

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

February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016

1:30pm – 3:00pm

Gerberding 142

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Review of the minutes from February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016
  3. SCAP report
  4. Curriculum Management
  5. Good of the order
  6. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

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

Helen Garret was introduced to the council as the new university registrar.

**2) Review of the minutes from February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

The minutes from February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016 were approved as written.

**3) SCAP report**

***Old Non-Routine Business***

**#1 – Oceanography**

Stroup explained the request has been held pending respond from the department on several questions.

***Old Routine Business***

**#1 – Bioethics and Humanities**

The request was held by SCAP as they are awaiting additional communication from the department relating to the proposed minor title and contents.

**#2 – School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences**

The request is for revised program requirements for the B.S. degree in Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences. Stroup explained SCAP had approved the request and all inquiries had been addressed by the school.

The request was approved by majority vote of the council.

### ***New Non-Routine Business***

#### **#1 – Department of English**

Stroup explained SCAP has held the request as there are pending questions concerning the proposed Writing minor.

#### **#2 – Asian Languages and Literature**

The request is for a minor in Southeast Asian Languages. Stroup explained the request had been denied by SCAP as the requirements were not language as much as language and culture. The Jackson School of International Studies has a similar minor in language and culture (although the school did sign off on the request).

Discussion ensued. One member mentioned that he didn't believe that a new minor being too much like an existing minor in another department was grounds for disapproval. There are currently majors in different departments that are so similar they can be completed with the exact same courses. For consistency, if there is a policy requiring minors to be different, there should also be a policy requiring majors to be different.

#### **#3 – School of Environmental and Forest Services**

Stroup explained the request has been held by SCAP as more information is needed from the school.

#### **#4 –Computer Science and Engineering**

Stroup explained the request has been held by SCAP until more information can be given relating to the ability of students to successfully progress through the proposed option in Data Science.

There was some discussion, with one member noting there is currently a proliferation of data science-related curriculum at the UW in varying fields. He questioned if there is a wider concern over course overlap or inaccurate course designations. It was noted sign off on the request was granted by the UW Information School. Another member noted sign off on a 1503 does not equate to peer-review of a program's content. Another member clarified that if the request was for an exact replication of existing university course content it would not be allowed.

### ***New Routine Business***

#### **#1 – Department of English**

Stroup explained the request was held by SCAP to request more information from the department.

#### **#2 – Asian Languages and Literature**

Stroup explained SCAP has held the request to obtain more information relating to the department's rationale for the proposed change.

One member explained the proposed request would, if approved, increase the total credits required for the major by one credit, which FCAS should note.

#### 4) Curriculum Management

Van Patten (Director, Student Information Systems UW-IT) briefed the council on a new service being developed for students by UW-IT, titled MyPlan Academic Explorer. She noted her specific goal is to highlight information for the council relating to the data collection process attached to this new service. She used a PowerPoint during her presentation (Exhibit 1).

Van Patten explained MyPlan Academic Explorer will provide an online tool students can use to undertake degree exploration before selecting a major; this will be an extension of the existing MyPlan suite, to be rolled out in the 2016-2017 academic year. She explained surveys show that many students find it difficult to choose a major or otherwise plan out their educational and professional career trajectories, a problem worsened by the fact there is no central place where students can see everything that is offered at the UW. She explained this new service is designed to aid in easier discovery of what the UW has to offer by cataloguing this information, pairing it with brief descriptions of programs, and showing admission requirements and other information.

The focus of the first iteration of this expansion will be on consolidating, organizing, and presenting information on undergraduate programs. She noted there is a student hierarchy of needs (from the student's perspective) that needs to be addressed, including:

- I know the program exists
- The program matches my interests and/or career goals
- I can get into the program
- I will not struggle academically or take too long to complete the program

Van Patten noted UW-IT needs to reach out to every department at the UW to create the tool's content. Each department will need to sign off on the listing of its information. The specific parameters of content to be gathered include a program overview, credential overview, and admission type, as well as a departmental overview, listed advising contact, advising URL, and social media links. Van Patten explained this "succinct information summary" does not currently exist anywhere in the university currently. It was clarified that packaging this information for students is the goal. The proposal for collecting this information includes onboarding each school and college independently, which begins with a meeting at the Dean's level asking Deans to communicate with faculty and planning for the review of content in the department and the college. After these reviews, the content is "batched" for easy consumption of the data, and the vetting process ends with the review of the content by SCAP and FCAS (before the department is given a last look before publishing).

There was some question of if data should be mandatorily reviewed by departments and colleges. After some discussion, the council agreed that departmental review of content is recommended, and college sign off is required before the content is forwarded to FCAS for review. Kramer explained that FCAS can only approve UW Seattle curriculum.

Van Patten explained they will provide a final review at the department level before making information live to students.

A member asked what the student view will be once Academic Explorer is live. The department is listed first and, then, the various degrees (called “credentials”) offered by the department are shown. “Program” refers to majors or minors within a department.

Content vetting process will begin in SCAP and then move to FCAS. Batches of content will begin being forwarded at a monthly frequency, but this can be altered. Van Patten explained they want to have all content vetting finished by the end of summer 2016. Once the first batch is received by SCAP, they can advise UW-IT further on the question of appropriate frequency of batch forwarding.

The council thanked Van Patten for the information and her efforts.

Kramer noted this is a major initiative. She explained it is fundamentally important that faculty have input on their posted content, which is why FCAS is involved. It was noted the service provides real advantages for students.

## 5) Good of the order

S/NS recommended Class B legislation language

Miller explained the Office of the Registrar has now drafted language recommending restrictions for registering into courses under the Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory basis (Exhibit 2). She noted the document includes the existing policy. The recommendation is that undergraduate students would be able to enroll for a maximum of 20 credits under the S/NS basis (in 180 credits), with exceptions granted by approval of the registrar. Miller explained the Registrar’s Office is trying to close the loophole while still maintaining a balance.

Kramer explained the council’s goal is to help the Registrar’s Office devise the appropriate set of words for the policy change to be included in FCAS Class B legislation. It was noted no other policy elements will change besides the added language. There was some concern the restriction might negatively affect students who are attempting to use S/NS appropriately, as a way to stay at the university while they work on strengthening their academic performance. It was noted the appeal process is available for these students.

After discussion, the council agreed with a 20-credit restriction. There was some question of adding a restriction allowing only students of “good academic standing” to register under S/NS. One objection was noted to adding the restriction. Kramer noted they would discuss the motion in SCAP and return to FCAS with the beginnings of Class B legislation.

## 6) Adjourn

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

---

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

**Present:** Faculty: Phil Brock, Don Janssen, Patricia Kramer (chair), Dan Ratner, D. Shores, Sarah Stroup

**Ex-officio reps:** LeAnne Jones Wiles, Robin Chin Roemer, Roy Taylor, Mel Wensel

**President's designees:** Phil Ballinger

**Guests:** Robert Corbett, Matt Winslow, Emily Leggio, Tina Miller

**Absent:**

**Faculty:** Mark Johnson, Robert Harrison, Peter Hoff, Thaisa Way, Daniel Enquobahrie, Champak Chatterjee

**Ex-officio reps:** Aaron Vetter

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – MyPlan AE Data Collection

Exhibit 2 – S\_NS recommendation.docx

**Existing UW Grading Policy regarding the S/NS grading option:**

*Student Governance and Policies, Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 110*

6) S/NS

a) An undergraduate may earn up to 25 elective credits of the 180 minimum credits required for graduation on a satisfactory/non-satisfactory (S/NS) basis. Each instructor shall report numeric grades to the Registrar, who shall convert satisfactory grades (2.0 or greater) to S, and non-satisfactory grades (less than 2.0) to NS for the student's transcript. S/NS shall not be considered in computation of the grade-point average.

b) The student may indicate at the time of registration if she or he elects to take a course on an S/NS basis. The student can change to and from an S/NS option through the seventh week of the quarter through electronic registration. There is no limit to the number of S/NS credits that a student can register for in a given quarter. Withdrawal from an S/NS course is subject to the same regulations as for any other course.

c) An instructor may not submit an S or NS in a course. S/NS grades shall appear on the transcript only in the event that the student is registered on an S/NS basis.

**Recommendation**

It is our recommendation that undergraduate students be allowed to register for a maximum of 20 credits under the satisfactory/non-satisfactory basis, with exceptions possible by approval of the campus Registrar.