

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
May 30, 2014, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from May 16, 2014
 3. SCAP Report
 4. Chair's Report
 5. Update on the Undergraduate Diversity Graduation Requirement
 6. Good of the Order
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kramer at 1:30 p.m. ,

2) Review of Minutes from May 16, 2014

The minutes from May 16, 2014 were approved as amended. Cunningham abstains.

3) SCAP Report [Exhibit A]

Old Non-Routine Business

1. Laboratory Medicine - (LABM-20140228) Revised program and continuation requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree Medical Laboratory Science.

Taggart reported that SCAP has been working on Laboratory Medicine's continuation policy and it is starting to look better. Taggart explained the 1503 included an unusual list of essential requirements which led to conversations with Disability Resources for Students (DRS) to determine if there were issues to be concerned about. SCAP has suggested that Laboratory Medicine work with DRS and the School of Medicine to review their lists of essential requirements. Kramer clarified that FCAS is taking an advisory role in the matter.

The proposal received unanimous approval.

2. School of Public Health - (SPH-20140401) Revised program and continuation requirements for both the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees in Public Health.

Taggart reported the 1503 is still on hold. Taggart explained the proposal suggests that students would be removed from the major if they are engaged in non-academic misconduct. SCAP prefers to move this out of the criteria for probation and have it as part of the continuation policy so students are aware they must behave professionally as part of the program.

New Routine Business

1. Program on the Environment - (ENVIR-20140411) Revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Environmental Studies.

A question was raised asking if the minimum 2.0 GPA in each of the 110 credits required for graduation was grandfathered in as part the changes. Taggart explained that was correct. Taggart clarified that the proposal does not create a significant change to the major, allowing for this requirement.

The proposal received unanimous approval.

4) Chair's Report

Kramer reported that while SCAP will meet next week she is not sure FCAS requires a final meeting. Unless there are substantive issues that are brought up next week Kramer plans on cancelling the last meeting of the year. As this may be the last FCAS meeting Kramer thanked outgoing subcommittee chairs Cunningham and Taggart. Kramer noted that Taggart will continue to serve in faculty governance by sitting on the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning. Kramer stated that Janssen will chair the Admissions and Graduation subcommittee, Pengra will continue to serve as chair of the Honors Subcommittee and Sarah Stroup, a previous FCAS member, will return and serve as the chair of SCAP. Corbett used the opportunity to thank Kollet for his service on FCAS and noted that Kollet will be moving to alumni relations next year.

Kramer reported that she recently attended an end-of-the-year luncheon with other council chairs. One issue that came up was concern that some councils do not have sufficient agenda items to merit meeting on a regular basis. Although Kramer does not believe FCAS has this problem, she asked members to notify her about any agenda items that the council should address in the future.

Kramer reported that she received an email from an individual who runs Health Informatics and Health Information Management (HIHIM) as part of the Evening Degree Program. Traditionally, HIHIM students were allowed to take some of their necessary coursework to receive a UW baccalaureate degree in the day classes. Kramer was aware that the Evening Degree Program had more open boundaries between their students and the rest of the university than the current Student Regulations allow. She explained that overlap is not allowed between regularly admitted and program-specific status, but did recognize HIHIM may be still in transition and UW should provide accommodations for these students. There will be a discussion with the Evening Degree Program. Kramer suggests a 1503 should be submitted to reflect this information. Leggio will look to determine how many students this is affecting but mentioned that HIHIM students routinely take courses in the day program on a space available basis. Discussion ensued about whether this is a problem that needs to be addressed. Members discussed the Evening Degree Program and how it interacts with the recently-approved legislation reclassifying students as generally admitted or program-specific. Members discussed the difficulty in moving the program under the School of Public Health due to its fee-based structure and specific admissions and program requirements.

5) Update on the Undergraduate Diversity Graduation Requirement

Kramer reported that she attempted to review the minutes from the Diversity Implementation Task Force but it appears they do not keep meeting minutes. However, Kramer did meet with Jack Lee (Chair

of the Faculty Senate), Jim Gregory (past-Chair of the Faculty Senate), Marcia Killien and the co-chairs of the task force (Ed Taylor and Betty Schmitz). Kramer reported that the discussion was a good opportunity to explain the intent of the legislation and how it should have been properly interpreted. Kramer explained there may have been confusion about the interpretation surrounding the “inequities” portion of the legislation. Kramer explained the Registrar’s Office is willing to update the catalog as soon as the courses are approved by A&S curriculum committee.

Kramer explained that the incoming freshmen class will be the first wave of students to be required to graduate with these requirements. Kramer expects that once the Registrar’s Office receives notice of which courses fall under the designation there should not be a problem.

A question was raised about the possibility of delaying the requirements for a year. Kramer explained that is the Provost’s decision and the current feeling is that if UW can get the courses to the Registrar’s Office in the next couple weeks there is no need for a delay. However, if there is still a delay then FCAS may need to revisit the issue. Kramer explained that of the 800 courses proposed as “diversity” only 100 were approved. Concern was raised that the decision to interpret the legislation against its original intention was inappropriate and does not fit with UW’s concept of shared governance.

6) Good of the Order

Corbett provided the council a resolution on changes to the 1503 instructions and other policies to be hosted on the Registrar’s Curriculum office website. Members agreed on the following statement:

“As of May 30 2014, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) approves the revision of the instructions for the 1503 form and affirms that policies therein represent those that FCAS has approved in the past. Taken together with other policies hosted on the Registrar’s Curriculum Office website, these documents represent all current policies approved by FCAS concerning standards for academic programs and undergraduate degrees at the university. However, since webpages may need to be edited and updated as needed, FCAS recognizes that editing for corrections and clarity are useful. Therefore, the Council advises the Office of the Registrar to make such changes as needed in consultation with the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP). When revisions to a policy or a procedure in the instructions are needed, such changes should be approved by FCAS. If there is a question about whether a change is one of policy or procedure, that question should be referred to SCAP for a decision.

Intent: allows staff to make editing changes to wording of the instructions in consultation with SCAP.”

The resolution received unanimous approval.

A comment was raised that the language in the updated website materials indicates that a student must take 15 upper-level credits to complete a minor. However, there is no language about requiring any upper-level courses for a major. Kramer stated this could be an agenda item for the next academic year.

Kramer reported on the progress made on re-creating the UW Curriculum Committee as a semi-independent subcommittee of FCAS. Kramer has met with Lee and O’Neil and they are in favor of it. The Provost will need to agree to this proposal. The goal is to have the committee developed and

functioning by Fall Quarter 2014. Kramer explained that this subcommittee has tri-campus implications, which will require broad consultation.

Pengra presented his report from the Online Education Joint Task Force [refer to Exhibit B]. A question was raised asking about the status of the final report issued by the task force. The final report will likely be sent to the Provost by June 6th. Pengra added there is no plan for the task force to continue next academic year. A question was raised about a possible report from Jim Gregory relating to the approval of online majors. Pengra is not aware of this report and it is not tied to the task force.

Discussion ensued about the role of UW Educational Outreach (UWEO). Concern was raised that any course that is offered online must go through UWEO which does not provide any additional value to the offering. A member added that the technology is available to the instructor who could offer the courses themselves. Kramer clarified that faculty may teach online (or distance learning (DL)) courses without the assistance of UWEO as long as the course has been approved for DL by the appropriate curriculum committees. Discussion ensued about how UWEO and course offerings are funded and the academic mission of UWEO. A comment was raised that the issue of online courses are very difficult and there are many options available for faculty. Additionally, there are ongoing discussions about other services to support faculty offering online courses, such as the Center for Teaching and Learning.

A comment was raised about a recent article mentioning that community colleges will begin offering academic credit for work experience. The concern for UW is transferring the degrees and how the university will recognize them, if at all. Discussion ensued about the transferability of English proficiency testing and MOOCs. Concern was raised about “credit laundering” and transferring inadequate credit to complete a degree at UW. A comment was raised that this is not new to the state board. Additionally, UW was involved at one point regarding this issue and was able to weigh in on the discussion. Discussion ensued about the concept of “competency”, moving between programs and the impact on accreditation.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Kramer at 2:50 p.m.

Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst, gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Kramer (Chair), Cunningham, Hoff, Janssen, Deehr, Pengra, Taggart
Ex-Officio Reps: McNerney, Wensel
President’s Designee: Ballinger

Absent: **Faculty:** Keil (sabbatical), Brock, Harrison, Salehi-Esfahani
Ex-Officio Reps: Kollet, Chin Roemer

Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) Summary

1:30-3:00 pm
May 23, 2014
Gerberding 036

Old Non-Routine Business:

1. **Laboratory Medicine - ([LABM-20140228](#))** Revised program and continuation requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree Medical Laboratory Science.

Background: The department has submitted course applications to split the required LAB M 428 into two courses, 428 and 435, effective AUT/2014 for the April 15th Curriculum Committee. They also would like to extend their current grandfathered 2.0 grade in each LAB M course required for the major to all didactic and clinical rotation courses (add IMMUN and MICROM courses). These changes will also require the continuation policy to be updated.

Action Taken: 03/14/2014 - Hold. Need to more information about when students take the IMMUN and MICROM courses in the program. Also need a probationary period and an appeals process in the Continuation Policy. Make 2.0/2.00 consistent in the catalog copy and continuation policy.

Update: The department has reinstated their probation and appeals process into the continuation policy and provided the first year schedule for students which show that the IMMUN and MICROM courses are taken within the first 3 quarters of the program. They also edited the existing document to show that they meant a 2.0 in all places the 2.00 was listed. They will have the document edited in Word once it is approved to post on their website.

Action Taken: 04/25/2014 - Hold. What is LAB M 427 and why is it worth dismissing students from the major if they do not receive credit? For dismissal policy remove 1 & 2 and move #5 to #1.

Update: Passing LAB M 427 has been removed from the updated continuation policy and dismissal criteria have been streamlined per suggestions.

Action Taken: 05/09/2014 – Pending SCAP chair conversation with Bree Callahan on the continuation policy.

Action Taken: 05/23/2014 – Approve and forward to FCAS with edits to the continuation policy. Jennifer to encourage LAB M program, on the behalf of SCAP, to work with DRS and SoM offices ensure the “essential requirements” and student handbook comply with University and ADA rules.

2. **School of Public Health - ([SPH-20140401](#))** Revised program and continuation requirements for both the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees in Public Health.

Background: The School of Public Health is asking to add a minimum grade of 1.7 to the four core SPH courses for the majors (SPH 380, 381, 480, 481) to align with accreditation criteria being developed for baccalaureate programs by the Council of Education for Public Health (CEPH). This change will also require updating the continuation policy for the 1.7 minimum grade and they would also like to add criteria for student conduct to contention policy.

Action Taken: 05/09/2014 – Hold. SCAP chair to investigate the University Community Standards/Conduct Code and whether inclusion of conduct in a continuation policy (i.e grounds for removal from the major) is double jeopardy for the students.

Update: Susan Inman from SPH to visit to discuss Continuation Policy.

Action Taken: 05/23/2014 – Hold for SPH edits of continuation policy.

NEXT MEETING: June 6, 2014

New Routine Business:

1. **Program on the Environment** - ([ENVIR-20140411](#)) Revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Environmental Studies.

Background: The Program on the Environment is proposing changes to the major requirements to rename and reorganize categories. They feel that the changes will improve student understanding of the requirements and better reflect the selection of courses that can be used to complete the major.

Action Taken: 05/23/2014 – Approve and forward to FCAS.

NEXT MEETING: June 6, 2014

Brief report to FCAS on the Online Education Joint Task Force

The OEJTF was convened in November 2013, and met approximately monthly through the remainder of the 2013-14 academic year. The committee was charged with the task to make recommendations about the role of online education at UW, including fully online degrees and degree completion programs, MOOCs and other relevant digital initiatives, with a focus on the appropriate scope of such initiatives, along with risks and opportunities and how such programs should be reviewed to make sure they are meeting the needs and properly serving the students who participate in them. The Chairs were Jim Gregory (History) and Betsy Wilson (UW Libraries).

The first few meetings were taken up with presentations of online education activities currently underway at UW. We heard from Matt Sparke on the ISS program (as it was in the middle of its approval process), David Szatmary on UWEO's online learning program. (There are currently 17 online degrees offered through UWEO, all masters programs except ECFS.), Amanda Hornby on the Active Learning Spaces in Odegaard library, Dan Grossman on his experiences with MOOCs and how they are best appreciated, and Rebecca Aanerud from the graduate school on Graduate Online Learning. Much of what was presented and discussed will be familiar to members of FCAS from the deliberations concerning the ISS, and ECFS programs, and from Dan's presentation on MOOCs to us last year.

Between these discussions there was much talk about the challenges and problems of online education, with an attempt to clarify how or whether online education differs importantly from on-campus education in terms of how programs should be assessed, whether MOOCs represent a sea change in education or a passing phenomenon, and the issues surrounding intellectual property rights.

The task force decided to limit its inquiry to three types of online initiatives: Fully online undergraduate degree completion programs; fully online graduate and professional degrees; MOOCs and other related online offerings that are not UW degrees but carry the UW "brand." Hybrid courses and other on-campus use of online tools was specifically excluded from discussion, except insofar as these activities reflect on the fully online counterparts. Also, an effort was made to limit consideration of specific technologies, companies or particular tools (e.g., Canvas), but rather focus on policy issues and how online education should be governed.

The following recommendations were put forth, and were generally agreed upon by the committee as a whole, although opinions on the details varied:

- The UW should continue to be actively involved in online education initiatives in a variety of ways. Such initiatives promote the UW as an institution, increase access to students who would otherwise be unserved by the UW, promote innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning, and are another way for faculty to develop professionally.
- The cost of producing and maintaining online education should not drain resources from existing state-funded programs, but may come from UWEO, department-level initiatives (e.g., the MOOCs from CSE), and fee-based programs like ISS.
- Oversight of online education should be handled through existing Faculty Councils. However, the specifics of how, in practice, such oversight will be carried out is somewhat vague. Should

there be a significant increase in the number of online degree program proposals, the workload added to FCAS and other bodies could require an adjustment of the scope of oversight and the use of additional resources.

- Care must be taken at all levels, from overall program oversight down to departmental review and student advising to ensure that the integrity and quality of online courses is maintained at the same level as on-campus courses.
- The Graduate School has for some time offered online Masters degrees through UWEO, and it currently reviews such programs on a regular basis. This should continue, and the Task Force agreed that the Graduate School could also carry out reviews of online Bachelor degree programs, as they have experience and the capacity to do this. (The Graduate School has conducted reviews of certain on-campus BA programs in cases where there is no single department that owns the program, such as CHID.)
- MOOCs should be encouraged, because they represent a way to promote the UW brand, support recruitment to the UW itself, offer another way for faculty to publicize scholarship, and promote the civic role to provide educational opportunities to people who cannot become UW students. However, MOOCs should not be parlayed into official UW courses because they cannot reasonably be subject to the same oversight processes. Committee members agreed with Dan Grossman's formulation that a MOOC is more like a textbook than a course: it may have a role in a course, but it cannot replace a course.

What the UW should do about a number of other issues remains murky. It was noted that many of these issues also vex every other institution that has moved forward with online education:

- *Intellectual property rights.* It was agreed that some sort of *shared* stewardship of course materials was appropriate, since the creation of them includes both university resources and significant effort by instructors. Precisely what this means is harder to pin down. Currently, the contracts with UWEO specify that the creation of online course materials is "work for hire" and the instructors sign over their control of the results. However, in all cases so far, if an instructor wants to use these materials when they move to a different institution, UWEO has allowed it. Dan Grossman believes that this arrangement is unlikely to sit well with many faculty members.
- *Tri-Campus conflicts.* Because online education does not happen at a particular place, the development of online degrees can have ramifications on programs that are similar on the three UW campuses. Questions such as who should own an online program, how an online course developed at one campus could be equivalent to an on-campus course on another campus, and how different modes of program oversight can be coordinated are unresolved. For example, Tacoma offers a fully online BA degree in Criminal Justice that is completely equivalent to its on-campus program. Unlike the restricted status of students in Seattle's ISS or ECFS programs, there is no wall between the online and on-campus courses or programs—students may move freely between them. It is also believed that the creation of the online CJ program went through a much quicker review at Tacoma than was done with ECFS and ISS at Seattle.
- *The future of MOOCs.* Everyone agreed that MOOCs were interesting and also a lot of work. However many open questions remain: Will MOOCs be a significant drain on university

resources, or will they mainly just draw from a few faculty members? Should they be subject to oversight by Faculty Councils or should that be left to individual departments? Who gets to offer a MOOC: should persons who want to make a MOOC be vetted for their suitability to represent the UW “brand?” It appears that UWEO is moving away from the idea of offering MOOCs for a fee, as the economics of it are not favorable. Overall, the future role of MOOCs vis-à-vis college education appears uncertain. MOOCs appear to have a more natural home in corporate education, technical training, and various non-profit outreach programs that can make the economics work.

Left largely undiscussed were the following issues of concern to FCAS: the rights and responsibilities of students in online programs as compared to their on-campus peers; the specific problems of ensuring course integrity; whether online programs would lead to a second tier of faculty that only “live” online; whether there can or even should be a different cost structure for online programs. All of these topics were raised, but the committee as a whole did not deal with them in depth.

Final impressions. Although the task force was charged with making a number of wide ranging recommendations concerning online education at UW, the topic itself is so vast, and the idea of “online education” means so many different things to different people, that most of the work of the committee was spent on learning about what the UW is already doing. Adding to the difficulty is the fact that digital learning tools and how they are used is changing daily. MOOCs in particular seem to have gone from being really hot and exciting to yesterday’s news during the time that the committee was active; there appear to be few parties on campus working on new MOOCs, as everyone has learned how much work it can be to make one, and that so far there is no money in it. It is also clear that the distinction between “online” and “on-campus” education is getting fuzzier; so many parts of on-campus courses are currently being conducted online: homework, discussions, video lectures, etc., that students can (and do) opt out of coming to campus without harming their performance in an on-campus course. Online education, in all its forms, appears to be “regularizing”—its growth neither spells the doom nor the salvation of higher education, the UW included.

David Pengra, 30 May 2014