

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
1:30 p.m. to 3:00 pm, February 22, 2013
142 Gerberding Hall

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from February 8, 2013
 3. SCAP Report
 - a. Consent agenda (routine actions)
 - b. Non-routine actions
 4. Chair's Report
 - a. Scheduling Points
 - b. Class B issue update
 5. Old Business
 - a. Education Online Degree Request
 - b. Diversity Requirement Proposal
 6. New Business
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair George Dillon at 1:32 pm.

2) Approval of minutes from January 25, 2013 meeting

The minutes for the February 8, 2013 meeting of FCAS were approved, with amended language on providing success rates for international students for Business's English assessment test. SCAP Chair Brad Holt remarked that the proposed guidelines for new degree proposals that had been approved at the last meeting would be uploaded as a document to website for the Curriculum Office.

3) SCAP Report

a. Consent agenda (routine actions)

1. **Community, Environment, and Planning** - (CEP-20121206) Revised admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Community, Environment, and Planning; new continuation policy for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Community, Environment, and Planning.

Background: CEP wants to formalize requirements and processes already practiced internally, as well as include new courses recently approved. (They are forgoing the graded and CR/NC choice for now)

2. **Foster School of Business** - (BUS-20130107) Revised program requirements for the option in Information Systems within the Bachelor of Arts in degree in Business.

Background: The School wants to replace I S 310 with I S 451 as they feel it is more relevant to make students competitive in the labor market.

3. Education, Learning, and Society - (ELS-20130118) Revised program requirements for the minor in Education, Learning, and Society.

Background: The ELS minor wants to include the revised Dream Project courses as suitable Field Experiences.

b. Non-routine Business

1. Early Childhood and Family Studies - (ECFS-20130131) Allow a distance version of the onsite major.

Background: The major wants to establish an online version of the onsite major.

SCAP Chair Brad Holt introduced the proposal from the College of Education to offer their existing BA in Early Childhood and Family Studies as an online degree, which the subcommittee had recommended for approval for posting for Tricampus Review. He noted that there [are] two parts to SCAP's recommendation as this was the first petition to waive the residency requirement for on an online undergraduate degree that the Council had received. The first issue was the approval of the proposal to offer the program online. SCAP had recommended the proposal for approval of the proposal for posting, but had also requested that revised catalog copy be included in the proposal. Secondly, SCAP recommended that the proposal's final approval after Tricampus Review depend on approval of Class B legislation regarding the rights and responsibilities of students admitted to a fee-based rather state-supported program. Holt proposed that the Council deal with the proposal itself first and then the question of Class B legislation. FCAS Chair Dillon said that this arrangement would work as long as it was understood that proposal's approval is tied to the approval of Class B legislation.

Don Janssen remarked the proposal specifically states that students must take courses such as Biology 101, Nursing 201, and other courses outside the College of Education after they are admitted. He asked if these courses are currently available online and whether the offering departments had agreed to take ECFS students. Carol Davis, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education for the College of Education, and Gail Joseph, Associate Professor and Director of the Early Childhood and Family Studies program introduced themselves to discuss the issue. Davis said the catalog copy should state that equivalents for these courses can be used for the major. Currently, most students are admitted with the courses completed, while in other cases, students enroll in community colleges to get these courses, so there are opportunities to take them offline. Joseph said that Education was developing a "Human Development and Childhood" course to be offered online. Janssen said he was concerned that the College was requiring something for the major that the students would not be able to access at the UW. Davis said the specific courses were not required, but equivalents because there are problems with students in the onsite program accessing them. Janssen asked if the courses would be changed to an admission requirement. Davis said that they could make the change, but also that the program had been revised in 2012 so the specific courses were no longer required, but rather equivalents could be submitted. Janssen said he understood. Holt said that then the courses would be changed to admission requirements, and that the words, "or equivalent would be added.

Kramer asked if the intention was that the sixty-four credits required for the major were to be taken from the UW. Holt said rather than requiring the courses for the major be taken “in residence”, the catalog copy should state “from the university” since the courses are online. Janssen asked if students would pay a different rate if they took online classes outside the major. Vice Provost for Educational Outreach David Szatmary said that the rate would be based on the student’s status, not how the courses were offered; in the case of the ECFS proposal, students would not be required to take courses outside their major.

Joseph said that work was under way on courses that would serve as electives for the program in conjunction with a center in the College, and that faculty would work on identifying them as I&S or VLPA as appropriate. Holt said that, since this was online degree, there would be a review undertaken after five years, so identifying these issues initially would help.

Dillon asked whether students would be able to access “day” courses. Davis said students in the online program would not, but “day” students would. Dillon said the proposal then would differ from Evening Degree Program (EDP). Szatmary said that while advisers could make exceptions for students in the EDP, it was rare, and students in the ECFS major would be off-campus without access to onsite courses. Kramer said in the case of ECFS, there might be a financial incentive for students to take the program online.

Janssen asked whether students currently enrolled in the day program would be able to apply for the online degree. Davis said that was an intention of the proposal. Taggart asked whether restrictions on taking classes onsite should be included in the language. Holt said that the issue was really an issue for class B legislation, but it might be appropriate to include in the program’s general description. Janssen asked if a student would be able to transfer into the online program in the middle of the major. Joseph said that they would, noting that some students currently encountered problems completing the degree as in any other program, and that the online degree would provide another way to serve these students. Kutz asked if students changing to the online major would also switch to a different tuition category. Szatmary said that they would have to apply and be admitted to the online degree separately, and if they qualified, they would qualify for the lower rate of the online program.

Holt said it was important to note that admission to the online program would differ from how students are regularly admitted to the university. For the online program, students would apply to the program and then, if admitted, would be reviewed to assure they met the minimum requirements for university admission. So the admission to university--if not the major--would not be competitive. Davis said that that was correct, noting that currently students work closely with the advisor previous to admission even to the university so that the two processes are intertwined. Holt said that Class B was required, nevertheless, because students did not compete to get into the university as they usually do.

Instead of having another meeting to review the proposal, Holt suggested that next step was to make the changes to the catalog copy that had discussed at the meeting, and send to SCAP for their approval and then have the proposal forwarded for Tricampus Review. Janssen requested that the version sent out Tricampus Review include a statement that final approval for offering the major online would depend upon approval of Class B legislation defining the status of students in this and other similar programs. Holt said that was intent of his proposal, and his motion could be so amended. Holt proposed the following motion:

FCAS has approved the proposal for the online BA in Early Childhood and Family Studies completion degree (subject to SCAP's review of the catalog copy) for moving forward to Tricampus Review with the inclusion of the statement that final approval of the program is pending passage of Class B legislation regarding the status of students in fee-based programs.

Taggart seconded the motion. Dillon asked for discussion. Pengra asked about what was being changed concerning the proposal. Holt said that there were adjustments to the catalog copy. The motion was approved.

3. Chair's Report

Dillon said he wanted to note that the next meeting of FCAS would start at 1:00 PM so as to allow Jacques Lawarrée to attend the meeting.

Dillon also said that there had been discussion about Class B legislation at SCAP, where it had been proposed that language about the status of students in programs such as the EDP and the proposed online major be inserted in the section on scholastic regulations overseen by FCAS. Following that, Educational Outreach had suggested another location for the language about students in fee-based programs. Dillon said that the finalization of the language was very near for a proposal to put a statement in a section of preliminary definitions about matriculated students. Holt said he thought the distinction should be based on how students are admitted to the university. Registrar Virjean Edwards said that she had brought the point up at a national meeting of university registrars, including many universities with online programs, and none had this distinction. Edwards said she had discussed logistics of providing these students separate codes with her office, so that was possible. Edwards said she worried that the classification was set up another layer of administration to be managed.

4. Diversity Requirement Legislation

Chair Dillon noted that members of the Faculty Council on Minority Affairs and various student representatives were in attendance for the discussion of the proposal for adding a course requirement in diversity. He circulated a copy of Resolution 16 from the ASUW Senate endorsing the proposal. Angela Ginorio, Associate Professor of Women Studies and Chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs introduced the proposal by saying that they had representatives from the ASUW as well students on the committee that developed the proposal for the diversity credit, and others who had worked on the proposal.

Sarah Stroup asked about how the list of courses had been developed. Betty Schmitz, Director of the Curriculum Transformation Project, said the list had been developed to find out if there would be enough seats in classes should the requirement pass, and the list had been based on course descriptions only. She said that if the legislation passed, there would a process set up so faculty could request that that a course fulfills the requirement. Dillon said that in thinking about the process, the analogy was made to how general electives such as VLPA were fulfilled. Schmitz said additionally that the courses would need to appeal to students, so that each college would use the minimum requirement to develop courses.

Holt asked if Arts & Sciences would be approving the requirement for other colleges. Schmitz said that each college would approve their own courses. Holt suggested that another proposal would make the approval similar to requesting a course be approved as meeting the writing requirement (i.e. be listed as

a “W” class), as faculty could use their own judgment in this case. Stroup said that she was in favor of the proposal in principal, but worried about the requirement’s implementation, particularly since it seemed that courses featuring historical and international content had been excluded. Schmitz said that document did not represent consensus on implementation, but rather on the principle; how the requirement is developed and approved would come later.

Ginorio said that the committee had expected Stroup’s criticism, and said that the idea was that each college would have a role in approving courses as fulfilling a diversity requirement. Stroup said she worried because to change or add a category to what a course fulfills, faculty would have to submit course change form and a new syllabus—in some cases for courses approved a long time ago. The process for the “W” requirement would be a simpler process, since it was up to the faculty member teaching the course, and addresses the fact that different faculty include different content when they teach the course. Ginorio said for the committee it was important that understanding diversity be one of the stated objectives of the class. Stroup remain worried that implementation would be an imposition on faculty.

Dillon said that course selection was one issue that could be discussed further, but asked about what other comments the Council had on the proposal. Holt remarked that a similar proposal had failed 14 years ago, but in the meantime the student population had changed. The diversity requirement should reflect the changed population, such that it would serve international students; changing the requirement to “perspectives” could address this. Stroup added that including ethics, as Western has proposed, would be important, and noted that other universities use perspectives as their term. Morayma Reyes, Assistant Professor of Pathology and a member of the FCMA, said changing the requirement to perspectives would make it a different proposal. There a discussion about whether the term diversity itself was a “flashpoint” that would raise issues for faculty. Reyes noted that legislation had been passed for inclusion of diversity in the faculty promotion process. Holt noted that the diversity component was suggested, not required as the diversity proposal would.

Kutz said that in the ASUW Senate meeting the previous week in which Resolution 16 had been approved there had been efforts to change the requirement to one of perspectives that had been defeated by large majorities. Holt spoke about attending a panel on study abroad where a student discussed how a program in Morocco had changed her perspective; with a “W” like process, that course could count towards the requirement. A student, Enrico Abadesco, spoke of a study abroad experience in Jordan, where the students dealt with engineering problems, but avoided the cultural and political context that contributed to the problems, so that the course did not deal with diversity. Stroup said that illustrated how leaving the decision to faculty would help.

Kramer said she could not discern from the discussion whether the proposal was courses in U.S. diversity or for ones in international diversity. Ginorio said that the issue was that there could be no understanding of US diversity without understanding global forces. Helen Fillmore said that the original proposal a year ago had been for two courses, one global and one U.S.; that had been judged unfeasible because it was for two courses rather than one. The emphasis on the content was the intent of the proposal since its purpose educating students for the world outside.

Dillon said the issue with a “W” approval process ran into the issue that individual faculty have varying definitions of learning about diversity is, not all of which are in line with the proposal. Holt said that the solution could be to develop guidelines that assure the intent is met, but still leave the decision itself to individual faculty; one reason for the “W” process is because it is a requirement that can be added to a

VLPA, I&S, or NW course, as would be possible with the diversity requirement. Stroup said she was concerned about whether faculty would vote for a proposal for a more centralized process. Taggart said her concern was that the flexibility of the W requirement made it hard for students to find the course, since the designation appears in the time schedule, not the catalog.

Schmitz said she hoped she could allay some of the Council's concerns based on her experience on the taskforce for diversity in the undergraduate curriculum. Members of the taskforce include deans and assistant deans from colleges and schools such as Engineering, Information and Education, and reflected efforts on their parts to create courses that fulfill the requirement. Schmitz said she would be happy to send a summary of what the taskforce had learned. Deborah Wiegand, Assistant Dean for UAA, and member of the Curriculum Committee described the process for approval for a course to fulfill areas of knowledge, as there some cases where a course change form is not required. The rationale for using this process for the approval of the diversity requirement is because it's fulfillment would be based on the content of the course. The writing requirement is based on how students are assessed in a course. Wensel said one rationale for using the W process is to allow courses that are relatively fluid in content, such as special topics, to meet the requirement. Fillmore said that the committee had discussed the W process and had concerns that not all courses designated in this way would fulfill the intent of the requirement. As a compromise, she asked if there was a way to combine the two processes.

Dillon said that he had promised Kutz that the Council would come up with a list of questions to be addressed on the proposal. Holt said he had three considerations: 1) the approval process; 2) definition of the requirement; and 3) that the 50% rule for course content was higher than other areas of knowledge. Grant Kollet, Director of First Year Programs, while he had no suggestion about the best outcome for the discussion, he noted that there is lot of work being done by different colleges integrate diversity into their major. The diversity proposal seemed to be a separate endeavor to make an institutional statement about diversity. Since there are number of efforts towards integrating diversity into the curriculum, he thought it would be strategic for the groups to articulate these efforts, how they overlap, and what the overall goal is in order to persuade the faculty in general.

Janssen said that US diversity was not mentioned specifically in the proposal. He also questioned whether the proposal should be put forward as diversity if the word itself caused problems. Reyes said there should be no concern about using the word diversity, and that the revision of the proposal could include a definition including some of the words discussed at the Council. Ginorio said that the committee labeled the proposal as diversity and that students embraced that label. Stroup said she felt the term was misleading. Annette Anderson, PSO Representative, gave the example of the diversity minor, as an example that students do understand what is intended by the term. By contrast, Taggart said she felt that term "perspectives" was vague compared to diversity. Emil Pitre, Assistant Vice President of Minority Affairs, said that it would be a shame to take the word diversity out of the proposal when it was one of the six core values of university; leaving it out would give the students the impression that faculty do not support that value.

Janssen said he had an additional comment about the list of courses. So many of the courses are at the 300 or 400 level that he worried that freshman and sophomores would be averse to taking them, when those are the years that most students fulfill their general electives. He hoped that the list would evolve to include more lower-division courses. Fillmore said that students in their orientations are told that courses that higher number courses are more specific, and not necessarily at a higher level, unless prerequisites are required.

Dillon asked about next steps with the proposal. Ginorio said that if there was consensus, he could call for a vote. Holt said that legislation to go into the scholastic code had to be written in order for there to be something to vote. He noted that the section the code would go into was the responsibility of FCAS. Dillon said the essence of the discussion of the meeting had been about how to write the legislation. While there had been discussion about how courses would be approved for the requirement, Dillon noted that the proposal itself stated that the courses would be a subset of area of knowledge courses. Ginorio said that from what she heard from the students they wanted the classes to be regarded as areas of knowledge. She also said that passing the legislation would give an opportunity for her committee to discuss the proposal with a larger group, including the Faculty Senate.

Dillon asked if the discussion had been sufficient for the Council to write language that would be responsive to the proposal. Ginorio said that discussion had been sufficient and that she would be willing to consult with the Council on the legislation. Holt said that then the appropriate thing to do would be to propose to admissions and subcommittee of the Council to write the language. Susanna Cunningham, chair of the admissions and graduation subcommittee, said while her group did not typically write legislation, she felt the proposal needed to move out of the impasse. She also said she agreed with Pitre that if diversity was a value of the university, then the proposal should reflect that, and that there was no reason for avoiding any controversy associated with it. Dillon asked if it was the sense of the meeting that proposal should be referred to the committee on admissions and graduation to write legislation. His proposal was agreed to.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 pm.

Minutes by Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs rcorbett@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Dillon (Chair), Cunningham, Holt, Janssen, Keil, Kramer, Melin, Pengra, Stroup, Taggart
 President's Designee: Ballinger
 Ex-Officio Reps: Anderson, Ballinger, Fugate, Kutz, Wensel
 Regularly Invited Guests: Corbett, Edwards, Kollet, Wiegand
 Invited Guests: Enrico Abadesco , Fabiola Arroyo, Carol Davis, Helen Fillmore, Jennifer Gibbons, Angela Ginorio, Gail Joseph, Morayma Reyes, Emil Pitre, Shange Purnell, Betty Schmitz and Evan Smith

Absent: **Faculty:** Almgren