

University Of Washington  
Faculty Council on Academic Standards  
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m., April 5, 2013  
Gerberding 142

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order
  2. Review of Minutes from March 22, 2013
  3. SCAP Report
    - a. Consent Agenda (routine actions)
    - b. Non-routine Actions
  4. Discussion with Jim Gregory on Class B Legislation Regarding Diversity
  5. Old Business
    - a. Request by Economics Department for an English Writing Skills Assessment Admission Requirement
  6. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dillon at 1:35 p.m.

**2) Review of Minutes from March 22, 2013**

Janssen moved to revise specific language in the minutes. Specifically, he did not believe that Killien's statement was correct when saying that historical diversity proposals included the definition of diversity. Discussion ensued about what was actually stated and what was accurate, along with what FCAS has submitted in the past. Concerns were raised asking if the minutes are to reflect what is actually discussed during meetings. After further discussion the council approved the revisions to the minutes.

Janssen moved to revise the minutes to show that "sexuality" was included as a "friendly" amendment to the Di course definition. Court explained that the motion to add "sexuality" was a secondary motion which was technically never approved by the council as a whole. However, that point is now moot since the Di course designation which was voted on by email ballot had in fact included the term "sexuality". After further discussion the council approved to revise the minutes to reflect that "sexuality" was approved through the online ballot.

Janssen moved to revise language regarding the survey of courses that attempted to assure sufficient seats were available to meet the proposed diversity requirement. Discussion ensued of what was actually stated in the meeting. The council approved the revisions to the minutes.

Holt moved to insert the resolution which was passed by FCAS regarding the "limited student" legislation. The council approved the revisions to the minutes.

Minutes from the March 22, 2013 meeting were approved as amended

**3) SCAP Report**

Holt stated that SCAP has not met since last meeting and has no report to submit.

Janssen stated that when he was reading into online degrees he came across something about approved equivalency. However, the only groups to approve course equivalency are the departments themselves. Examples of such “course equivalencies” include general education requirements, mathematics and statistics courses. Holt explained that there are several ways the university approves course equivalency, and this language is also used in other departments as well, so it is not uncommon to see this. Discussion ensued. Holt stated that this can be looked at again at future meetings.

a. Consent Agenda (routine actions)

No report.

b. Non-routine Actions

No report.

**4) Discussion with Jim Gregory on Class B Legislation Regarding Diversity**

Senate President Jim Gregory discussed the prospect of the diversity language proposed by FCAS and how it will be received during the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting scheduled for April 8, 2013. His goal today is to provide some feedback of the assessment of where SEC leadership is at with proposed diversity requirements. Gregory stated that we are looking at a train wreck. There is little likelihood that the measure submitted by FCAS will pass. The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) is opposed to it and faculty leadership is convinced that it will fail during SEC’s upcoming meeting. Gregory asked if FCAS is open to a last minute compromise. The feeling is that in order for the resolution to be passable it needs to have a greater definition of diversity in the Class B legislation. Gregory is aware of the arguments of not doing so, but this is controversial and it is likely that faculty members will not vote for something that is not clearly stated. Also, the definition needs to be broader so that courses can apply to other departments as well, not just to Arts and Sciences. Additionally, topics such as race and sexual identity are not included in the current proposal which will also create problems going forward.

Gregory drafted a compromise proposal and asked FCAS to consider his suggested legislation. Gregory’s proposal incorporates language from FCAS, FCMA , ASUW’s past resolution on diversity requirements, and the definition from UW’s 2011 blueprint on diversity. The language in the proposal removes the 50% requirement which might not be acceptable with some stakeholders, but it includes a broad list of courses that can be taught throughout campus. Gregory explained that similar proposals in the past first required 10 credits then required only 5 credits. This proposal now requires only 3 credits of diversity courses. Gregory restated that this proposal is the best chance of passing and he can guarantee that the current legislation originally submitted by FCAS will fail in SEC. Gregory asked what the council would like to do now.

Kramer asked if FCMA has formally voted to reject FCAS’s proposal. Gregory explained that there was no formal vote; however he has heard that FCMA will not support it. Gregory clarified that it does not matter at this point since it will belong to SEC on Monday anyway and it will be up to SEC to handle it. From this meeting he wants to know what message FCAS will send to SEC in order to move this forward. Holt stated that this does not represent consultation with other stakeholders and will be controversial.

Gregory explained that this is our best effort. Holt stated that Gregory's proposed language on diversity is actually narrower than FCAS's definition. Language from both proposals was compared. Stroup listed off items which were not covered in Gregory's proposal. Keil asked for the ASUW representative to comment and provide feedback since FCAS has to make a decision that will impact students.

Kutz presented the students' position. Students definitely want topics such as race, political diversity, and world cultures in the definition of diversity. When asked if the students would accept Gregory's "hail Mary", Kutz stated that he is not sure. However, the individual changes and the restructuring of the definition would be better received than the original proposal. Gregory went into detail about how this language could be received by SEC and the Senate. In addition, when the language of Di course description only goes into the advisor's manual, and not in the legislation, the faculty then loses control over the diversity language. Discussion ensued about what language to include in the definition. Stroup stated that people do not use "race" anymore because it is a modern term, plus it is not in her field of study. Stroup stated that she would not vote for this and is not comfortable passing it on to SEC due to specific wording and incorrect grammar. Stroup would like the proposal to pass but wants to vote for something that works.

Janssen questioned whether faculty has better control of the diversity language if it is originally in the legislation. FCAS actually has control of the definition and their original version would be better for faculty members because FCAS would be more responsive to changes to the university handbook. Gregory stated that it is hard to determine how faculty can actually change the language once it is in the advisor's handbook. In terms of voting on legislation, it is a political and visibility problem if the definition of diversity is not specifically clarified in the legislation and could create suspicion amongst faculty. Janssen responded stating that there will be an explanation alongside the legislation that would take care of the problem. Stroup stated that legislation drafted for tenure and advancement was brief and that was passed. Gregory explained that this legislation is high profile and been going for 20 years and will be fought as it goes through SEC and the Senate. Even then it has to go to the faculty which makes it even more difficult to pass. Gregory believes that the best outcome today would be if FCAS can signal that they are comfortable to modifications.

Ballinger asked if it is sufficient to keep the current legislative proposal and just change the Di course definition by adding Gregory's language. Gregory stated that the language needs to be broad. Discussion ensued about different examples to use. Gregory explained that FCAS is moving in the right direction and the goal is to address concerns of specific definitions of diversity and the desired outcomes. In addition, this is also a gesture of respect for the students who have been working on this for two years. Holt stated that FCAS has respected the students' position, but it is faculty who determines the curriculum. While they take the students' position seriously they do not necessarily have to do what the students want. Gregory explains that the student's position has value. Discussion ensued. During the discussion Gregory restated the history of diversity language and the role students have played. Kutz explained that FCAS has an opportunity here to come up with something that is passable while relaying the thoughts and ideas presented by FCMA and students. Discussion ensued to determine again who will be able to alter and change the language in the advisors manual.

Stroup presented a new definition of diversity. Court asked Stroup to clarify the motion. Discussion ensued to determine if this should be a motion and to determine what this would look like if it is a motion. Stroup goes into detail of the new diversity definition. Kollet asked if this new language is more or less descriptive of diversity. Discussion ensued to again determine what this language is and what should be sent to SEC. Gregory stated that this is good language and seems to get at most of the

dimensions which are desirable. Janssen discussed additional changes that could be made. Keil suggested pushing this through.

Stroup amends the definition by adding additional language. Discussion ensued about the term “world cultures”. Kollett asks to clarify if this will be Class B legislation that addresses Areas of Knowledge. Stroup states that the language is supposed to be a subset of Areas of Knowledge. Discussion ensued about the impacts of where the legislation could be inserted, how it would impact graduation requirements, and if it includes Areas of Knowledge. Chair Dillon asked the council if FCAS has something to send to SEC and to decide if this language is more attractive than what FCAS originally presented. Court asked to clarify if this language is to amend the Class B legislation that was previously adopted. The response is that this definition of diversity is separate from Class B legislation.

Holt moved to amend the diversity language that was previously adopted which was seconded. It was clarified that this motion is a statement to SEC saying that this is the language that FCAS wants in the Di course designation. Gregory states that this works and could go to SEC which they can switch out. Discussion ensued.

It was clarified that this language expresses the sentiment of what FCAS believes should be diversity requirements in order for students to graduate. The question was presented before the council for a vote. The following language received unanimous approval by the council:

*No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the diversity of human experience. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected world cultures. Courses focus on sociocultural, political, and economic diversity at local or global scales; cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, age, and military or socioeconomic status. Course activities might encourage thinking critically on the topics of power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.*

Kutz brought up the question about the inclusion of military status. Discussion ensued but no action was taken.

#### **5) Request by Economics Department for an English Writing Skills Assessment Admission Requirement**

The agenda item was not discussed during the meeting.

#### **6) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dillon at 3:20 p.m.

---

*Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst. [gcourt@uw.edu](mailto:gcourt@uw.edu)*

**Present:** Faculty: Dillon (Chair), Holt, Janssen, Keil, Kramer, Stroup, Taggart  
**President’s Designee:** Ballinger  
**Ex-Officio Reps:** Fugate, Kutz, Kollet

**Guests:** Jim Gregory, Robert Corbett, Sahr

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Pengra, Almgren, Cunningham, Melin, Schaufelberger  
**Ex-Officio Reps:** Wensel, Anderson