provide information about best practices and resources for syllabuses in general. The sample syllabi included below provide different examples of how to provide course content, expectations, and resources for students in different disciplines.

Syllabus Format

A syllabus is required as part of the documentation submitted for review of all new course applications and proposals to substantively change existing courses. In addition to forming an important aspect of the review of course proposals, the syllabus is kept by the Office of the University Registrar to aid in documenting the course content for students. Besides its administrative purpose, students depend on the information on a syllabus to understand what is expected of them in the course. While disciplines will vary in the format and specific content of the syllabus, certain components are important for most courses. A syllabus should provide the following information:

1. Course description
   a. Logistics to obtain necessary materials and assistance
   b. Learning/intellectual content
   c. Learning objectives
   d. Characteristics of class meeting (online, lecture-based, seminar, etc.)

2. Course assessment/expectations
   a. Explicit description of types of assessments, including method (points, percentages, etc. for each type of assignment) and general criteria (participation, improvement, content correctness, etc.)
   b. List of assignments with estimated due dates and scope
   c. Overall course grading scale

3. Course policies
   a. Accommodation
   b. Academic integrity
   c. Inclusivity
   d. Technology Protocol
   e. Strategies for success
Policy Statements for Syllabi

**Academic Misconduct:** The university’s policy on plagiarism and academic misconduct is a part of the Student Conduct Code, which cites the definition of academic misconduct in the WAC 478-121. (WAC is an abbreviation for the Washington Administrative Code, the set of state regulations for the university. The entire chapter of the WAC on the student conduct code is [here](#).) According to this section of the WAC, academic misconduct includes

> “Cheating”—such as “unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes”, “Falsification” “which is the intentional use or submission of falsified data, records, or other information including, but not limited to, records of internship or practicum experiences or attendance at any required event(s), or scholarly research”; and “Plagiarism” which includes “[t]he use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgment.”

Departments, schools, colleges and campuses have statements on plagiarism which may be used on a syllabus rather than the definition above. In addition, the University Libraries provides a comprehensive list of tools for understanding and preventing plagiarism.

**Accommodation:** Instructors are obligated to provide reasonable accommodations for students who have disabilities. The university’s Disability Resources Office (DRO) is the campus partner that provides services for students “with either temporary or permanent physical, health, learning, sensory or psychological disabilities.”

Below is the opening paragraph of the statement that the DRO recommends including in a syllabus

> Access and Accommodations: Your experience in this class is important to me. If you have already established accommodations with Disability Resources for Students (DRS), please communicate your approved accommodations to me at your earliest convenience so we can discuss your needs in this course.

The website for the DRO provides other resources for students and faculty for making accommodations.

**Electronics in the Classroom:** There is no general policy on the use of technology (phones, tablets, laptops, etc.) at the university. However, instructors can set expectations about how these devices may be used, including banning them (except in cases where a disability may require use of a device). Any policy on the use of electronics should be included in the syllabus.

**Inclusivity:** Among the core values of the university are inclusivity and diversity, regardless of race, gender, income, ability, beliefs, and other ways that people distinguish themselves and others. The Diversity page provides an overview of the ways the university addresses this value. Inclusivity applied to teaching a course means that assignments and activities should be accessible to all students, including class trips or research in the field. In such cases, alternative assignments should be available to those who need them.
Grading

Participation: Instructors may not grade students solely based on attendance. At the same time, instructors may base a portion of a student’s grade on participation. While most instructors understand the need for explicit guidelines regarding how assignments, such as term papers, will be graded, the rubric for participation can be overlooked. Generally, students cannot be assessed for their behavior and attendance is considered a behavior (See Faculty Resource on Grading (FROG) at https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/grading.html). Students may be assessed on their participation in the classroom as long as the rubric used to assess the quality of that participation is explicit (i.e., described in detail in the syllabus) and not based solely on attendance. In courses where the pedagogy requires that more than 15% of the course grade be based on in-class participation, the assessment rubric is critical so that students understand what is expected of them. Best-practice examples and other information can be found at the Center for Teaching and Learning website: http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/. Since disciplines have differing methods of teaching, there are also different types of grading on participation. Departmental, school and college guidelines may provide specific guidelines about participation for certain types of courses. For the purpose of the syllabus, what is most important is provide clear expectations how participation will be used in the class.

Extra credit: Extra credit is discouraged. Should it be used, extra credit opportunities must be offered judiciously and not as a replacement for primary course material. Such opportunities are to be: fair; that is, available to all students equally; not dependent upon a specific time outside the regularly scheduled class period (e.g. attending a specific talk or performance); not dependent upon the ability to travel to or from specific locations (e.g. attending a specific talk or performance); not dependent upon the expression of political or social interest (e.g. caucusing, voting, watching a debate, volunteering); and made explicit in the syllabus. In no event should extra credit be offered to only a subset of students. If any student in a class cannot feasibly complete an extra credit opportunity, the instructor should offer an alternate but commensurate opportunity to that student.

Peer evaluation: Peer evaluation must be used judiciously and in moderation. Peer evaluation may not replace grading by the instructor; while peer evaluation may be included in a grading rubric, students are not to assign grades to other students.

Incompletes: An incomplete grade (I) is only given if a student is doing satisfactory work up until the last two weeks of the quarter and has furnished proof that the work cannot be completed because of illness or other circumstances beyond the student’s control. The instructor must file a written statement with the head of the department or the dean of the college listing the work that a student will need to do to remove it. For further information on incompletes, see how the Registrar treats them and the university policy on their use.

Medical Notes:

- As a legal matter, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) imposes requirements upon those who possess medical information of others. In particular, identifiable health information falls under “The HIPAA Privacy Rule” which imposes requirements on the possession of health information.
- As a practical matter, student requests for “medical excuse notes” place a burden upon health care providers, in particular to Hall Health.

Instructors are therefore strongly discouraged from requiring medical or legal documentation from a student for any absences. In the case of absences that result in a student missing a course requirement (class activity, assignment submission, exam, e.g.), or of extended absences, accommodations are left to the discretion of the instructor. Accommodations might include, e.g., makeup exams, alternate assignments, or alternate weighting of missed work, so long as the grades for other students in the course are not affected by the accommodation.”

**Students’ Right to Due Process**: Students have a right to due process, particularly regarding academic misconduct. Thus, the syllabus is important in providing students with a clear statement of the instructor’s expectations. For further discussion of what is meant by the students’ right to due see the section of the subject in the FROG.

**Other Resources**

**Disability Resources for Students**: [Disability Resources for Students](http://www.lib.washington.edu/teaching/plagiarism) is housed in Mary Gates and provides a host of resources for students. In addition, [The Access Technology Center](http://www.lib.washington.edu/teaching/plagiarism), providing support for access to university technology, is also located in Mary Gates.

**Faculty Resource on Grading**: The [FROG](http://www.lib.washington.edu/teaching/plagiarism) is a site that has been developed by the Office of Educational Assessment with input from FCAS and the Office on Student Conduct. It provides explanations of the UW grading system, grading on participation, academic conduct, and other topics.

**Syllabus Design**: The Center for Teaching and Learning is a campus resource for all aspects of teaching. They provide advice on course design and syllabus development, beginning with [http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/preparing-to-teach/designing-your-course-and-syllabus/](http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/preparing-to-teach/designing-your-course-and-syllabus/) The UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly has a [webpage](http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/preparing-to-teach/designing-your-course-and-syllabus/) that provides statements for inclusion in syllabi on topics addressed above and others such as classroom civility. The UW Bothell Campus Council on Academic Standards & Curriculum (CCASC) has a list of [FAQs](http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/preparing-to-teach/designing-your-course-and-syllabus/) for developing a syllabus for a course requiring curriculum review. The Chronicle of Higher Education has a website on [syllabus development](http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/preparing-to-teach/designing-your-course-and-syllabus/).

**The Student Conduct Code**: Chapter 478-121 of the Washington Administrative Code is the set of official policies developed to implement the [Revised Code of Washington](http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/preparing-to-teach/designing-your-course-and-syllabus/), which was passed as a statute by the Legislature. The Student Governance Policy, Chapter 209, is on academic misconduct. The code describes instances of misconduct as well as rights to privacy and due process that students have.

**UW Libraries Resource on Plagiarism Prevention**: This useful guide for students is found at [http://www.lib.washington.edu/teaching/plagiarism](http://www.lib.washington.edu/teaching/plagiarism)