

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS  
FRIDAY, November 2, 2007, 1:30-3:00 p.m.  
224 Mary Gates Hall

The meeting was called to order at 1:38 p.m.

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1 Chair's Report

- Membership and Subcommittees

2. Approval of Minutes

3. Subcommittee Reports

- Admissions & Graduation Update
- SCAP: Final Approval of Interdisciplinary Minor in Marine Biology
- SCAP: Housekeeping

4. New Business I: Tricampus Undergraduate Academic Program Approval

5. New Business II: 1503 Form Presentation (Robert Corbett)

6. Adjourn

---

**1. Chair's Report--Membership and Subcommittees**

Chair George Dillon opened the meeting by discussing the Council's membership, its subcommittees and the proposed committee on the English as a second language program. He noted that Cynthia Fugate, ex-officio representative for University Libraries, received her appointment letter just that week. The appointments of ex-officio members Doug McManaway (for ASUW) and Vikki Haag Day (for the Undergraduate Advisory Council) would be approved at the November meeting of the Faculty Senate. Caroline Simpson, having not attended three meetings, would have to be replaced. In addition, he was still looking for a member from the humanities to serve on the Admissions and Graduations subcommittee.

Finally, Dillon said that the Graduate School had inquired about including a member of FCAS on all future program reviews (also known as "10-year reviews") for departments. It was felt that this is a good idea and so Dillon said he would pursue it further. Brad Holt said that it was a fine idea, but that some faculty had questions about the reviews themselves, such as whether they duplicated accreditation for some programs. Associate Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs John Sahr said that either he, Dean Ed Taylor or Associate Dean Janice Decosmo all take part in program reviews as a representative of UAA. He also noted that undergraduate programs are a minor part of the program review process.

**2. Approval of minutes**

Richard Fitzpatrick moved and Susan Cunningham seconded the approval of the minutes from October 19, 2007 with minor corrections. The minutes were approved unanimously

**3. Subcommittee Reports**

- **Admissions and Graduation:** Chair Cunningham said that the first meeting of the subcommittee would take place November 13<sup>th</sup>.
- **SCAP: Final Approval of Interdisciplinary Minor in Marine Biology.**  
Chair Jay Johnson said that the review period of the proposed interdisciplinary minor in Marine Biology had expired and all the postings were supportive and enthusiastic for the proposal. As the Council had already given preliminary approval to the proposal before its submission to university three-campus review, Johnson moved that the proposal for final approval. Fitzpatrick seconded and the proposal was approved unanimously.
- **SCAP: Routine**  
Johnson said that Jennifer Payne, the university's curriculum coordinator, had found out that GARS had put a hold on the CMUITS option, which apparently had never been approved originally. Payne then requested a 1503 to eliminate the program from the Department of Communication.

Johnson said that the subcommittee had also approved making exceptions for students who fulfilled the Aerospace Studies minor with ROTC courses that previously had been "deductible"--that is, these courses did not count towards a student's graduation, although they did count for the purposes of enrollment. As these courses had become "nondeductible," it seemed appropriate to allow the program to make exceptions for students on a case-by-case basis.

#### **4. New Business I: Tricampus Undergraduate Program Approval**

Johnson said that recently some issues had come up raising for him a concern about faculty governance and undergraduate program approval on the three campuses. He noted that his presentation of SCAP's visit with the Tacoma Academic Program Council sparked a discussion of program approval in general after the previous FCAS meeting. He noted also the announcement of proposed sites for a UW campus in Snohomish County, along with the statement that courses in science and technology would be started in Everett in 2008. Finally, he said that he discovered that the CFR takes part in an undergraduate certificate program in restoration ecology, known as UW-REN, despite the fact that undergraduate programs are not supposed to be called certificates. (In addition, UWT faculty had several programs in development stages called "certificates".) His worry was that since all degrees are in effect from the University of Washington, then they should all be equivalent, and it did not appear that there was any university faculty body that was assuring equivalency. While the situation was not necessarily critical, Johnson suggested that it might be wise to address the situation before it became a problem.

It was suggested that when equivalency is required by accreditation, particular colleges and schools do have a process to assure this. Susanna Cunningham mentioned that the School of Nursing has such a body. Assistant Registrar Matt Winslow said that when one campus's faculty in programs with joint accreditation submits a new course, there is a two-week review period for the other campuses.

The discussion continued for some time and addressed a number of areas. Issues that were raised were as follows:

- Equivalency of courses in similar subjects but on different campuses
- Students from one campus getting a major from another campus
- Distinctions between campuses on diplomas and transcripts
- Balancing need for campus autonomy with need for equivalency
- Deciding when a program or a campus should seek separate accreditation
- Competition between graduates from different campuses in the job market and for admission to graduate school
- Growth of "traditional" majors at Bothell and Tacoma

Dillon said that he would raise the issue with Faculty Senate Chair Dan Luchtel and that the discussion that council had had could be the basis for a memo on the issue.

### **5. New Business II: Presentation on 1503 Form (Robert Corbett)**

Coordinator of New Programs Robert Corbett gave a brief presentation on "form 1503," which is used to submit requests for changes to existing undergraduate academic programs (henceforth, "programs") and proposals for new ones. He mentioned three websites for more information, including an administrative wiki for which he could request access for any Council members interested in it. They were as follows.

- <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/fcas/issues.html>  
(Form 1503, instructions for the form, and policy statements from FCAS)
- <http://www.washington.edu/students/reg/tricampus.html>  
(Proposals under tricampus review)
- <https://fmwiki.admin.washington.edu/x/nww>  
(SCAP "wiki" including FCAS policies and faculty code language)

Corbett handed out a copy of completed form 1503 for a change to the Bachelor of Arts in Social Welfare (B.A.S.W.), a copy of the catalog language that resulted from the change, and a sheet describing the criteria that the HECB evaluates new programs (the last is attached to these minutes). Corbett said that of most concern to him was the fact that programs were not given much guidance for writing justifications, even for new programs. He suggested the criteria for the HECB could be adopted in part. Johnson said that a number of the HECB's criteria concerned administration rather than academics, but agreed that some of them could be useful. Other issues that he raised included:

- Distinction between an undergraduate major ("Biology") and a degree ("Bachelor of Science").
- Options and minors as ways to create programs that do not require HECB approval.
- Reporting of requests such as name changes or continuation policies.
- All changes that affect DARS (degree auditing and record system) must be approved by FCAS.

FCAS also discussed the university's agreement with state community colleges to waive changes in admission requirements by programs for two years for transfer students. (This policy dates from the time that the university also made its proportionality agreement.) The Council also discussed the development of "major ready pathways," which are supposed to help community college students transfer into certain competitive majors successfully, whether they apply to the UW or another public baccalaureate. Holt said that it might be appropriate to include a box on form 1503 for a program to indicate whether a program participates in such an agreement. Sahr said that the issue JAOG (the Joint Access and Oversight Group) has discussed is how to communicate such changes between the baccalaureates and the community colleges.

Finally, the Council discussed the forms usability since the Adobe version does not allow a program to format a proposal easily. The Registrar's Office has indicated that they can include a version in MS Word that allows for easier formatting, as they do with forms for submitting course proposals and changes. Though there is some interest in making the process more "electronic," both the need for signatures and the amount of proposals (~50) made that unrealistic for now.

## **6. Adjourn**

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

*Minutes by Robert Corbett*

**Present:** **Faculty:** Cunningham, Dillon (Chair), Fitzpatrick, Holt, Johnson,  
**Ex-officio:** Mildon, Rocha  
**Regularly Invited Guests:** Ballinger, Corbett, Sahr, Winslow  
**Invited Guests:** Vicki Haag Day, Doug McManaway

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Breitner (excused), Keil (excused), Schaufelberger (excused)  
Simpson  
**Ex-officio:** Hahn (excused)

**Regularly Invited Guest:** Wiegand (excused)

## **Attachment: HECB Criteria for New Degree Programs**

### HECB Criteria for New Degree Proposals including Standards for Staff Review

#### *General Criteria:*

HECB staff will review all proposals to offer new degree programs and will prepare an executive summary for the board highlighting information about whether the program is likely to:

- Support the HECB strategic master plan goals of:
  - Increasing opportunities for students to earn degrees; and
  - Responding to the state's economic needs
- Support the unique role and mission of the institution(s)
- Foster high-quality programs that enable students to complete their studies in a reasonable amount of time
- Meet state and/or regional student, employer, and community needs
- Provide access for diverse student populations
- Demonstrate that the need is commensurate with the costs to be incurred and represents an effective use of fiscal resources
- Be free from unnecessary program duplication

#### *Explanation of criteria*

- 1) Relationship to Institutional Role, Mission, Program Priorities - Describe how the proposed program reflects and supports the role and mission of the institution, and reflects program priorities.
- 2) Documentation of Need for Program - Describe the relationship of the program to the regional and statewide needs assessment for higher education, including student, employer, and community demand for the program.
- 3) Support of the Statewide Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education - Describe how the program will support HECB policies and goals for higher education as articulated in its Strategic Master Plan.
- 4) Relationship to Other Institutions - Identify similar programs offered by public or independent institutions in the region. Describe unique aspects of the proposed program that differentiate it from similar programs and/or describe why expansion of an existing program would be desirable or necessary. Describe options for collaboration with other institutions, businesses, and/or community organizations considered in the development of the proposal.
- 5) Curriculum - Describe credit-hour requirements for the program, requirements for admission and degree completion, including prerequisite coursework and other special requirements. Describe the program plan for articulation with two-year college degree programs, including identification of major-ready pathways, if applicable (for bachelor's degree programs). Indicate when the program would be offered (day/evening/weekend), where the program would be offered (campus location(s) and/or distance learning), and the delivery mechanism (in-person classroom, online, other distance).

- 6) Infrastructure Requirements - Describe required infrastructure improvements, including the need for additional library or technology resources, special space requirements (laboratory space or special classrooms), and equipment needs.
- 7) Faculty - Provide a profile of the anticipated faculty (e.g., full-time, part-time, regular, continuing, adjunct) that will support the program and the total FTE allocated to the program. There should be a sufficient number of qualified faculty dedicated to a new program.
- 8) Administration - Describe the staffing plan for administrative and support services for the program.
- 9) Students - Describe the student population to be served. Provide projected enrollments for five years or until full enrollment is reached (whichever is longer). Detail efforts planned to recruit and retain a diverse student body.
- 10) Accreditation - Indicate whether the institution will seek specialized program accreditation. If so, discuss plans for accreditation and identify the appropriate accrediting body.
- 11) Program Assessment - Describe the institution's plan for assessing how well program objectives will be met. Describe how the assessment information will be gathered and used.
- 12) Student Assessment - Describe expected student learning outcomes of the program and how student learning outcomes will be measured and results used.
- 13) Budget - Describe program cost and impact on other programs or departments within the institution. Include information on headcount FTE; FTE funding from state or self-support; other funds requested/needed; if reallocation, impact on other programs (especially if moving FTE); and contingency, if FTE funding is not provided. Identify the amounts and sources of all program funding for year one of the program and the year it is expected to reach full enrollment.
- 14) External Evaluation of Proposal - In an appendix to the proposal, provide copies of the external evaluators' reports to the institution. Summarize responses and any changes made to the program because of the review.