

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
November 7, 2014
1:30pm – 3pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from October 24, 2014
 3. SCAP report
 4. Credit hours for majors – review
 5. Ownership of course content
 6. Good of the order
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Kramer at 1:30pm.

2) Review of minutes from October 24, 2014

The minutes from October 24, 2014 were approved as written.

3) SCAP report

Old non-routine business

#1 and #2 – Economics

Representatives from the economics department spoke with SCAP to discuss course equivalency and residency requirements as part of its recent 1503. Economics agreed to break all equivalency requirements between outside courses; students would still be allowed to individually petition if they want the course to be considered equivalent. Outside the UW courses will transfer in as ECON 3XX. A question was raised asking how this would impact courses transferred from UW Tacoma and Bothell. In that case, the UW campuses negotiate equivalency. Kramer explained that SCAP is still waiting for economics to notify departments before approving the 1503.

#3 – Dance

There was only one response during the tri-campus review period which was positive. The proposal received unanimous approval.

#4 – Early Childhood and Family Studies (ECFS)

SCAP is still waiting for ECFS to contact departments to make sure they agree that courses can be listed.

New non-routine business

#1 – Social Work

SCAP is still waiting for the continuation policy to accompany the policy on early admissions.

Major Guidelines

A suggestion was raised to correct the following sentence:

*“Program requirements should generally be achievable in two years residence at the university, especially if they are upper division requirements. Courses that **are** either not taught frequently enough or do not have adequate spaces to be consistently taken by students should **not** be required courses.”*

Section #7

Discussion ensued about “progress towards degree” and cohort policy issues. Kramer clarified that a cohort policy refers to students starting programs together, and staying together, throughout the entire program. Discussion ensued about graduation requirements, continuation policies, and freshmen admits. Kramer explained that this issue has been raised because there is concern that a department could admit a freshman directly into their major, but if they do not perform at the same level as an applicant who would be a junior admit, the department may have the desire to replace the student because they have a better candidate. A suggestion was made that the language reflect all students are held to the same continuation policy regardless of when they were admitted. Members agreed to adjust the following language to:

“Majors and degrees that are competitive must include a continuation policy to graduate. All students are to be held to the same continuation policy regardless of when they were admitted.”

The finalized guidelines for majors received unanimous approval. Corbett mentioned that the changes will now go onto the registrar’s website.

Listserves

Kramer reported that the DDC list no longer exists. The Office of the Registrar will contact the provost’s office requesting an official memo stating that the DDC list has been taken off-line and replaced by the UW administration list to be used for tri-campus reviews. Kramer will assist if necessary.

4) Credit hours for majors - review

Discussion ensued about a recent report on credit hours for all UW majors. A comment was raised stressing the need for a conversation about how the credit load for individual majors impacts broader enrollment outcomes across the university. Currently, departments make the judgment about what is appropriate for the individual program but there is not a larger discussion about how these decisions effect issues such as time-to-degree. For now FCAS is the sole decision-maker on this issue because the council addresses credit load when reviewing proposals. For example, during the review of integrated sciences FCAS had a long debate about the credit load for the major which exceeds 100 credits. Concern was raised that there still has not been a robust conversation about majors being offered across campus

and stressed the importance that the council assess how it impacts students when majors are created with excessive credit loads. A comment was raised that new degree proposals do outline the program plan for students who move through the major. Concern was raised that the credit loads that are represented in the report do not indicate whether prerequisites are being counted. Members discussed their personal experiences within their own departments. Members discussed the differences of credit loads between majors in the arts and majors in the sciences.

A suggestion was raised to take a closer look at the outcomes for majors and graduation standards over a 4-year period. Kramer and the Office of the Registrar will develop data for the Council to review.

5) Ownership of course content

Kramer reported on a recent issue regarding ownership of courses and equivalency. This problem is a multifaceted issue because it addresses tri-campus concerns and influences how FCAS will address these problems when they arise, such as course ownership between various colleges and schools. Kramer explained this problem is a result when a course change/creation passes a department curriculum committee and goes to the UW Curriculum Committee (UWCC) which attempts to maintain consistency across all three campuses. Kramer noted that there has been an increase of controversies, not between campuses, but between colleges at UW Seattle who want ownership or veto power over another college's course.

Kramer explained this issue came up with a recent course proposal from the School of Public Health creating a 400-level course called "Ethics, Social Justice and Policy in Public Health". The UWCC sent a notice to a number of departments about the proposal, including bioethics in humanities which replied with a negative response and requested that all future proposals be vetted by their unit and the philosophy department prior to being submitted to the UWCC. Kramer explained that this is a problem because departments have not been allowed to tell other departments which courses can be offered to students.

Discussion ensued about departments vetting other departments' course proposals and the similarities and overlap that may occur between programs, such as statistics. Members discussed their personal experiences and raised concern that practically every course has some sort of connection with others in different departments. A comment was raised stressing the importance for departments to collaborate together before submitting proposals. A comment was raised noting that it is odd for a department to attempt to define what ethics means in each field and suggested this appears to be a competition for ownership over words and ideas, rather than course content.

A comment was raised stressing the problem is whether there are enough students to support additional courses if they cover essentially the same topic. Discussion ensued about how activity-based budgeting may have influenced units to compete for students by creating courses for themselves. A suggestion was raised to create a website that lists the new courses that are being proposed in order for faculty and administrators to review prior to approval. This would allow departments the ability to collaborate together rather than simply reacting to new proposals. The problem now is that these decisions are up to the college curriculum committees, but they do not have the incentive to take a cross-campus view of how their decisions will impact the rest of the university.

Discussion moved to course applications and the amount of content that is required to rationalize a new course proposal. Concern was raised that the amount of information readily available is quite small.

Also, there is nothing readily searchable for new courses that are going through the process. Members discussed their personal experiences submitting proposals and the amount of information required to describe the course. Concern was raised that not enough information is being provided. A comment was raised that course proposals are meant to be broad, not specific, and include important information about how the course will be graded and class versus lab time. Kramer suggested that this should be a future agenda item for the council to discuss at a later meeting.

Kramer explained that she will write a response to the School of Public Health explaining that the university will continue to inform them about courses they may be interested in; however, they do not have vetoing rights over another department.

Kramer asked members how the council should address this problem in the future and suggested that a fourth standing committee may need to be created. Another alternative is to address the issues on an ad hoc basis when the problem arises in the future. A suggestion was raised that UWCC could communicate to departmental curriculum committees explaining the recent issues related to course overlap. A suggestion was raised that new course approvals should include a section asking the department to prove that the course is not already available somewhere else on campus. Kramer suggested that the ad hoc committee could address this issue as well.

A question was raised asking if UWCC is responsible to FCAS. Kramer had proposed a similar idea to senate leadership last year but since the issue has tri-campus policy implications that are difficult to implement.

6) Good of the order

Janssen reported that the Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation will be sending out a Doodle poll asking for members' availability. There will be two 90-minute meetings before the end of the quarter; one to catch up to speed on the holistic review process and one to start conducting business. The subcommittee will report on its progress to FCAS once it has something substantial to discuss.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Kramer at 3pm.

Minutes by Grayson Court, council support analyst, gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Patricia Kramer (chair), John Deehr, Don Janssen, Richard Keil, David Pengra, Dan Ratner, D. Shores, Sarah Stroup, Thaisa Way
President's designee: Phillip Ballinger
Ex officio representatives: LeAnne Jones Wiles, Hailey Badger
Guests: Robert Corbett, Virjean Edwards, Emily Leggio, Janice DeCosmo, Tina Miller

Absent: **Faculty:** Peter Hoff (sabbatical), Phil Brock, Robert Harrison
Ex officio representatives: Robin Chin Roemer

Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) Summary

1:30-3:00 pm

October 31, 2014

Gerberding 026

Old Non-Routine Business:

1. **Economics** - ([ECON-20140529A](#)) Revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Economics.

Background: The department wants to add a residency requirement to the major.

Action Taken: 10/03/2014 – Hold for residency policy.

Action Taken: 10/03/2014 - Pending FCAS approval of in residence major requirement.

Action Taken: 10/31/2014 – ECON invited to meeting to discuss equivalency as it relates to residency – Michelle Turnovsky (Senior Lecturer) will be representing ECON. Jennifer to work with the Department to revise 1503 to remove ECON 300/301 equivalency language. Patricia to contact Emily Leggio and Admissions to make sure they know not to transfer ECON 300/301 for any institution. Hold for next SCAP meeting.

2. **Economics** - ([ECON-20140529B](#)) Revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics.

Background: The department wants to add a residency requirement to the major.

Action Taken: 10/03/2014 – Hold for residency policy.

Action Taken: 10/03/2014 - Pending FCAS approval of in residence major requirement

Action Taken: 10/31/2014 – ECON invited to meeting to discuss equivalency as it relates to residency. See above notes.

3. **Dance** - ([DANCE-20140508](#)) Reinstate standard major option in Dance; revised admission and program requirement for all options within the Bachelor of Arts degree in Dance.

Background: Dance wants to reinstate the standard major option to allow students greater flexibility to study within the major. They are also asking to revise the admission requirements to allow students to declare the major sooner; and to revise the program requirements to allow more styles of dance to be counted towards the technique requirement which will allow students who study cultural/social/other forms of dance access to the major. Lastly update the catalog copy to reflect the currently coded 2.00 cum GPA in courses applied to the major.

Action Taken: 10/03/14 – Approve and forward to FCAS. Jennifer to make minor edits to catalog copy for clarity.

Action Taken: 10/31/14 – Post Tri-Campus Review. One positive response. Approve and forward to FCAS.

4. **Early Childhood and Family Studies** - ([ECFS-20131008](#)) Revised admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Early Childhood and Family Studies; new option in Teaching and Learning within the Bachelor of Arts degree in Early Childhood and Family Studies.

Background: The ECFS major has experienced significant growth in the past 5 years including the addition of the online major. This increase in enrollment has led them to propose revising the major to allow students to either have a greater diversity of electives (geared towards double majors) or select deeper, content related preparation for students interested in teaching and learning. They are proposing to get eliminate the Biology Science/Development

NEXT MEETING: November 14, 2014

and the Mathematics/Statistics general education requirement (which was also an admission requirement for the online major); they are also revising the ECFS core (was 64 credits, now 50 credits; Add ECFS 200; Remove ECFS 301, 304, 305, 400, 454, and 455 – all of which + ECFS 312, 411, and one additional elective comprise the Teaching and Learning option). Students will pick either the 35-37 credit option or take a minimum of 30 credits of approved electives.

Action Taken: 06/06/2014 – Hold. Ask department why they are dropping the Biology/Developmental and the Mathematics/Statistics requirements. Also ask that the list of elective be revised to include a DL identifier for courses approved to be offered online.

Action Taken: 10/03/14 – Hold. SCAP would like to know if 45 credit residency requirement for on-line majors also should apply to on-site majors. Also they would like confirmation from ENGL, PSYCH, SOC, GH, and NUTR that ECFS program specific students are okay in their DL courses.

Update: See response at end of scan. For consistency the major will ask for 40 credits (50%) of the on-site major to be completed in residence and 50 credits (62.5%) of the on-line major to be completed in residence. They are working with ISS to help them contact all of the on-line non-EDUC elective departments for approval to include their courses on the online ECFS list.

Action Taken: 10/31/2014 – HOLD. SCAP wants to see approvals from non-EDUC elective departments before proceeding with option.

New Non-Routine Business:

1. **Social Work - ([SOCWF-20141020](#))** Revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Social Welfare.

Background: The School of Social Work wants to add an early admission process to their major so students know at the end of their freshman year or early sophomore year if they will be accepted in to the major.

Action Taken: 10/31/2014 – HOLD. SCAP wants a continuation policy to accompany early admissions.

Other Business:

1. Sarah and Robert to continue to work on language for establishing policy on “within major” residency requirements and preliminary discussion on what constitutes a major.
 - a. [FCAS Majors Policies w/ in major Residency](#) as of Oct 2014
 - b. [UWS Programs with major residency requirements](#)
 - c. [UWS Programs with major residency requirements - grouped by further rules on credit](#)
2. [List Serves](#) for Tri-Campus Review. The Provost’s Office has retired the DDC list that is specified as one of the notification lists for the Tri-Campus Review and replaced it with a new UW Administration list-serve. The Provost’s Office claims it contains the same people but every time I sent a Tri-Campus Invitation since switching lists I received at least one email from a Director or Dean asking why they are getting the emails. The Provost’s Office suggested that we create our own list for distribution – but how would we maintain such a list without the knowledge of people starting/stopping work at the UW?

Update: Patrica to contact the Provost’s Office requesting an official memo stating that the DCC list has been taken offline as replaced by the UW Administration list to include with the Tri-Campus Review Policy.

3. New language to be added to 1503 Instructions documentation for website:

Update: Patrica has proposed the following language to be incorporated at the beginning of the 1503 instructions website under construction.

“Unit and College/School Approval – Programs propose changes to or creation of options, minors, majors, or degrees via the 1503 form. The program proposers are responsible for assuring formal approval at the appropriate levels (department or unit, Dean’s Office) before submitting the final document to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards for review and approval.”

NEXT MEETING: November 14, 2014