

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS  
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2010  
224 MARY GATES HALL

**Meeting Synopsis:**

- 1) Call To Order and Chair's Report
- 2) Approval of the Minutes of January 22, 2010
- 3) SCAP Report (Brad Holt)
  - Consent agenda (routine)
  - Non-routine actions
- 4) New Business
- 5) Adjourn

\*\*\*\*\*

**Call to Order**

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

**Approval of the minutes from the January 21, 2010 meeting**

The minutes of the January 21, 2010 meeting were approved with one edit correcting the attendance of Cunningham.

**Reports & Business Items**

**1. Chair's Report (John Schaufelberger)**

- A. The Council was introduced to Alex Bolton, the new Faculty Council Support Analyst.
- B. Chair Schaufelberger reported on a meeting he, Corbett, Taggart and Winslow had with Applied Math. Applied Math is creating a new bachelorette degree. They will also be asking for a waiver on the policy requiring that 45 out of last 60 credits must be taken on campus because they are hoping that the degree can be offered both on-campus and on-line. Because they would be creating a new degree, they will have to get HEC Board approval. The handbook makes it so that the 45 credit on campus requirement waiver would have to be approved by FCAS every six years. Holt states that this was the policy put in place to deal with undergraduate distance degrees. Schaufelberger is unsure when FCAS and SCAP would see the proposal because the HEC Board process is more complicated. The Council then discussed what the process may look like and what order steps should be taken. There was also discussion as to what the six-year review would look like. There is more to be determined.
- C. A survey on cross-campus enrollment was shared. It is a catalyst survey and there are two versions: one for advisors and one for students. The goal is to have the information compiled by the end of February. Haag Day distributed it to the advisors,

while Padvorac distributed it to the students. The goal of the survey is to see if students and advisors are aware of the option, and for those that have participated, to learn of any issues that might need addressing.

- D. Chair Schaufelberger attended a meeting earlier in the day on English proficiency and shared the data he received with the Council.

## 2. SCAP Report (Brad Holt)

### A. Consent Agenda

- a. Astronomy (ASTR-20091204) Change program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Astronomy.
- b. Geography (GEOG-20091130) Change program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Geography.
- c. Italian (ITAL-20091123) Change program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Italian.

*Approved*

### B. Non-Routine Business

- a. School of Art (ART-20090717) New minor in Interactive Design

*Approved*

- b. School of Art (ART-20091027A) Change name of program from Photography to Photomedia; add a continuation policy, and revise admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in Photomedia.

Holt shares background on proposal and SCAP discussion about Two-Stage admission process and possible precedent. SCAP reluctantly advises that it be approved for a few reasons: 1) It is a small program, and 2) the two-stage admissions process happens early in an undergraduate's career (beginning of sophomore year). There are some concerns regarding transfer students, but there is a very explicit procedure for transfer students to gain entry in to the major. There was also discussion as to what precedent this sets. Questions remain such as how small is small enough, and how early is early enough.

*Approved*

## 3. Continuation Policy (Vikki Haag Day)

Haag Day shares the template made for Continuation Policies. She also shares that there was an advisors working group on the matter. Part of what spurred the issues was to make sure students were getting into majors in a timely manner as well as graduating at 180 credits. Also coming from that was the suggestion that Departments *could* create continuation policies. The advisors that will be discussing continuation policies with departments asked for a template because continuation policies have to be approved by SCAP. Last week SCAP discussed what should be included in the continuation policy template. There was some discussion if continuation policy should be by academic unit

or by major. There was also discussion as to what would happen when satisfactory progress (University) and continuation policy differ. Holt states that one must satisfy both. A continuation policy could not have lower standards than satisfactory progress, and SCAP must be sure not to approve any continuation policies that would do so. SCAP is going to require departments to have continuation policies if the major has grade requirements.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Schaufelberger adjourned the meeting at 2:07 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Minutes by Alex Bolton*  
*Council Support Analyst*  
[bolt@u.washington.edu](mailto:bolt@u.washington.edu)

**Present: Faculty:** Schaufelberger (Chair), Cunningham, Holman, Holt, Keil, Kramer, Pengra, Taggart

**Ex-Officio Reps:** Fugate, Jespersen, Haag Day

**Regularly Invited Guests:** Corbett, Sahr, Winslow, Says

**Absent: Faculty:** Almgren, Stroup

**President's Designee:** Mildon

**Ex Officio Rep:** Padvorac, Blume, Allen

**Regularly Invited Guests:** Ballinger, Wiegand