

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
April 3rd, 2015
1:30pm – 3:00pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of minutes from March 20th, 2015
 3. Review of policy regarding the use of entry codes (Exhibit 1)
 4. Review of courses with overlapping content (listed below)
 5. Chair's report
 6. Good of the order
-

1) Call to order

Kramer called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

2) Review of minutes from March 20th, 2015

The minutes from March 20th, 2015 were approved with one abstention.

3) Review of policy regarding the use of entry codes (Exhibit 1)

Kramer requested the council consider approving the newly drafted policy statement titled "Faculty Council on Academic Standards Policy on Access to Courses and the use of Entry Codes" (Exhibit 1). A member asked if there was known abuse of entry codes at the University of Washington, and Kramer replied that several situations have come up which would not meet the criteria of the drafted policy statement. The issue has been of concern to students and advisors, she explained.

It was noted that the draft policy statement clarifies what the council agrees should happen with regards to the use of entry codes at the University of Washington.

The council voted unanimously to approve the drafted document as an official FCAS Policy Statement.

4) Review of courses with overlapping content (listed below)

After passage of a policy on overlapping content of courses at the March 20th 2015 FCAS meeting, several courses that had been held by the UWCC need to be reviewed by FCAS. The council noted they would like to track which course overlap decisions require arbitration due to Activity Based Budgeting (ABB).

Faculty Council on Academic Standards Policy on Access to Courses and the Use of Entry Codes

University policy is that all students who have met the prerequisites should have equal access to courses within the constraints of registration period (which takes into account class standing), major restrictions (majors may have priority over nonmajors) and participation in selective activities.

The university recognizes two guiding principles. The first is the need for timely graduation of students. Consequently, courses can be established such that majors have priority registration periods over nonmajors and the registration system allows seniors to register before juniors, who can register before sophomores, etc.

The second principle is one of fairness, real and perceived. Students with the appropriate pre-requisites and affiliations, as approved via University procedures, should be equally likely to gain entrance to a course.

Entry codes are routinely used in any registration period to:

1. "overload" the course (i.e., add more students than the enrollment maximum);
2. override pre-requisites.

Registration by entry code only for registration period 1 (PD1, when currently enrolled students are allowed to register for courses) and registration period 2 (PD2, when incoming students are allowed to register for courses) is appropriate in the following circumstances:

1. independent research courses;
2. courses that provide credit for student activities for which students are selected, examples of which include:
 - a. capstone or introductions to extra-curricular projects;
 - b. departmental honors;
 - c. performance-based courses where auditions/portfolio assessments are required;
 - d. internships;
3. courses where affiliation with a University program is required, examples of which include:
 - a. HONORS courses;
 - b. courses associated with scholarships or fellowships;
 - c. Equal Opportunity Programs (EOP);
 - d. First-Year Interest Groups (FIGs)
4. Situations where approved pre-requisites for the course cannot be implemented in the UW student information system.
5. Situations where maximum enrollment cannot be managed via existing time schedule protocols.

In addition to the situations described above for registration periods 1 and 2, entry codes can be required for registration period 3 (PD3) when entrance to the course after

classes have begun would disrupt coursework for currently registered students or would result in poor performance for the prospective student. Such situations include:

1. service learning courses;
2. laboratories;
3. group-based or cohort-driven learning.

Approved by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards on April 3, 2015

a. G H 537/HSERV 526 with ANTH 519/G H 538/ HSERV 521 (on hold)

It was explained a new graduate course proposed by the Department of Global Health, which is joint listed with the Department of Health Services, is substantively the same as an existing graduate course joint listed by the Department of Anthropology, the Department of Global Health, and the Department of Health Services. She noted her suggestion would be to break the current joint listing of the existing course, and any subsequent joint listing can be ad hoc (“withered”). The council agreed this a favorable solution. A member made a motion to deny the course creation request. The motion was passed by a majority vote.

b. FISH/MARBIO 270 and BIOL 220 (on hold)

The School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences has requested to create course joint listed with Marine Biology; the course has overlapping content with Biology 220. As stated in the “justification” section, difference examples will be used in the course, although the central content overlaps with Biology 220. The council generally agreed that this is a fundamental difference that renders the courses diverse from one another. Pengra noted clear differences in content, which provides ample justification for a new course to be created. Janssen noted there is a misprint on the course creation request form, in Section 9. There is a number “1” missing.

A motion to approve the course creation passed unanimously.

c. FISH/MARBIO 370 and BIOL 354 (on hold)

The council noted the precedent had been set for this request by the previous discussion. It was clarified that this course creation request was not explicitly disputed by any other academic unit.

A motion to approve the course creation passed unanimously.

d. OCEAN 285

It was noted the course is being offered currently (spring 2015) and is being retroactively reviewed.

A motion to approve the course creation passed unanimously.

e. OCEAN 215 with CSE 160 (on hold)

The two courses have overlapping content in that they both provide training for the same computer software. There was indecision in the council over whether or not overlap in computer software training is problematic. It was noted that CSE courses (Computer Science & Engineering) are difficult to enroll into and having a course offered with similar content may be beneficial for students.

Kramer noted this is a question of if multiple credit for the same course content is detrimental to the university. Some members expressed that they do not find it to be an issue in this case. It was mentioned that the contact hours for the lab were being counted fully (2 hours of lecture and 2 hours of lab for a 4-credit course). Discussion ensued, with some members mentioning that counting labs as only

half is typical in their college, while other members stated they were not aware of a standard policy. Kramer was asked to contact Deborah Wiegand, a former long-time member of the Curriculum Committee to see if she was aware of any established guidelines for counting lab and quiz-section hours.

There was discussion over students' potential ability to "game the system" if they were to take one of these courses and then enroll in the other, having already learned the content. The council agreed this is a deeply-rooted practice, and it is implausible that it could be remedied.

A motion to approve the course creation passed unanimously.

Kramer noted that, with these decisions, the council has set a precedent that overlap in course content is acceptable, unless objections are raised by an affected department.

f. LAW 200 (on hold)

The Law School did not consult with the Law, Society and Justice (LSJ) program in the creation of the course in question. Kramer noted that the council could send the request back to the Law School and request that they more widely consult.

A member moved to send the request back to the Law School, and request they consult with LSJ and other possibly affected parties. The motion passed unanimously.

g. ESS 449 with BIOL 475 (on hold)

Kramer noted this item is pending other changes and may return to the council in a later meeting.

5) Chair's report

Kramer noted she had nothing substantive to report.

6) Good of the order

Janssen asked if any progress had been made between the Office of the University Registrar and the Foster School of Business in looking at data on the written exams applicants to the Business school take. Ballinger and Miller noted they would work together in the near future on this and report back to the council in a later meeting.

Corbett explained the Student Achievement Council will meet again on April 15th. Among the agenda items for the meetings is discussion over the minimum admission standards of the university.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Present: **Faculty:** Phil Brock, John Deehr, Don Janssen, Richard Keil, Patricia Kramer (chair), David Pengra, Dan Ratner, D. Shores, Thaisa Way
Ex-officio reps: Hailey Badger, LeAnne Jones Wiles
President’s Designee: Philip Ballinger
Guests: Janice DeCosmo, Robert Corbett, Emily Leggio, Tina Miller

Absent: **Faculty:** Robert Harrison, Peter Hoff, Sarah Stroup
Ex-Officio reps: Robin Chin Roemer

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 - Faculty Council on Academic Standards Policy on Access to Courses and the use of Entry Codes