

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards**

June 9th, 2017
1:30pm – 3:00pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of minutes from May 26th, 2017
 3. Chair's report
 4. SCAP report
 5. Good of the order
 6. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

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

2) Review of minutes from May 26th, 2017

The minutes from May 26th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Chair's report

Department of Communication

Ratner thanked members from the Registrar's Office and Undergraduate Academic Affairs (UAA) for their help with an issue relating to a consolidation of course offerings in the Department of Communication. COMM 201 and COMM 202 will run as single course in fall quarter, 2017. There was some discussion of how the change may affect community colleges in the region.

Changes for Activity-based Budgeting

It was reported that the Activity-based Budgeting (ABB) distribution parameters will be altered from 60%/40% to 80%/20% (student credit hours/degree majors). It was noted the new parameters will apply to undergraduate programs as well as graduate programs.

4) SCAP report

Old Routine Business

#1 – Art History

The request is for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Art History. The department is proposing the elimination of curriculum patterns that create bottlenecks and other issues mainly related to courses that are no longer taught. The required credit amount for completion of the

major will increase to 60 credits (from 55) as a result of the change. SCAP approved the request after some brief back and forth with the department.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

#2 – Business

The request is for revised program requirements for the option in Entrepreneurship within the Bachelor of Arts degree in Business Administration. The department is proposing the creation of a new course to be added to the allowable electives for the option.

SCAP members approved a revised version of the 1503 preceding the FCAS vote.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

Old Non-Routine Business

#1 – American Indian Studies

The request is for revised admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in American Indian Studies, as well as the minor in American Indian Studies. Proposed changes include restructuring admissions and program requirements, adjusting courses for faculty departures and arrivals, as well as moving from minimum requirements to an open major. The total number of required credits for the major will not change as a result of the proposal.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

#2 – Computer Science and Engineering

The request is for an interdisciplinary minor in Neural Computation and Engineering (proposed by Computer Science and Engineering, Bioengineering, and Neurobiology). The minor would consist of 30 credits, and BIOEN 461 will be the capstone course. Electives span numerous departments; sign off from all departments was given.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

#3 – Mathematics

The request is for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics. The department is proposing consolidation of the standard BS and Comprehensive Option in order to only offer a single Bachelor of Science degree with no options.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

#4 – Mathematics

The department is notifying suspension of the Comprehensive Option they currently offer as part of their initiative to offer a single Bachelor of Science degree with no options. The department was given RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation, Elimination Procedures) instructions.

There was some discussion of the proposal. An error in the corresponding 1503 was discovered relating to the GPA requirement. It was noted the actual GPA requirement will be 2.0 (not 2.5) in item 4 of the 1503 (confirmed by the department).

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

#5 – Asian Languages and Literature

The department is proposing a Bachelor of Arts degree in Asian Languages and Cultures. The BA would be made up of 60 credits. After consultation with SCAP, the department agreed to start the major open.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

#6 – Asian Languages and Literature

The department is proposing a 30-credit minor in Asian Languages and Cultures. They agreed to have 10 of the 30 credits focused on “culture,” and to begin the minor open rather than under minimum requirements.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

#7 – Sociology

The request is for revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology. The department is proposing adding 2.5 cumulative GPA to their admission requirements for courses that apply to the major (the requirement already appears in the program requirements). SCAP approved the request and forwarded to FCAS.

After some discussion, a member put forth a motion requesting the item be held while FCAS inquires with the department into the rationale for the change. The motion was seconded and approved.

The request was held.

#8 – Art

The department is proposing a new Bachelor of Arts degree in Art consisting of 70 credits with four options. Under FCAS policy, options must share “at least 50% common core” (Guidelines for Creating & Changing UW Seattle Undergraduate Degrees Majors, Options, & Minors). Part of the rationale for the change is the planned termination of the Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) program, while additionally, modern art students are expected to possess an increasing amount of art-related skills.

It was noted an RCEP will be required for the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree. The department has indicated an interest in going through with the creation of the new degree before beginning the RCEP process for the BFA. After discussion, it was decided the request should be held in SCAP until paperwork

for suspension of admission to the other art majors (planned for termination) is submitted. The 1503 will return to FCAS for a vote following submission of those materials.

The request was held.

#9 – Design

#10 – Design

#11 – Design

The requests are for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Design degree in Industrial Design, Bachelor of Design degree in Interaction Design, and Bachelor of Design degree in Visual Communication Design.

The department is reducing the total number of credits for each of the three majors to levels between 87-93, as well making some changes to the courses which form part of their core requirements and adding an electives category.

It was noted the current catalog copy states transfer students must take course DESIGN 166, which is incorrect, and must be corrected (via another 1503).

The request was approved by majority vote of council members.

New Non-Routine Business

#1 – Early Childhood & Family Studies

The request is for revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Early Childhood & Family Studies.

The department is proposing campus and online programs be recognized as different programs, as well as a revision to the distribution of electives required for campus students.

The request was approved by majority vote of council members with the proviso that the name of the online program be changed from the name of the on-site program.

5) Good of the order

Faculty Resource on Grading (FROG) update

Ashlei Tobin-Robertson (Assistant Director for Community Standards & Student Conduct) and Elizabeth Lewis (Director of Community Standards & Student Conduct) joined the meeting to present information on changes coming to the Faculty Resource on Grading (FROG), which is an online resource designed to “bring relevant information for the difficult task of assigning grades to student performance in University of Washington courses” (UW FROG website). Currently, the FROG lives on the Office of Educational Assessment website. The site was inspired and sponsored originally by FCAS, and the guests explained this prompted review of draft changes by the body.

As a result of changes to the Student Conduct Code (WAC 478-120 to WAC 478-121), the FROG includes outdated and inaccurate information and will require updating to bring it in line with new code, policies and process. Other updates include visual FROG updates, updating of broken links and outdated information, and revised/new language for the FROG's Academic Conduct section. An exhibit was shown with details on the changes (Exhibit 1).

Members felt that the Office of Educational Assessment should be consulted on the changes before they are implemented. There was some discussion of the section "Grading on Mastery of Content vs. Conduct," and a member questioned if the policy should be posted on the FCAS website. A guest felt the existing location for the policy was appropriate. It was clarified the Academic Conduct section must be officially updated by August 22nd, 2017. After discussion, there was no opposition to approving updating the SCC processes within the FROG.

Lewis and Tobin-Robertson noted they would keep in contact with the council over the changes for the FROG.

FCAS Policy on Service Learning and Internships

Ratner presented a draft of the FCAS Policy on Service Learning and Internships to the council and asked for feedback (Exhibit 2). He noted the main component of the policy is that "prior to UW Curriculum submission of courses and 1503 submission to FCAS, programs/classes involving service learning or internships should:

- ❖ Speak with the internship contact at UW's Career & Internship Center or the service learning contact at the UW Carlson Center to discuss best practices in establishing an internship or service learning component in their curriculum.
- ❖ Contact the UW Office of Risk Services to address liability associated with providing the experience (FCAS Policy on Service Learning and Internships)."

It was noted the policy also includes several questions that should be answered by a unit planning to offer service learning/internships. The questions were read aloud (Exhibit 2).

After discussion of the policy language, two changes were made in the first paragraph (Exhibit 2). A member explained although the policy was designed to apply to programs/courses which make internships a requirement, any 1503 approval or course that includes the terms "internship" or "service learning" should be reviewed under the policy's terms.

Following discussion, the new FCAS Policy was approved by majority vote of members.

6) Adjourn

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

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Dan Ratner (Engineering) (Chair), Phil Brock (Arts & Sciences), Patricia Kramer (Arts & Sciences), D. Shores (Business), John Sahr (Engineering), Lynn Dietrich (Education), Champak Chatterjee (Arts & Sciences)

Ex-officio reps: Jennifer Payne, Donna Sharpe, Meera Roy

President's designee: Philip Ballinger

Guests: Janice DeCosmo, Robert Corbett, Helen Garrett, Tina Miller, Elizabeth Lewis, Ashlei Tobin-Robertson

Absent: **Faculty:** Sarah Stroup (Arts & Sciences), Mark Johnson (Navy ROTC), Daniel Enquobahrie (Public Health), Matthew Taylor (Arts & Sciences), Ann Huppert (Built Environments)
Ex-officio reps: Conor Casey, Jayda Greco, Kaitlyn Zhou

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Proposed FROG Updates.pdf

Exhibit 2 – Policy-v6.0_revised_approved_060917

GENERAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE FROG

Visual FROG Updates

- Update [website](#) to [current branding expectations](#) of the university

FROG Broken Links

- Webmaster: grading@u.washington.edu
 - Not monitored; email goes to Nana Lowell who is no longer at the university
- Policies and Procedures -> UW Grade Reporting (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/policies/reporting.html>)
 - Grade Appeals – written appeal link is outdated; can be directed to https://www.washington.edu/students/genocat/front/Grading_Sys.html or <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/SGP/ScholRegCH110.html>
- Links (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/links.html>)
 - Guide for People with Disabilities is only about ADA Building Access; should be directed to <https://compliance.uw.edu/ADA> (Compliance Services)
 - Student Conduct Code link should direct to <https://www.washington.edu/cssc/student-conduct-overview/student-code-of-conduct/>
 - University Handbook should be renamed to UW Policy Directory and direct to <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/>

FROG Outdated Information

- Update information throughout the FROG to be in line with current times (pagers, overhead transparencies, etc.)
- Students with Disabilities (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/disabilities/index.html>)

Disability Resources for Students
~~448 Schmitz, Box 355839-011 Mary Gates, Box 352808~~
 2096-543-8924 (voice & relay)
~~206-543-8925 (TTY)~~
uwdss@u.washington.edu uwdrs@uw.edu
- Policies and Procedures -> UW Grade Reporting (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/policies/reporting.html>)
 - Matt Winslow is now the Senior Associate Registrar if he is still the contact person for questions about grading options for courses

ACADEMIC CONDUCT SECTION

Academic Conduct (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/index.html>)

The [Student Governance and Policies, Chapter 209 Student Conduct Policy for Academic Misconduct and Behavioral Misconduct](#) explains that admission to the University carries with it the presumption that students will practice high standards of professional honesty and integrity ([SPG, Chapter 209, \(5\)\(B\)](#)). The [Student Governance and Policies, Chapter 209](#) guides the process when a student alleges violates any section of the policy.

[Establishing Expectations for Student Conduct](#)

Faculty play a critical role in defining acceptable student conduct [in the classroom. This section provides more information about suggestions for establishing these expectations:](#)

[Grading Issues Related to Conduct](#)

~~Although court cases focused on inappropriate grading practices are quite rare, grading based exclusively on content mastery (rather than student behavior) is far less susceptible to legal challenge. Faculty are encouraged to consider the learning outcomes of their course(s) in order to grade students on mastery of content versus a student's behavior in the classroom.~~

[Addressing Academic Misconduct](#)

~~This section provides Specific~~ approaches to reduce the likelihood of academic misconduct and to address it if it does occur.

[Student's Right to Due Process](#)

Although faculty at any public institution have responsibility for maintaining a productive learning environment, they may not unilaterally penalize a student for [academic](#) misconduct without first providing the student with [Due Process.](#) ~~the opportunity to appeal an action to an unbiased University authority.~~

[The Disciplinary Review Process](#)

~~The length of time to complete the review will vary according to the level of review required to resolve the issue.~~ This section provides an outline of the student conduct process.

Establishing Expectations for Conduct (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/expectations.html>)

An important first step for faculty in the process of evaluating students is to establish an atmosphere in which all students have the opportunity to learn ~~without distraction~~. As representatives of the University, faculty have the authority, and the responsibility, to establish expectations for academic conduct that allows all students to learn equitably and effectively. Although students are entitled to free expression, this freedom must be balanced against the right of all students to a productive learning environment. To establish an atmosphere where students can learn and have that learning assessed equitably, instructors may ~~forbid limit the use of certain items conduct that distracts other students and/or interferes with their ability to teach, including~~ such ~~things~~ as:

- ~~use of cell phones, pagers, music or video players~~electronic devices, including cell phones, tablets, laptops and smart watches;
- ~~loud talking or whispering~~
- ~~eating and drinking~~
- ~~overly distracting dress or behaviors~~sleeping

~~You cannot limit students' first amendment right to free expression, but the right to a productive learning environment takes priority. So, for example, you could ban a student who comes naked to class or wearing another costume meant to distract you and other students, but you can't ban a student from wearing an earring in their nose or lip or a very short miniskirt simply because you don't like that style or find it disrespectful. It can be challenging to balance a student's first amendment right with supporting a productive learning environment. The Center for Teaching and Learning has some strategies and resources:~~

- Include expectations for student conduct in your syllabus
- Establish ground rules during the first week of class
- Ask students to help establish norms for the classroom

When students ~~violate the rules~~do not meet the expectations that have been established to promote learning, you may ask them to stop their disruptive behavior or leave the class. (From the *SGP, Chapter 209 (7)(D).((7): An instructor has the authority to exclude a student from any class session or other academic activity in which the student is materially disorderly or disruptive.) or obstructive...*) However,

~~You must make exceptions for students for whom Disability Resources for Students has identified accommodations (for example, a pregnant woman or a diabetic might need to eat in your class), and you may not use such behavior as a criterion to determine a student's grade without granting the student the~~ right to due process.

Grading Issues Related to Conduct (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/grading.html>)

You have the right to:

- establish [rules-expectations](#) for your classroom in order to ensure a constructive learning environment.
- [judge-evaluate](#) a student's expertise in your academic discipline. You may grade a student on any of the learning goals you set forth and communicate to that student.

You do NOT have the right to:

- grade a student based on his or her behavior alone.

Grading on Mastery of Content vs. Conduct

The difference between behavior and academic fitness can get quite fuzzy. Part of the learning goals of clinical medicine is the ability to interact effectively with patients and other medical colleagues. Thus, a medical student might be graded on his/her ability to be personable and could be graded down in this area if they were considered rude or difficult to interact with. A student in entry level science courses is responsible for mastering academic skills and content and no matter how rude or difficult this person is, he/she should not be graded down because of it. On the other hand, a student in a course where one of the learning goals is the ability to work and create knowledge in collaboration with other students, might be graded on his/her ability to collaborate.

Grading a student on behavior	Grading a student on course learning goals
Grading a student on attendance in a large lecture course where (attendance is not part of the learning goals for such a course)	Grading a student on attendance in a clinical or lab course where their ability to contribute to a group is part of the learning goal
Grading a student down for handing in papers late in order to punish him or her for lazy or disorganized behavior	Grading a student down on a paper handed in late in a course designed to teach study skills for college

Because students are assured of the [right to due process](#), if you choose to include student behavior as a criterion for course grading, it is important to have clear distinctions between grading on mastery of academic content and grading on conduct. It is equally important to develop strategies for clarifying [expectations for students](#) and for letting students know what opportunities are available if they wish to discuss grading issues with you.

Grading on mastery of content. Because the instructor is universally recognized [as](#) the authority on course content, barring the "arbitrary" or "capricious" assigning of grades, instructors are granted the right to evaluate a student's mastery of content or skills in the academic discipline.

You may evaluate students on any [learning goals](#) established for a course and fail students who do not [need-meet](#) minimal academic standards you have established. As part of due process, however, you are encouraged to develop clear criteria for evaluation, identify those criteria for students, let students know the level of mastery expected for each criterion, and provide opportunities for students to discuss directly with you concerns about the grades you have assigned. In this way, grading cannot be perceived as "capricious" or "arbitrary".

Grading on conduct. Inappropriate classroom behavior should be confronted apart from the instructor's grading practices and processed through the University's ~~regular~~ conduct system (see [Community Standards & Student Conduct](#)). In cases where misconduct is at issue, ~~courts-it is~~ expected ~~that~~ university personnel ~~to~~ follow due process procedures.

~~C~~lass grades should be assigned on mastery of course content unless it can be clearly shown that a direct link exists between the misbehavior and a specific course goal. Under any circumstances, the student's due process rights must be respected. Once again, for cases of misconduct, instructors are encouraged to use the University's formal administrative channels. Unless a student's misbehavior is linked to course goals, an instructor should not use conduct as a grading criterion.

Example: A situation in which no relationship exists between the misbehavior and class goals

- A student who is responsible for and can demonstrate mastery of course content in an entry-level course but is rude and inconsiderate toward the instructor. (The instructor should request that the student change the behavior, and depending on the student's response and the seriousness of the misconduct, use the University's normal channels to ~~charge-consult with Community Standards & Student Conduct about the alleged the student with~~ violation of the Student Conduct Code. An appropriate ~~penalty-sanction~~ would then be determined through that process ~~if there is a violation of SPG, Chapter 209 Policy on Student Conduct Policy for Academic and Behavioral Misconduct.~~)

Example: A situation in which a possible relationship exists between the misbehavior and class goals

- A student appears to demonstrate disorganization and/or lack of motivation by being consistently late to class. (The instructor may request that the student change the behavior because it is distracting to others, or lower the student's grade for any learning that is lost because of the tardiness, i.e., a missed quiz at the beginning of class, inability to participate in an initial group discussion that is essential to the learning in the class, etc.).

Example: Situations in which a clear relationship exists between the behavior and class goals

- A student's inability to communicate effectively in a clinical course in which a major goal is to develop the ability to interact effectively with patients and colleagues. (Mastery of certain communication skills is part of the competency required in the course. As a result, the behavioral competency is stated in the course goals. Attendance in such clinical or laboratory learning environments may, indeed, relate to mastery of the subject.)
- A student's inability to collaborate in a course in which a learning goal is to create knowledge in collaboration with other students. (Ability to collaborate is clearly stated as a skill required in the course, so the student has been given notice; and the instructor can assess student's mastery of collaborative skills.)

Grading on Attendance or Late Submissions

Although, on the surface, lowering grades because of absences or late papers may appear to violate students' rights, instructors may use such conduct in determining grades when students are given notice that such behaviors are criteria for evaluating student performance. To avoid pitfalls, instructors who choose to lower grades for poor attendance or late submissions should provide students with information regarding how and why these behaviors negatively affect course mastery.

Including attendance as a criterion for grading

- Be sure that the students understand that you are not merely grading on attendance but rather whether their learning is affected by absences (it is usually helpful to clarify this both orally and in the syllabus).
- Link attendance to specific course goals (i.e., learning to work in groups, generating insights through class discussion, developing skills under the instructor's supervision because immediate feedback is an important part of the process, etc.).
- Consider making attendance part of a participation grade (i.e., suggest that an important part of the learning in a course comes from interaction among students and the instructor and that students are not experiencing the development of ideas in a course if they are not present for the interactions).
- Let students know what their options are if they wish to discuss grading procedures with you.

Taking off points for late papers

- Be explicit that you are not grading on students' laziness or lack of ability to organize their time.
- Tell students both orally and in the syllabus that assignment due dates serve to determine how well students can master the content in a specified amount of time and that anyone needing extra time (excepting [students with disabilities](#) who may need ~~special~~ accommodations) will be docked points as an indication that they did not show an acceptable level of mastery in the time allotted.
- Let students know that, for the sake of equity and fairness, all students will have the same amount of time to demonstrate their mastery of assignments.
- Inform students that it is essential that they reach acceptable levels of mastery by a certain time so that you can move on to new material or skills.
- Let students know what their options are if they wish to discuss grading procedures with you.

Addressing Academic Misconduct (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/prevention.html>)

You may address academic misconduct by:

- working to **prevent academic misconduct**.
- **talking to students** you suspect of academic misconduct and reaching a mutually agreeable resolution.
- **reporting students** you suspect of academic misconduct.

You may NOT address academic misconduct by:

- unilaterally lowering a student's grade

Prevent Academic Misconduct

Establishing an ethos valuing academic honor and scientific integrity

- Put a statement of ethos in your syllabus.
- Put a handout on [cheating academic misconduct](#) in your course packet.
- Talk about the definition of academic pursuits and the importance of honesty.

Reducing chances for [cheating academic misconduct](#) during exams

- Use [ScorePak](#) forms and testing options to reduce chances of copying in exam situations.
- Use a distinctly colored pen to correct papers and mark clearly with an X through blank questions so students do not fill these in later and come back saying, "they were missed by the grader."

Preventing [plagiarism and fabrication academic misconduct](#) of research results

- Use assignments that require students to show how they have developed their work.
- Have students work in teams arranged by instructor so they can cross-check [each other's](#)' work.

[More suggestions about preventing academic misconduct can be found here on the Community Standards & Student Conduct website as well through the Center for Teaching & Learning.](#)

Talk to Students Suspected of Academic Misconduct

An instructor may inform a student that s/he is suspected of [cheating academic misconduct](#) and [is encouraged to report the matter to Community Standards & Student Conduct or the Dean's Representative for the student's respective school or college. This helps prevent students from engaging in future misconduct and holds accountable those students who continue to engage in repeated misconduct. provide her/him with multiple options \(including accepting a zero as a grade on the assignment\) as long as the instructor makes it clear to the student that s/he has the right to appeal the matter to Community Standards & Student Conduct or the Dean's Representative depending on the College. As the grading sanction under consideration by the instructor increases in severity, the instructor should give stronger consideration to referring the matter to the Dean's Office for processing. An instructor may also choose to exercise other options:](#)

Less severe [sanctions options](#). The options you give the student do not result in [her/his/their](#) failing the course or seriously undermine [her/his/their](#) grade in the course.

Professor: *I noticed that this paper doesn't look at all like previous work I've seen you produce. In fact, it looks quite a bit like a paper I wrote back in 1992. I'm going to give you three options:*

- Redo this assignment and hand it in. [with an X reduction in grade.](#)
- Drop this assignment and let your grade be determined by the average of your remaining course work.
- [If you feel I have charged you inappropriately, you may appeal the matter through the conduct process to the Dean's Representative. \(NOTE: The student conduct process is not an appeal of an instructor's grading decisions. Each school or college has grade grievance procedures in place for a student to grieve a grading decision which is outside of the student conduct process\)](#)

Moderately severe sanctions options. The options you give the student do not result in [her/his/their](#) failing the course but could seriously undermine [her/his/their](#) grade in the course.

Professor: *I noticed your answers are exactly the same as the [person](#) who was sitting next to you and you were witnessed looking over at your neighbor's paper a number of times during the hour. I suspect you of cheating. Here are your options:*

- You can accept a zero on this exam and refrain from any other cheating in this class. If you do well enough on the five [other](#) unit exams you should still pass the course with no problem.
- [If you feel I have charged you inappropriately, you may appeal the matter through the conduct process to the Dean's Representative. \(See above NOTE\)](#)

Severe sanctions. The options you give the student could cause [her/him-them](#) to fail the course.

Professor: *It is clear to me that you have fabricated the results of your marketing research project for this course. (The research project counts for 60% of the course grade.) Here are your options:*

- I plan to give you a zero on this project, and you will fail the class.
- [If you feel I have charged you inappropriately, you may appeal the matter through the conduct process to the Dean's Representative. \(see above NOTE\)](#)

Instructors are encouraged to resolve [cheating-academic misconduct](#) incidents through an informal, agreed resolution process, e.g., the instructor and student agree on the facts, the decision, and the sanction. [\(NOTE: A number of Colleges strongly recommend their faculty report alleged academic misconduct to the Dean's Representative. This is not consistent with College level expectations.\)](#) If no agreement exists, the matter should be referred to [Community Standards & Student Conduct or the Dean's Representative depending on the College the Dean's Representative](#) for resolution. Instructors must be careful not to intimidate students into "agreeing" to a sanction for fear of being referred to [Community Standards & Student Conduct or the Dean's Representative the Dean's Representative](#), however. If no agreement is readily reached the instructor should offer to suspend judgment on the matter and forward it to [Community Standards & Student Conduct or the Dean's Representative the Dean's Representative for a more formal, fair hearing](#) to resolve the incident through the conduct process.

Report Academic Misconduct

When instructors choose to refer cases of academic misconduct, they typically are resolved at the college or school level [in an informal hearing with a conduct meeting](#) within a couple of weeks. A few cases, however, require several levels of disciplinary review and take longer for resolution. [For a list of Dean's representatives and information on reporting Academic Misconduct please see HERE](#)

Students' Right to Due Process (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/dueprocess.html>)

Your Grading Practices and a Student's 14th Amendment Rights (NOTE: This section should be reviewed by the Attorney General's office for accuracy.)

Due process involves providing students with a clear description of course expectations, including grading requirements, as well as behavioral guidelines. Most important, it provides students with the opportunity to appeal conduct-related decisions to a higher University authority. Since an important element of due process is the giving of notice of expected behavior, classroom expectations/criteria should be placed in the syllabus and on your faculty web page and announced during class. This notice is an important prerequisite for establishing fair rules of behavior.

Even though you have the right to confront a student suspected of ~~cheating~~ academic misconduct, as an instructor at a public institution of higher education, you do not have the right to ~~sanction~~ penalize a student without offering ~~him or her~~ them notice of the allegation and an opportunity to be heard. the opportunity to contest the charge ~~allegations and appeal the decision. Regardless of whether the student contests the charge, you~~ You have the right, ~~however,~~ to report a student suspected of misconduct to Community Standards & Student Conduct or the Dean's Representative ~~the Dean's Representative~~. This report will be processed in accordance with the due process procedures outlined in the Student Conduct Code.

- The 14th amendment affirms that the State may not deprive a student enrolled at a public university the right to a public education without proper due process.
- The issuance of grade-related sanctions ~~penalties~~ by instructors must always be accompanied with the offer of due process since giving a student a failing grade constitutes a threat to their enrollment.
- Therefore, unless the accused student is in full agreement with your account of the facts, as well as the grade-related sanction ~~penalty~~ you propose, you are strongly encouraged to refer the matter to the Dean's Representative and the University's disciplinary procedures.

Due Process as it applies to Academic or Behavioral Misconduct

The University's disciplinary procedures are designed to assure that students accused of wrongdoing ~~violating the Student Conduct Code~~ will be treated fairly. To this end, no student may be punished ~~found responsible and sanctioned~~ for any misconduct except through the procedures defined by the Student Conduct Code. ~~(or SGP Chapter 209)~~

Academic Standards

A faculty member may fail a student for failure to meet academic standards. The course itself is the procedure of due process for examining the student's academic fitness. To avoid complaints, instructors are encouraged to define learning goals for each course. Course goals should be presented clearly, along with the means for proving mastery. In other words, the students must be evaluated in accordance with the criteria announced at the beginning of the course.

Students' Right to Due Process (<https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/reporting.html>)

Most cases of academic misconduct cheating are resolved at the instructor at the, college, or school level in an agreed resolution between the instructor and student or through an informal hearing conduct meeting with Community Standards & Student Conduct or the Dean's Representative depending on the College ("conduct officer") a Dean's Representative within a couple of weeks. Occasionally, however, cases are appealed students may ask for review and require additional disciplinary review. These cases may take several months to resolve. Below is a general flow chart of the conduct process.

PLACE HOLDER FOR A FLOW CHART

Step 1: Informal Hearing

In charge: Dean of school or college or the Vice Provost for Student Life

Timeline: Usually less than two weeks

The student is allowed to defend himself/herself against allegations. The faculty member and student need not meet with the person in charge of the informal hearing at the same time. The student is advised of a final decision and may accept that decision or appeal the case to the next level. Cases involving suspension, expulsion, hazing, or restitution of over \$300 are automatically forwarded to the Faculty Appeal Board for administrative review.

- Most complaints are resolved at this level.
- This administrator (the dean's representative) schedules an informal hearing which provides an opportunity for the student to respond to the allegations made against him or her.
- The person initiating the complaint against the student (e.g., the instructor) provides a written account of the incident, and may meet with the dean's representative to provide additional information.
- The student meets face-to-face with the dean's representative to respond to the charges.
- The instructor and the student need not meet with the dean at the same time.
- Everyone involved at this point must represent themselves.
- A student who fails to attend the informal hearing waives his or her right to an informal hearing.
- The student may at any point request a hearing by the University Disciplinary Committee.
- The student has 21 days to appeal any decision reached within the informal hearing.

Step 2: Formal Hearing

In charge: University Disciplinary Committee

Timeline: Usually not less than three weeks

Most of the cases heard by the University Disciplinary Committee are appeals of informal hearings. All parties are allowed to present evidence and argument before the committee. The student is entitled to hear all testimony and examine all evidence that is presented. The student is advised of a final decision and may accept that decision or take the case to the next level. Cases involving suspension, expulsion, hazing, or restitution of over \$300 are automatically referred to the Faculty Appeal Board for additional administrative review or a formal hearing. The hearing should be carried out as quickly as possible but because of procedural rules and scheduling conflicts, the process may take several weeks to conclude.

Few complaints reach this level. Usually when they do it is because:

- a student requests a formal hearing.
- the student has appealed the dean representative's decision and/or sanctions.

The University Disciplinary Committee:

- is made up of three faculty members, three students, and a chair appointed by the President of the University; and
- is responsible for carrying out a formal hearing according to WAC 478-120-095 of Washington State Law and the Student Code.

Step 3: Formal Hearing and/or Administrative Review

In charge: Faculty Appeal Board

Timeline: Months

The Faculty Appeal Board conducts administrative reviews of the procedures and content of cases referred directly by the dean's representative or cases that come forward on appeal from the University Disciplinary Committee. The Faculty Appeal Board also conducts formal hearings in response to student appeals in cases where exceptional circumstances are involved, such as suspension, expulsion, hazing, or restitution of over \$300. After receiving the final order of the Faculty Appeal Board a student has 21 days to appeal.

Very few complaints reach this level. Complaints reach this level because:

- the student requests a formal re-hearing and sets forth the exceptional circumstances that exist (e.g., suspension, expulsion, hazing, or restitution of over \$300); in addition, the Faculty Appeal Board must agree and grant the request.
- based on exceptional circumstances, the Faculty Appeal Board chooses to conduct an administrative review of an earlier decision; this action need not be initiated by the student and involves a review of the written record.
- the chair of the University Disciplinary Committee requests the case go before the Faculty Appeal Board.

The Faculty Appeal Board:

- is made up of seven members of the faculty appointed by the chair of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Faculty Council on Student Affairs;
- completes an administrative review of the cases referred to them, looking both at procedure and content; and
- may conduct a formal hearing with legal counsel and testimony made under oath.

Step 4: Presidential Review

In charge: President of the University

Timeline: Varies

~~The President of the University reviews all decisions for dismissal from the university, and cases from the Faculty Appeal Board that have been appealed to this level.
After receiving the final order from the President, the student has ten days to file a request for reconsideration.~~

Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) Policy on Service Learning and Internships (V4)

FCAS supports efforts to increase the number of internships and service learning opportunities available to students and simultaneously wishes to ensure that these experiences are high quality through adequate unit-level and centralized support. The goal in establishing a policy on service learning and internships is to help academic units position students for success in securing and maximizing these opportunities. This policy pertains to all ~~new~~ degree programs and classes that require-require or include the option for students to work outside the classroom with an off-campus partner.

Prior to UW Curriculum submission of courses and 1503 submission to FCAS, programs/classes involving service learning or internships should:

1. Speak with the internship contact at UW's Career & Internship Center or the service learning contact at the UW Carlson Center to discuss best practices in establishing an internship or service learning component in their curriculum.
2. Contact the UW Office of Risk Services to address liability associated with providing the experience.

Programs are encouraged to consider the following questions prior to UW Curriculum or 1503 submission:

1. How is the program defining the internship or service learning experience?
 - a. How is the focus of the experience centered on student learning?
 - b. How will students be advised and evaluated before, during, and after the experience?
 - c. How will the program work to ensure the rigor of the experience?
2. Are there a sufficient number of relevant internships in the region to support the requirement?
 - a. How will students find these experiences – on their own, from a unit-curated list, through a placement model, etc.?
3. What is the program's bandwidth to manage enrollment and/or facilitate the relationship with the organization(s) hosting the internship?
 - a. How will capacity constraints/resources be managed to ensure the program can meet demand?
4. If an internship/service learning experience is required, and the available opportunities are unpaid, how will the program address the equity challenge for students with limited financial resources?
5. What will the program do in the case of students who are not able to satisfy the requirement?
 - a. If an internship/service learning experience is required, how will the program address students that cannot secure a position?

- b. How will international and undocumented students be accommodated and advised when citizenship presents a challenge to eligibility for a position?

DRAFT

Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) Agenda

1:30-3:00 p.m.

June 2, Gerberding 026

Old Routine Business:

Art History ([ARTH-20161229](#)) Revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Art History.

Background: The Department is proposing the elimination of curriculum patterns that created bottlenecks and classes that are no longer taught.

Action taken 05/19/2017: SCAP requested the department submit a clean copy of the 1503 that does not include revisions.

Update 05/22/2017: Department revised 1503 (p. 4 -6), and provided current (p. 7-9) and proposed (p. 10-12) catalog copy.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Business ([ENTRE-20170418](#)) Revised program requirements for the Option in Entrepreneurship within the Bachelor of Arts degree in Business Administration.

Background: The Department is proposing the creation of a new course which needs to be added to the allowable electives for the option.

Action taken 05/19/2017: SCAP member said 1503 proposal was not required.

Update 05/22/2017: Upon further review this has been placed back on the agenda because a new course is being added to the catalog.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Old Non-Routine Business:

American Indian Studies ([AIS-20170210](#)) Revised Admission and Program Requirements for the Bachelor of Art degree in American Indian Studies, as well as the Minor in American Indian Studies.

Background: The Department is restructuring their admission as well as their program requirements, see attached.

Action taken 03/10/2017: SCAP requested the list of electives for both the BA and the minor, and found that the full 15 elective credits for the minor need to be upper division courses. Additionally, there were some catalog language edits.

Update 05/17/2017: Department has provided revised catalog copy and a list of electives (p.7-9).

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Computer Science and Engineering ([CSE-20170105](#)) Interdisciplinary Minor in Neural Computation and Engineering

Background: An open admission interdisciplinary minor is being proposed by Computer Science Engineering, Bioengineering, and Neurobiology. The minor would be composed of 30 credits, of which BIOEN 461 would be the integrative capstone course.

Action taken 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Update 04/14/2017: Minor requirements revised.

Action taken 04/21/2017: Was not discussed.

Action taken 05/05/2017: Was not discussed.

Action taken 05/19/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS, pending requested approvals of all departments with courses on list of electives, and the removal of a general studies course from the list of electives.

Update 05/30/2017: Department has met SCAPs requests.

Mathematics ([MATH-20170101A](#)) Revised Program Requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics

Background: The Department is proposing to consolidate the standard BS and the Comprehensive Option so they only offer a single Bachelor of Science degree with no options.

Action taken 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 05/05/2017: SCAP requested catalog copy changes and justification for the minimum 2.5 cumulative GPA.

Update 05/11/2017: Department revised catalog copy and responded regarding GPA (p. 6-9).

Action taken 05/19/2017: Approved, but will not forward to FCAS until [MATH-20170301A](#) is approved.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Mathematics ([MATH-20170301A](#)) Notification of suspension of the Comprehensive Option within the Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics.

Background: The Department is notifying suspension of the Comprehensive Option they currently offer as part of their initiative to offer a single Bachelor of Science degree with no options from now on. RCEP instructions have been shared with the Department.

Action taken 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 05/05/2017: SCAP requested the department inform them their timeline for completing RCEP, and would like the department to include additional information in the 1503 (student enrollment and how they plan to handle the transition).

Update 05/11/2017: Department responded, see attached (p.4-6)

Action taken 05/19/2017: SCAP requested an RCEP timeline that aligns with [MATH-20170101A](#)

Update 05/22/2017: Department responded, see attached (p.4)

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Asian Languages and Literature ([ASIAN-20170118A](#)) Bachelor of Arts degree in Asian Languages and Cultures

Background: The Department is proposing a minimum requirement BA in Asian Languages and Cultures. The BA would be made up of 60 credits.

Action taken 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 04/21/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 05/05/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Action taken 05/19/2017: FCAS/SCAP requested the department explain why they are proposing as a minimum requirement major instead of an open major.

Update 05/23/2017: Department responded, see attached (p.5), and catalog revisions (p. 7).

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Asian Languages and Literature ([ASIAN-20170118B](#)) Minor in Asian Languages and Cultures

Background: The Department is proposing an open admission, 30 credit Minor in Asian Languages and Cultures.

Action taken 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 04/21/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 05/05/2017: SCAP requested the minor require a minimum of 10 credits in non-language classes.

Update 05/10/2017: Department revised catalog copy. (p. 5).

Action taken 05/19/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Sociology ([SOC-20170209](#)) Revised Admission Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Sociology.

Background: The Department is proposing to add 2.5 CUM GPA for courses applied to major requirements to their admission requirements as it is already in the program requirements.

Action taken 03/10/2017: No official comments at this time.

Action taken 04/07/2017: SCAP requested edits to the Catalog Copy, as well as clarification of how the min 2.0 grade in courses required for admission would apply to the 5 credits of a Sociology course in progress.

Update 05/01/2017: Department responded, see attached (p. 4-8).

Action taken 05/19/2017: SCAP requested clarity regarding minimum cumulative 2.5 GPA.

Update 05/23/2017: Department responded, see attached (p. 4-12).

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Art ([ART-20170405](#)) Bachelor of Arts degree in Art consisting of 70 credits with four options.

Background: The Department is proposing a new undergraduate major in Art with four options. This is a new 1503 submission replacing [ART-20161207](#), which was in Held Business on the April 21 SCAP meeting agenda.

Action taken 05/05/2017: Was not discussed.

Action taken 05/19/2017: SCAP requested department revised catalog to state 35 credits must be taken at 300/400 level.

Update 05/23/2017: Department revised catalog copy (p. 3-4) and provided a legible chart of courses on the Learning Goals page (p. 5).

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.

Design- ([DESIGN-20160401A](#)) Revised program requirements for Bachelor of Design degree in Industrial Design

Background: The Department is reducing the total number of credits for the major from 103 to 89-93, they are making some changes to the courses which form part of their core requirements, and are adding an electives category.

Action Taken 11/04/2016, 12/09/2016, 01/13/2017, 01/27/2017, 02/10/2017, 02/24/2017, 03/03/2017, 03/10/2017; 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 04/21/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 05/05/2017: SCAP requested information from the department regarding workshop availability, a breakdown of workshop fee, and workshop accessibility for those unable attend. In addition, SCAP requested clarification about portions of the catalog copy submitted with the 1503.

Update 05/25/2017: Department provided information requested by SCAP (p. 4-7) and revised catalog copy (p. 8-9). See Design major application process [responses](#) provided by ASUW.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Forwarded to FCAS with no recommendation.

Design- ([DESIGN-20160401B](#)) Revised program requirements for Bachelor of Design degree in Interaction Design

Background: The Department is changing the total number of credits for the major from 93 to 87-93, they are making some changes to the courses which form part of their core requirements, and are adding an electives category.

Action Taken 11/04/2016, 12/09/2016, 01/13/2017, 01/27/2017, 02/10/2017, 02/24/2017, 03/03/2017, 03/10/2017; 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 04/21/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 05/05/2017: SCAP requested information from the department regarding workshop availability, a breakdown of workshop fee, and workshop accessibility for those unable attend. In addition, SCAP requested clarification about portions of the catalog copy submitted with the 1503.

Update 05/25/2017: Department provided information requested by SCAP (p. 4-7) and revised catalog copy (p. 8-9). See Design major application process [responses](#) provided by ASUW.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Forwarded to FCAS with no recommendation.

Design- ([DESIGN-20160401C](#)) Revised program requirements for Bachelor of Design degree in Visual Communication Design

Background: The Department is reducing the total number of credits for the major from 98 to 89-93, they are making some changes to the courses which form part of their core requirements, and are adding an electives category.

Action Taken 11/04/2016, 12/09/2016, 01/13/2017, 01/27/2017, 02/10/2017, 02/24/2017, 03/03/2017, 03/10/2017; 04/07/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 04/21/2017: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Action taken 05/05/2017: SCAP requested information from the department regarding workshop availability, a breakdown of workshop fee, and workshop accessibility for those unable attend. In addition, SCAP requested clarification about portions of the catalog copy submitted with the 1503.

Update 05/25/2017: Department provided information requested by SCAP (p. 4-7) and revised catalog copy (p. 8-9). See Design major application process [responses](#) provided by ASUW.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Forwarded to FCAS with no recommendation.

New-Non Routine Business:

Early Childhood & Family Studies ([ECFS-20170430](#)) Revised Admission Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Early Childhood & Family Studies.

Background: The Department is proposing campus and online programs be recognized as different programs, and a revision to the distribution of electives required for campus students.

Action taken 06/02/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.