

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

December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015

1:30pm – 3:00pm

Gerberding 26

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Approval of minutes from December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015
  3. SCAP report
  4. Chair's report
  5. ABB report
  6. Good of the order
  7. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

The meeting was called to order by Kramer at 1:34 p.m.

**2) Approval of minutes from December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

The minutes from December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015 were approved as amended.

**3) SCAP report**

***Old-Non Routine Business***

**#1 – Honors**

The request is for revised honors requirements for the Interdisciplinary Honors Program.

After discussion, it was noted potential impacts of approval of this request to College of Engineering students have been briefed to the CEP (Council of Educational Policy in the College of Engineering), and revisions were made to the request by recommendation of that body.

There was no more discussion.

The request was approved by majority vote.

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

The request is for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences.

It was noted there were additional questions pertaining to the request on behalf of SCAP and so the request was held.

## ***New Routine Business***

### **#1 – Bioethics and Humanities**

The request is for revised program requirements for the minor in Bioethics and Humanities.

Due to additional questions on behalf of SCAP, the request is being held.

### **#2 – School of Public Health**

The request is for revised admission requirements for the both the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees in Public Health.

The request was noted to be routine in nature.

The request was approved by majority vote.

### **#3 – Architecture and Construction Management**

The request is for revised program requirements for the both the Bachelor of Arts degree in Architectural Design and the Bachelor of Science degree in Construction Management, as well as the dual degree Architectural Design and Construction Management.

The request was approved by majority vote.

## **4) Chair's report**

Kramer reported University Registrar Virjean Edwards will officially retire effective December 19<sup>th</sup>. She explained Matt Winslow has assumed the position of Interim Registrar for the UW until a permanent replacement is located. Kramer explained Jennifer Payne, University Curriculum Procedures Analyst in the Office of the Registrar, has accepted a new position in the UW Foster School of Business. SCAP will undergo a transition due to this, being as Payne as curriculum analyst was a key member of the subcommittee. FCAS expresses its appreciation to both Edwards and Payne for their many years of effort on behalf of the Council.

Kramer explained UW Curriculum Management (UW CM) is moving forward with the creation of online forms to be used in a paperless curriculum application process. A new feature related to helping students explore potential majors is also being developed. She noted a substantial part of this process will occur in the next six months and information relating to the kinds of degrees offered by UW departments will be gathered. Matt Winslow (Interim University Registrar) explained this degree information will be integrated into the academic online tool MyPlan, and individuals will be able to find degree programs they are interested in online.

Kramer noted she and Stroup (as SCAP chair) have been meeting with the College of Engineering (CoEng) to discuss what is to be included in their 1503 form relating to an expected change in the enrollment method of CoEng undergraduate students. Kramer remarked there is still information missing in the application and varying aspects of it are shifting rapidly, and so she does not have a lot of

concrete information for the council. However, she explained there is enough information available for the Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation (SCAG) to conduct a preliminary review of what is being requested for admission to the College. The preliminary review will occur in the subcommittee's January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, where SCAG will discuss feasibility and "big-picture" questions relating to the CoEng change. Kramer explained she will report back to the council after the discussion.

Kramer noted she held a meeting with Bob Stacey (Dean, College of Arts & Sciences) and Kevin Mihata (Associate Dean for Educational Programs, College of Arts and Sciences) to begin discussing impacts on the College of Arts & Sciences from the expected College of Engineering enrollment changes. Kramer noted the College of Arts & Sciences will be listed as an "affected department" on the CoEng 1503 form due to expected impacts. She mentioned that if FCAS members believe any other school or college will be affected by the CoEng enrollment change, those should be noted so that they may be consulted. DeCosmo noted she believes the College of the Environment will be affected.

Kramer noted one piece of the CoEng revised admissions plan includes freshman applicants to the UW, who indicate interest in being an Engineering major, will be evaluated for admissibility to the College of Engineering, and some of those will be admitted as engineering pre-majors (undeclared engineering students). Kramer explained admissions criteria to majors, for these undeclared students, becomes a continuation requirement (requirements have not yet been set). Kramer explained no other college at the UW admits students to departments in this way. It was noted that students will still apply for individual majors in the college if the change is implemented. She noted she understands why the College of Engineering would seek the change, but would like every member of the council to consider its impacts.

##### **5) ABB report (Exhibit 1)**

Kramer explained the first draft of the FCAS ABB (Activity-based Budgeting) report is before the council for discussion and recommended changes (Exhibit 1). She noted she would like to focus on the "Recommendations" and "Concerns" portion of the document for today's discussion.

###### *ABB report "Recommendations"*

The first recommendation listed in the report is "ABB fund allocations should prioritize support for teaching and learning." There was general agreement this recommendation is sensible and there were no further comments.

The second recommendation included in the report is "ABB should not be used to entirely determine the funding generated by courses and the President and the Provost should recommend this to Deans." There was some question of what "ABB" in the above sentence refers to. It was noted there is a related ABB formula which compresses four different academic related metrics down to a single ABB value or "score," but there was question if that is what is being referred to in the above recommendation. Kramer noted she had the same concern. More specificity is needed when referring to "ABB" within the report, and distinctions drawn between the ABB system and its associated formulas and/or metrics.

There was discussion of solely including the language "less quantitative" vs. "other quantitative" in the second recommendation. A member noted it is likely that administration wants an actual quantitative metric, and so "less quantitative" should not be incorporated. Kramer noted the point of passages "2.a" and "2.b" in the report is to set some boundaries. Janssen explained "2.a" is designed to assure there is

some relation between the percentage of departmental/program budget and a unit's ABB contribution, and "2.b" is designed to put a maximum on that relation (aka. a minimum and maximum percentage).

Hoff pointed out that one purpose of the second recommendation is to decrease the in-class student to teacher ratio, of which there is some evidence the ABB system tends to increase. He noted the recommendation is designed allocate more resources to teaching and that there may be other ways to do this besides the methods suggested in recommendation "2.a" and "2.b". Ballinger noted he likes the approach because it is a clear statement of the focus of the faculty, though agrees it is very defined, and if the point is to initiate a conversation, the points in the recommendation are read as requests which are to be granted or denied. It was noted including the language "one approach might be" before the suggestion to set minimum and maximums may be received in a more conversational tone.

It was noted the third recommendation is related to joint or shared courses, as currently, whoever is the primary owner of a course receives ABB credit for the course. The recommendation was read: "ABB credit should always be allocated to the department that provides the course instructor without regard for which unit is mapped as the "owner" of the course or with which unit it is jointly or collaboratively managed." There was some discussion of how the recommendation is "not perfect," but is a major improvement over the current system nonetheless.

The council discussed the fourth recommendation listed in the draft report: "ABB fund allocations should prioritize support for teaching assistants. Guidelines for when TAs are appropriate given class size and format should be determined at the college/school level through discussions with, college councils, curriculum committees and chairs." Kramer explained there is sense to the recommendation, though it may be harder to make work in large colleges like the College of Arts & Sciences, as it would be a major change in policy. It was noted there is a great deal of variability in how schools and colleges utilize and assign teaching assistants.

The fifth recommendation was noted: "Level of support (students per faculty and/or students per TA), course ratings and "challenge and engagement index" (from the course evaluation results) for large courses offered by a department that (combined) generate half or more of a department's SCH's should be evaluated as part of a department's 10-year review." A member noted someone should be monitoring when colleges grow in size, perhaps at their ten-year review. A member agreed and noted someone should be charged with oversight on this.

The Sixth recommendation was noted: "College/ School councils should regularly and systematically monitor and assess ABB allocations. SCPB should also review the allocations and applications on an annual basis." A member noted college councils and the SCPB review and monitor ABB allocations regularly.

The seventh recommendation was discussed: "Central funding should be available to directly support collaborative or joint degree programs, courses, and students to encourage cross-disciplinary programs and course." A member explained interdisciplinary and dual degree programs and collaborative courses need an extra push because no one dean will do it.

Janssen explained there were other ideas that did not necessarily rise to the level of becoming an official recommendation within the report.

The council held some light discussion on the "Concerns" noted in the report. Some of these include:

- Cohort-based programs with established class size delaying courses
- Increase of new programs that seem to overlap with existing programs
- ABB may be affecting the type of faculty hired, because temporary faculty are easy to utilize on a “on and off” basis

## 6) Good of the order

Miller explained it is becoming a concern in the registrar’s office and undergraduate advising that students are “gaming” S/NS (Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory) courses to remain in stasis at the university. There are few regulations around the use of these courses, which do not count against GPA and also do not count against credits attempted. It was noted students who are overloading on these courses seem to be disproportionately on non-resident visas. It was also noted there is concern that students are registering for courses but not attending them. There was some discussion that there should be a limit on enrollment in S/NS courses while allowing them to still be taken. There was some discussion if other universities have requirements for completion of courses. It was noted a change to UW student regulations would be one way to go about remedying the problem.

## 7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Kramer at 3:01p.m.

**Present:** **Faculty:** John Deehr, Peter Hoff, 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 designee:** Phil Ballinger

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

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Phil Brock, Robert Harrison, Thaisa Way, Daniel Enquobahrie, Champak Chatterjee

**Ex-officio reps:** Aaron Vetter

### Exhibits

Exhibit 1 - Recommendations ABB 121615.docx

## FCAS- DRAFT ABB Recommendations & Rationale

### **“Fostering collaboration in the 21st century” is one of the central initiatives in the university’s Sustainable Academic Business Plan**

On behalf of FCAS, the ABB review ad hoc subcommittee has completed a review of the impact of ABB on the curriculum and pedagogy of the program of Seattle campus of UW since the implementation of the ABB. Of particular concern was the status of collaboration across the campus. We were an ad hoc group that included faculty members from a variety of colleges and schools and staff from undergraduate academics and a student representative. We surveyed deans and chairs via a targeted email invitation to participate; responses from advisors were solicited via the advisor’s listserve. We also received feedback from individuals across the academy who learned of our work via word-of-mouth. Five (30%) deans and 30 (26%) departmental chairs or program directors responded; 41 advisors also responded to our survey. In addition a number of faculty contacted us directly to discuss their experience with the ABB program. Additionally, students came forward from three schools to give their impressions of the ways in which ABB influenced curriculum.

The following summarizes our primary findings followed by our recommendations and our concerns. Our intention remains to refine the ABB program in order to build transparency in budget allocations and foster increased support for teaching and learning, while balancing the negative impacts of implementation.

We hope the President and Provost as well as the Board of Deans and Chancellors will seriously consider our report as they refine ABB Phase 11.

#### Summary of findings:

- ABB appears to work well at the college or school level from the deans' perspectives. Advantages and disadvantages emerge when it is applied at the department or program level and ABB can impact departments / programs even when not applied directly at that level. In extreme cases, ABB has been turned into a point system that penalizes faculty who teach small classes (for pedagogical or curriculum reasons).
- We found far reaching negative effects on curriculum and the undergraduate and graduate experience. As one chair’s comments summarized our overall findings: "The number of unique courses was reduced, and [we] now have more shared courses across specialties and more core courses that are now large lecture courses. " Even though it was not the intent, curricular change in response to ABB is the reality and the University must address these negative effects.
- ABB currently encourages an atmosphere of territoriality to the detriment of collaboration. In implementation it discourages working across colleges, by discouraging faculty from offering joint and cross-discipline courses as well as students from taking courses outside their major department and/or across college / school. In practice, ABB discourages cross-listing and joint courses.
- ABB is not well understood by chairs, directors, advisors and faculty members.

## Recommendations

1. Recommendation: ABB fund allocations should prioritize support for teaching and learning efforts.

- Rationale: ABB funds do not appear to be appropriately supporting teaching and learning, as reflected in the number of large lecture courses without adequate teaching assistants, the increase in the student-to-TA ratio in writing courses, and the decrease in small seminar style courses.

2. Recommendation – Provost and President urge Deans/Directors/Chairs to not apportion funds based solely on ABB. ABB should be one component that influences funding decisions within a College/School, but other less-quantitative aspects must be included.

- Rationale: When funds are predominantly ABB, there is an incentive to base curriculum decisions on funding rather than pedagogy/ curriculum. Most programs need increased funding due to decreased budgets. Many programs have focused on increasing SCH/ degrees for funding reasons as opposed to curriculum reasons.

Though not intended, ABB as a system encourages larger courses and more general course content as opposed to small discussions, seminars, and upper level directed courses.

2a. Recommendation – There should be a minimum percentage of departmental/ program budget based on the unit's ABB contribution and those funds should support quality in teaching and learning. (We suggest at least 25%, but a separate faculty-led investigation should be initiated to determine the appropriate value.)

- Rationale: Department and programs that received 0% ABB-based budget allocations were not always adequately supported for their teaching activities. There are numerous instances of faculty in departments experiencing larger class sizes without seeing any direct benefit to the Department from this extra work. Having some amount of “ABB pass-through” will encourage faculty teaching efforts by demonstrating the reward of that effort. This should have a positive effect on faculty teaching performance and morale.

2b. Recommendation – There should be a maximum percentage of departmental/ program budget based on that department's ABB contribution and those funds should support quality in teaching and learning. (We suggest no greater than 60%, but a separate faculty-led investigation should be initiated to determine the appropriate value.)

- Rationale: Those departments/ programs with 100% ABB-based budget allocations were concerned that factors other SCH and degrees were not valued and that curriculum decisions were entirely based on SCH and degrees. ABB calculations do not account for resource-intensive courses such as laboratories and W-courses.

Additionally, as there is a delayed response in ABB (an increase in this year's SCH and degrees increases ABB funds next year), retaining some funding at the College level for distribution at the Dean's discretion allows the Dean to respond to short-term needs, such as higher than normal enrollment in a course, by providing additional teaching support such as TA's or graders.

2c. Recommendation – Broader pedagogical activities not reflected in SCH should be recognized in ABB funding allocations.

- Rationale – Student Credit Hours do not measure the quality of teaching.
3. Recommendation – ABB credit should always be allocated to the department that provides the course instructor without regard for which unit is mapped as the “owner” of the course or with which unit it is jointly or collaboratively managed.
- Rationale – When ABB funds are allocated based on course mapping rather than on the instructor, there is disincentive to collaborate across departments or to share teaching knowledge across disciplines.
4. Recommendation – ABB fund allocations should prioritize support for teaching assistants. Guidelines for when TAs are appropriate given class size and format should be determined at the college/school level through discussions with, college councils, curriculum committees and chairs.
- Rationale – Some large lecture classes do not get appropriate TA support. Funding TAs improves teaching and learning for undergraduate students in larger courses and supports mentoring of graduate students as teachers.
5. Recommendation – Level of support (students per faculty and/or students per TA), course ratings and “challenge and engagement index” (from the course evaluation results) for large courses offered by a department that (combined) generate half or more of a department’s SCH’s should be evaluated as part of a department’s 10-year review.
- Rationale – Larger courses are an inevitable side-effect of ABB, especially larger courses offered at the lower division and for non-majors. While increasing enrollments in specific courses is not necessarily bad, increased enrollments that are not accompanied by increased support / resources (TAs, graders, etc.) can lead to a decrease in the quality of the course (as evidenced by such metrics as course evaluation ratings and the “challenge and engagement index”). This possibility is a problem that needs to be addressed in order to maintain the academic value of the course(s).
6. Recommendation – College/ School councils should regularly and systematically monitor and assess ABB allocations. SCPB should also review the allocations and applications on an annual basis.
- Rationale: ABB can serve as a more stable and predictable source of income and resources; however, this is only true if there is clear and consistent data and analysis. This approach would encourage faculty on College councils to better understand ABB and budget allocations.
7. Recommendation – Central funding should be available to directly support collaborative or joint degree programs, courses, and students to encourage cross-disciplinary programs and course.
- Rationale – ABB as implemented discourages working across colleges and encourages an atmosphere of territoriality. ABB as implemented is considered a disincentive for concurrent degrees due to the complexities of sharing resources.

## Concerns

Concern – With new scheduling guidelines that will place some courses into less optimal time periods, the SCH of some units may drop. Data should be collected on the effects of the expanded “prime time” and how it impacts ABB allocations.

- Rationale – Units ending up with formerly large courses being scheduled outside of times considered “ideal” by students may face reduced course enrollments, hurting the accumulation of SCH.

Concern – In cohort-based degree programs, minimum class sizes should not be established that are larger than the average cohort.

- Rationale – Minimum class size larger than a degree cohort can negatively impact curricular decisions. It can lead to the teaching of core courses less often or making them into larger courses that do not cover the materials as deeply.

Concern – There appears to be an increase in number of programs, particularly in professional schools, offering undergraduate majors that overlap / compete with existing programs.

- Rationale – ABB effectively encourages schools and colleges to create new degree programs that compete with existing programs elsewhere. A world-class university should encourage collaboration across disciplines as reflected in the following statement: “Fostering collaboration in the 21st century” is one of the central initiatives in the university’s Sustainable Academic Business Plan.

Concern – The weighting factors for SCH / degrees at the undergraduate level may not be optimal at the current 60% / 40%. These weightings should be re-examined.

- Rationale – Numerous chairs suggested that a higher weighting for undergraduate SCH would be preferred.

Concern – The type of faculty we hire is impacted by ABB including increases in temporary instructors, who can be easily re-assigned.

- Rationale – Hires should be based on curricular needs, but increases in the number of temporary faculty have potential long-term impacts on curriculum and quality.