

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

December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015

1:30pm – 3:00pm

Gerberding 142

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Approval of minutes from November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015
  3. SCAP report
  4. ABB survey results analysis (Exhibit 1)
  5. Good of the order
  6. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

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

**2) Approval of minutes from November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

The minutes from November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015 were approved as amended.

**3) SCAP report**

***New Routine Business***

**#1 - School of Art**

The request consists of a revision of program requirements for all majors within the Bachelor of Design degree. SCAP found the request to be straightforward.

The council approved the request by majority vote.

**#2 - School of Business**

The request is for revised program requirements for the minor in Entrepreneurship that are designed to add a new accounting course as an alternative to a two-course accounting sequence.

The council approved the request by majority vote.

**#3 - School of Aquatic Fishery Sciences**

The request consists of revised program requirements for the minor in Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences.

The council approved the request by majority vote.

***Old Non-Routine Business***

#1 – Human Centered Design and Engineering

It was noted the request is for revised admission and continuation requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Human Centered Design and Engineering degree.

Stroup reported there was a lot of back and forth with this request - though SCAP has now received an updated continuation policy with revised requirements and has approved the request.

The council approved the request by majority vote.

***New Non-Routine Business***

#1 – Integrated Sciences

Stroup noted Integrated Sciences is preparing for an RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures), and the request before the council is for suspension to admissions of the Bachelor of Arts degree in Integrated Sciences. It was noted, however, that nine students have applied for the major and are currently waiting to hear back. Stroup explained the decision has been made that the RCEP for the program will go forward, and the students will be advised to ensure they have a place to “land” within the university.

Kramer noted after questions that the Integrated Sciences program has been in operation for three years with few students. She reiterated the decision to retire the program was made by the College of Arts & Sciences, not FCAS. She explained there is still interest in incorporating a university pathway wherein students may acquire the coursework to become, for example, a high school science teacher – though that is not what this program was doing. It was noted that the program began with this intention but changed since inception.

Taylor (ASUW representative) explained there are other, similar UW programs which students find attractive and which are much more marketable, as well.

The council approved the request by majority vote.

***Held Business***

#1 – Construction Management

It was noted the requested Minor in Construction Management is too restrictive and needs additional consideration, which is why it has been held by SCAP. There was some discussion of course overlap and the need for a minor (or option) in Construction Management, though members agreed the minor in question requires some reworking.

#2 - College of Education

Stroup explained the request is for a Bachelor of Arts degree in Education, Communities, and Organizations, and the major was planned to be competitive. She explained SCAP wants to avoid

starting this major as competitive, and if the program surpasses enrollment of 65 students each year, a competitive designation may be revisited.

### #3 - Aquatic Fishery Sciences

Stroup explained the request is for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences and has been held for clarification.

#### **4) ABB survey results analysis (Exhibit 1)**

Way reiterated the council's charge to investigate the effects of ABB (Activity-Based Budgeting) as defined by the ABB Review Committee and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), noting the charge has been the basis for broadcasting three surveys to members of the UW Seattle community to understand the effects of ABB. She explained the council's charge requests investigation into ABB's effects on "educational collaboration" and noted the results of the survey have been largely viewed in that regard. She noted she plans to highlight some preliminary survey findings for the council.

Way explained that the surveys reveal mass confusion relating to how Activity-Based Budgeting works and what it is meant to achieve. She continued, providing background to the council on individual survey results, beginning with the Dean's survey.

##### *Dean's ABB survey results*

Way explained Deans responses reveal a generally positive outlook on ABB. According to the responses, Deans generally do not find the ABB system to be problematic. She noted five Deans responded to the survey (from a total of twelve at the UWS campus) and responses may be correlated with how much a college's total budget is dictated by ABB. Way explained that the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of the Environment have fewer impacts from ABB. Other takeaway points include:

- A member explained one of the reasons Deans may like ABB is because it has made budgets more predictable
- Way explained TA (Teaching Assistant) funding was difficult to secure, though this trend was admittedly present before the implementation of ABB

##### *Chair's ABB survey results*

Way noted there was a 25% response rate among department chairs for this survey. She explained there are several ways to allocate ABB and some Deans are not as transparent with their chairs about funds as others are. She noted the number of part-time lecturers have increased since implementation of ABB as shown in the chair's survey results, though again this may be viewed as correlation and not necessarily causation.

Way explained TA issues came up much more often than was expected in results. She noted it is also clear that departments are offering many larger classes since the implementation of ABB. Way clarified this was not the intention of ABB, but it is one of the consequences, as evidence appears in all results across all surveys.

Way explained there is evidence of concern and cautiousness in creating or continuing joint or collaborative courses because of ABB-related disincentives.

#### *Advisor's ABB survey results*

Way explained UWS advisors reported more predictability and stability after implementation of ABB. A number of advisors reported an increase in student advising, and only two advisors reported course eliminations. Way explained there is a palpable fear that discussion courses will be removed due to their small size and low monetary incentive under ABB. A member noted this is an example of how ABB has affected curriculum in negative ways.

Way explained there are some pertinent quotes in the Advisor's ABB survey results that council members might read to get a better sense of the kinds of responses received.

#### *Council discussion and survey response themes*

Way explained that how ABB funds are distributed by Deans varies by College/School. She noted that in some cases, ABB money is used to pay faculty salaries. She noted in response to varying practice, the university should outline best practices for disbursement of ABB funds.

The council began discussion of a document entitled "Policy on Faculty Reimbursement for Teaching-Related Activities and Grant-Writing" (Exhibit 1). Kramer explained that it shows faculty teaching loads required to receive full salaries. She explained there is talk within departments of incorporating a "target" Student Credit Hours (SCH) amount for faculty. She highlighted how practices such as these affect quality of courses. It was noted that the faculty in the department of the reimbursement document (Exhibit 1) were not part-time, but full-time non-tenure track and, therefore, paid per course.

Way explained it is becoming difficult for faculty to teach small courses. She noted that there is incentive to teach larger courses. DeCosmo explained classes needing more students than the amount of students currently within the degree cohort is a major problem, as the course cannot be offered as often as appropriate. DeCosmo explained TA salaries have increased, so even less TAs are available for larger courses that generally need them.

Way explained the ABB Task Group had the impression that there was discouragement at the college level for students outside of a college to enroll in that college's courses, as that student would be taking the seat of the college's own students and the college would lose out on ABB revenue. Ballinger agreed and noted one student actually referred to ABB as the reason ([they were given) for their exclusion from a course. It was noted this practice has been confirmed through survey results.

Way explained curriculums which depend on smaller classes are being hurt by ABB because their core classes are so small that revenue streams are not sustainable.

Way concluded that ABB was implemented to make budgeting more transparent, and to make money follow the teaching activity. However, unintended consequences have occurred. Kramer noted the reasoning is fine for the implementation of ABB, though, unintended consequences now need to be assessed and fixed, so that the system may function healthier.

#### *Making use of survey data*

Ballinger asked how the FCAS ABB report and its recommendations would be disseminated to executive university leadership. Way explained she believes the recommendations need to go to the faculty at-large and to the Provost, as well as the SCPB and the ABB Review Committee.

DeCosmo noted if the main goal of ABB was for the budget process to be made transparent, then this was not achieved, as many have stated they do not understand ABB. Way agreed and added that some misunderstand ABB, yet still make changes at varying levels which affect others and the overall health of the university.

Way asked about ways to word recommendations from the council on these matters, as she would like to formalize some recommendations so the ABB Subcommittee may begin a report. She noted she wanted to talk about the proliferation of large classes and wonders how to state this problem as a recommendation.

A member explained ABB should not drive or dictate university curriculum, but that is how it is currently weighted. Kramer noted more numbers need to be devised as additional metrics. Hoff explained there needs to be a way to value the differences in instruction, as using a single number (SCH) does not capture every perspective. Janssen explained there are differences in evaluative measures and the time required for these, such as the difference in work involved in evaluating math vs. writing, which is not accounted for by ABB currently.

Chatterjee explained that teaching without TAs makes grading difficult, and this is a good argument to include in the recommendations. He explained departments need some discretionary funding, so various instructional types are not so severely incentivized/disincentivized.

DeCosmo explained that some component of ABB should be used to expand the quality of instruction.

Kramer explained that Way and her group need recommendations and council members should send their recommendations in writing, electronically. She explained the council will address the ABB report in their next meeting. She reminded everyone that the recommendations need to correspond with "academic standards." She asked for questions on this. Way added it would be helpful if the recommendations were addressed to the university as a whole and not individual units or departments.

## **5) Good of the order**

Brock reported the names of several students who were chosen for the Honors award by the Subcommittee on Honors.

## **6) Adjourn**

Kramer adjourned the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

---

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

**Present:**                      **Faculty:** Phil Brock, John Deehr, Peter Hoff, Don Janssen, Patricia Kramer (chair), Dan Ratner, Sarah Stroup, Thaisa Way, Champak Chatterjee

**Ex-officio reps:** LeAnne Jones Wiles, Robin Chin Roemer, Roy Taylor  
**President's designee:** Phil Ballinger  
**Guests:** Robert Corbett, Tina Miller

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Robert Harrison, D. Shores, Daniel Enquobahrie  
**Ex-officio reps:** Aaron Vetter, Mel Wensel

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 - faculty reimbursement\_fall2015

## POLICY ON FACULTY REIMBURSEMENT FOR TEACHING-RELATED ACTIVITIES AND GRANT-WRITING

(revised 4/30/15)

### Percent of Salary Reimbursed for Teaching, Based on Enrollment\* and Credits

Enrollment	6-9	10-19	20-29	30-49	50-99	100-149	150+
<b>Credits</b>							
<b>1</b>	NA	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>2</b>	NA	6	7	8	12	14	15
<b>3</b>	NA	8	11	12	15	18	19
<b>4</b>	NA	10	13	15	18	20	22
<b>5</b>	NA	11	15	18	21	23	25
<b>6<sup>^</sup></b>	12						

\* Enrollments used for compensation projections are based on a 3-year rolling average for state courses (MPH, MS, PhD, UGPH) and non-required eMPH courses; and projected cohort size for required fee-based courses (eMPH, EMHA, MHA, HIHIM, MHIHIM). These salary percentages are paid prospectively each year and will not be modified if enrollment is other than planned, unless enrollment exceeds projections.

<sup>^</sup> COPHP salary percentages assume 12 points for a 6-credit PBL course with 7-9 students.

### Other Criteria and Reimbursements

New course or instructor teaching course for first time (distance or face-to-face)	1.3 multiplier (for salary paid, from chart above)
Multiple instructors	1.2 multiplier; divided among instructors
Program seminar (2 credits)	3% of salary paid
Course or seminar with guest speakers 50% or more of the time	0.7 multiplier
Grant or contract preparation	2.5% paid for each competing grant or contract with life-of-grant direct costs $\geq$ \$200,000, upon submission or re-submission, up to two per year. Paid only to PIs (or shadow PIs) who are paid by Health Services.
<b>Advising (paid per student upon graduation, except PhD Chair)</b>	
HIHIM Capstone	Advisor, 1%
COPHP Capstone	Chair, 3%
Master's thesis or MPH-HP Capstone	Chair, 2% Member, 1%
Doctoral dissertation	Chair, 4% end 3 <sup>rd</sup> year; 4% end 4 <sup>th</sup> year Member, 3% end 4 <sup>th</sup> year

### Enrollment-Cap Policy:

The department discourages enrollment caps for any course; minimum enrollment cap is 25 students.

**TA Policy:** Any course can have a TA, with Program Director approval. TA plans should be confirmed annually in Spring. Enrollments used align with methodology described above for instructional reimbursement.

- <50 students: Faculty reimbursement lowered 2% of salary for every 0.25 FTE of TA
- 50-99 students: Faculty reimbursement lowered 1% of salary for every 0.25 FTE of TA
- 100+ students: Faculty reimbursement lowered 0.5% of salary for every 0.25 FTE of TA