# University of Washington Faculty Council on Academic Standards

October 2, 2015 1:30pm – 3:00pm Condon 511A

## **Meeting Synopsis:**

- 1. Call to order
- 2. Approval of minutes from June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015
- 3. Introductions
- 4. Chair's report
- 5. Review of ABB charge
- 6. Google Drive to replace Catalyst council file-sharing (Joey)
- 7. College of Engineering
- 8. Good of the order
- 9. Adjourn

#### 1) Call to order

Kramer called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

## 2) Approval of minutes from June 12th, 2015

The minutes from June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015 were approved unanimously as amended.

## 3) Introductions

The council members and guests went around the room and introduced themselves. Two members explained they expect to retire during the 2015-2016 academic year: John Deehr (Captain, Naval Science – NROTC), and Vijean Edwards (University Registrar, Office of the Registrar). Members thanked them for their service and insights. The council welcomed two new faculty members, Champak Chatterjee, and Daniel Enquobahrie.

### 4) Chair's report

Kramer explained to new members that FCAS meets from 1:30-3:00 p.m. generally every other Friday. She noted that the 3:00 p.m. end-time is strictly enforced, despite progress on discussions or action items. She noted FCAS subcommittees include:

- Subcommittee on Academic Programs (chair, Stroup)
- Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation (chair, Janssen)
- Subcommittee on Honors (chair, Brock)
- Ad hoc group on Activity-Based Budgeting (chair, Way)

Kramer asked council members to communicate with her electronically to join the ABB group; she passed around a hard copy sign-up sheet for the subcommittees.

### 5) Review of ABB charge (Exhibit 1)

Kramer provided the council with some background into the charge letter addressed to FCAS from the ABB Review Committee during spring of 2015 (Exhibit 1). She explained the implementation of Activity-Based Budgeting has differed among units, and there is a concern that ABB is changing the culture of interaction between departments, fostering a less collegial atmosphere. For these reasons and others, FCAS has been tasked to take up an investigation of the effects of ABB on "educational collaboration" (Exhibit 1).

Kramer explained FCAS has seen reactions to ABB in its own regular business, and there is little doubt that ABB has affected academic programs and academic standards around the university. One member explained that when it comes to interdisciplinary teaching and other forms of collaborative education within the UW, ABB has been detrimental.

Kramer explained the council has the authority "to be as broad as it wants" in its investigation of ABB's impact on academic matters. There was question of how FCAS may do this when it only typically responds to undergraduate-level issues and activities. It was noted that because there is not a university-sanctioned standing committee addressing graduate-level academic standards, FCAS will investigate ABB through a wider lens.

After some discussion, FCAS members agreed that ABB is not necessarily a problem on the whole, but it can be when it is implemented down to the level of department (or even sub-department). How ABB is implemented is unique to each College/School and consequently, confusion exists among the faculty.

The council requested that the council support analyst locate and broadcast a definition for Activity-Based Budgeting and how it works, to bolster the group's understanding.

#### Strategies for addressing the questions

Council members questioned how to go about conducting the investigation. Kramer explained that the group will start by brainstorming internally in FCAS meetings, and then, reach out to the units the group has confirmed are having issues to gain more information. Kramer also explained she is considering saying some words on ABB in an upcoming full faculty senate meeting.

A member mentioned that since not all central money (tuition plus state funds) is not distributed according to ABB, it would be useful to see the non-ABB allocations to colleges and schools in order to put the ABB allocations into perspective.

Kramer explained the ABB charge to the council is based on the assumption that the group will make recommendations after enough information has been gathered.

#### 6) Google Drive to replace Catalyst – council file-sharing (Burgess)

Council support analyst Joey Burgess demonstrated use of Google Drive (cloud-based file sharing software) to members of the council, and explained that in lieu of Catalyst Sharespaces' expected retirement by UW-IT on November 12th, 2015 - the council will make use of Google Drive for all future file-sharing needs. He noted this decision has been authorized by Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.

Logistically, he noted council members will receive hyperlinks connecting them to their respective council's Google Drive folder in each meeting broadcast email, and folder securities may or may or not be heightened depending on the council's posting of sensitive and/or exclusive materials.

He also explained that the minutes and agenda for upcoming meetings will be posted in the council's google drive folder. For making edits to the minutes, the document can be downloaded and edited (with tracked changes) and manually re-uploaded to the folder, or, sent to the CSA after edits are made, and the analyst will upload the file back into the folder.

## 7) College of Engineering

Kramer explained that a major item is coming before the council this academic year relating to the College of Engineering (CoEng). FCAS is anticipating that CoEng will propose shifting to a new model for admitting its students. In the new model, freshman will be admitted directly into the College of Engineering as "Engineering-undeclared" majors. Then, after one or two years within the college, they will be formally placed in a designated engineering major. It was noted this will be the first program at the university to try this approach in enrolling students. The CoEng is an affiliation of ten departments.

Kramer explained detailed 1503 forms will be required on behalf of the college to accomplish the change. She explained she and Stroup have already begun communicating with CoEng over what information will be required to appear with the documentation.

It was noted the CoEng is developing the new model in an attempt to respond to the fact that over 2100 freshman admits to the University of Washington state a desire to become engineers, but CoEng graduates approximately 1000 each year. Consequently, institutional history reveals that half of those will never be admitted to the college, even though the majority of rejected students are academically qualified to complete an engineering degree.

A council member explained that a news article in the Daily on the CoEng's proposed enrollment method has already been published, despite the fact that the college has not yet formally applied for any programmatic change. After some discussion, one member noted that other colleges within the UW will look at this and likely consider utilizing the same model. The council agreed that the "ripple effect" from this change may be swift and widespread. Ballinger (president's designee) noted the topic of direct admission has been discussed for a long time at the UW. He noted that in 1980, one steering committee found that changing a unit's admission methods to direct admissions will have a large effect on the university at-large.

Kramer explained both SCAP (Subcommittee on Academic Programs) and SCAG (Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation) will need to be involved in the council's response to the proposed shift.

It was noted, after question, that the change will also need to go through the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) and the Tri-campus Review process.

### Timeline for implementation

A member questioned if there is an expressed timeline detailing when all of CoEng's changes are expected to go through. It was noted the intention is for the change to go through during this academic year (2015-2016). All requests are expected to be sent to FCAS by January 1<sup>st</sup>, and three additional months will be required to get the requests through the many University level reviewing bodies. It was noted by Kramer and Stroup that this timeline is aggressive.

## 8) Good of the order

Kramer explained to new council members that the "good of the order" is the time within FCAS meetings wherein any member can bring up an item they wish the group to discuss. The discussion items do not require vetting on behalf of the CSA or the council chair beforehand, unlike other agenda items.

## Grading on Participation

A member brought up a concern over a practice of grading students based on course participation. The council noted several concerns inherent to this practice, including the fact that some students have issues which keep them from being able or wanting to speak in class, and many international students feel discouraged from speaking in class because of language or culture barriers. Kramer proposed that the council produce a document to clearly state some guidelines for instructors grading on participation. After some discussion, the council agreed to the idea, noting that the document will help protect students. Janssen noted that the ASUW (Associated Students of the University of Washington) will need to be informed of the guidelines once they are finished – to publish them in their own venues and broadcast them to students. Corbett recommended that the council reach out to the Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) while developing the guidelines.

#### Extra credit offered to only some students

A council member noted concern over the offering of special extra credit in UW courses. She noted all students will not have the same ability to attend after-hour film sessions, or other out-of-the-classroom activities, making the awarding of extra credit inherently unfair. The member noted some inexperienced faculty may simply not understand the UW's rules on these matters, and so perhaps FCAS can support students by publishing "guidelines on offering extra credit." The council found this to be well-advised, and in the interest of time, discussion will continue on this item in another upcoming meeting.

#### *Instructional time*

A member noted changes in how a course is taught happens without submission of a course change request. For instance, a course formerly taught with a quiz section, where homework problems were reviewed, is now being taught without the quiz section and with an additional lecture section. Kramer indicated that the course change review system has no method of knowing when these changes are made and she asked how the council could proceed in addressing the problem. It was agreed the council will look into this in a future meeting

Admissions resolution on funding from last spring

Ballinger noted the resolution from FCAS concerning UW admissions funding has had an impact. The Office of Admissions received temporary funds and was allowed some additional carry-over funds for the 2015-2016 AY. The office was also allocated a percentage of fees (one stipulation of the FCAS resolution).

#### Presidential search statement

Kramer noted that the presidential search statement drafted by the council in spring, 2015 was confirmed to have been reviewed by the executive search committee in one of their meetings.

## 9) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Kramer at 2:50 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, D. Shores, Sarah Stroup, Champak Chatterjee

Ex-officio reps: Leanne Jones Wiles, Mel Wensel

President's designee: Phil Ballinger

Guests: Janice DeCosmo, Virjean Edwards, Robert Corbett, Emily Leggio, Tina

Miller

Absent:

Faculty: Robert Harrison, Thaisa Way, Daniel Enquobahrie

**Ex-officio reps:** Robin Chin Roemer

**Exhibits** 

Exhibit 1 - fcas abb charge.pdf

October 6, 2015

Professor Patricia Kramer Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards

Dear Professor Kramer:

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards is charged with responsibility "for matters of university policy relating to the academic affairs of the university, such as admissions policy, scholastic standards, university graduation requirements, and inter-institutional academic standards" (Faculty Code, Sec 42-34). Activities historically performed include approval of undergraduate degrees, majors and minors for the University of Washington Seattle Campus; evaluation of admissions and graduation requirements; and the selection of honors medalists and honors GPA cutoffs.

Our recommendation is that the council identify 3 specific goals that can be accomplished by the end of the 2015-16 academic year.

The Senate office did a background review to help identify goals for your council. This included review of minutes from last year's meetings, review of discussions at Faculty Senate meetings, and selected outreach for topics. Recommended goals and / or topics for discussion include:

- Create a report addressing the interconnected set of issues surrounding the effects of ABB on
  educational collaboration inviting at least one member from the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
  to join discussions and present preliminary findings to the ABB Review Committee and Faculty
  Senate at the end of autumn quarter.
- Evaluate proposed changes to freshman holistic review, and where warranted provide feedback or potential revisions to the Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment, the council's presidential designee.
- Respond with due diligence to the expected College of Engineering proposal to change the method by which they enroll undergraduate majors.

After your first council meeting we will be available to discuss the goals your council identified. Thereafter, we will post your council's goals on the Faculty Senate Website to communicate the important work you are doing on their behalf.

Sincerely,

Norm Beauchamp / Faculty Senate Chair Professor of Radiology

/nlb