

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m., April 19, 2013
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of Minutes from April 5, 2013
 3. SCAP Report
 - a. Consent Agenda (routine actions)
 - b. Non-routine Actions
 4. Chair's Report
 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 1:30 p.m.

2) Review of Minutes from April 5, 2013

Melin asked about the minutes from the past meeting. He saw that the term "military" was removed from the diversity language and wanted to make sure he saw that correctly. It was confirmed that "military" was removed because ASUW did not support it.

The minutes were approved as written.

3) SCAP Report [Exhibit A]

a. Consent Agenda (routine actions)

b. Non-routine Actions

Holt introduced a changed requested by the School of Music to include an option in Music Theory to go along with the existing options in Music History, Voice, and Early Music. The council unanimously approved the change.

Holt added that Early Childhood and Family Studies is still looking at other issues about what to include in the catalog and that any approval is contingent on the proposed Class B legislation on limited admitted students. Holt reminded the council that the issue is creating a degree in which students might have to take classes from other colleges in order to complete the program. The issue becomes problematic if courses are not offered in distance learning and there is no certainty in how students will obtain the required credits. Would students then enroll in community college courses to obtain the required classes, or will the courses be offered through the program? It is important that the UW not encourage students to go out of the UW to take classes.

4) **Report of March and April Admissions and Graduations Subcommittee Meetings [Exhibit B]**

Cunningham reported on past Admissions and Graduations Subcommittee meetings. Issues addressed were:

- Online courses and the residency policy
- Holistic review process as applied to domestic, non-resident students
- Two appeals from students who were denied admission to the UW for Fall 2013
- Approved language related to how applicants to the UW undergraduate program will be given credit for A-level examinations

Cunningham explained that the UW is offering more online courses which is why the residency policy needs to be addressed again to determine whether or not these courses count as in-residence. There are various answers and they are looking at how other schools handle this. Holt explained that online courses are not considered in-residence and went into further detail. Cunningham said they will take that into consideration.

The holistic review policy was created at a time when non-resident student applications and enrollments were much lower and were not of primary concern to the UW. Now non-resident application numbers and enrollment has increased dramatically and needs to be revisited. One issue is whether applying socioeconomic-related factors to non-residents leads to unintended consequences for some students. For example, financial aid is not available for domestic non-residents so those selected using socioeconomic factors are at greater risk of incurring a large debt. The committee will continue to consult with the Office of Financial Aid to further examine the issue.

The committee discussed and approved language related to how applicants to the UW undergraduate program will be given credit for A-level examinations. These examinations are typically taken at the end of a two year program of intensive study on particular topics, usually around grade 13. Initially used in the UK, these programs and examinations are now being taken in many other countries, particularly in China. The goal was to have a clear policy that could be posted online and which should make the UW's position transparent to applicants, essentially codifying UW's policy on these exams. Pengra raised a question asking if the exams are given the same credit as AP courses. Cunningham explained that UW actually gives more credit for these exams. Discussion ensued about A-level credits. While this is a common exam taken by foreign students, some Florida schools are making an effort to install A-level testing as well. Melin asked if UW has seen high schools moving in this direction but there is no data now. The number of students taking these courses is small, but there is a growing trend.

5) **Chair's Report**

Chair Dillon updated the council on a memo he received from Patricia Kramer (also a member of the University curriculum committee) regarding approving courses offered by Professional and Continuing Education (PCE). The question raised asks if, when a curriculum change comes before the committee, has it already gone through the school or department for approval? The proposal in question relates to an offering from the ISchool which offers a summer certificate. The committee has not dealt with certificates much and does consider them important as they are not transcribed. However, it is important for the PCE site. Dillon believes this is an issue for the ISchool and PCE to figure out together, but wanted the council's opinion on the matter.

Wensel clarified that the concern is that courses are developed with state supported funds but are intended only for the (fee-based) certificate. This is something that the committee should be concerned

about because PCE is offering the certification even though the UW does not have a graduation certificate. It will be only a matter of time until a student taking a course asks why it's not on their UW transcript. Janssen asked if this is a UW credential, because that is one of PCE's selling points. Holt stated that PCE is a UW operation. Taggart read from the website that a PCE certificate is a "highly regarded UW credential".

Janssen explained that the committee should look at it as PCE not reimbursing UW's costs for the administrative work to coordinate this program. The greater problem is when the PCE courses show up with the same course numbers as UW and enrolled students are prevented from taking them. For example, CM 323 is offered by PCE but it is completely different than the course he teaches in the winter for enrolled students. UW students in the CM department who need CM 323 to graduate cannot take the PCE course when it's offered in the spring because it is provided by an outside instructor. These are two different courses; they share the same number but have different eligibilities. Further discussion ensued. Winslow stated that if UW works under the assumption that CM 323 is CM 323, then they should also assume that it was vetted by the department. The concern was still raised that if these PCE certificates are offered to UW students, then students may get angry if the credits don't count towards graduation in their program. Further discussion ensued about how the graduate school's certificates are impacted.

Dillon provided an updated status on two Class B legislative proposals that came out of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The first proposal, limited admitted student status, went through unaltered and did not receive much debate. The diversity initiative had a much more eccentric process. FCAS' substitute to the definition of diversity was met by a counter proposal offered by Marjorie Olmstead from the Faculty Council on Women in Academic (FCWA) because she was a member of SEC. This proposal slightly amended FCAS' original language and was eventually passed by SEC after being itself slightly amended.

Holt passed out three documents: the diversity proposal approved by FCAS, the diversity proposal that SEC approved, and the background/rationale that was distributed alongside SEC's diversity proposal. Holt explained that the SEC proposal, along with the background/rationale, went out all the senators and included a section which stated that the diversity proposal is supported by FCAS. However, FCAS never endorsed the SEC version therefore FCAS should not be said to support it. Additionally, the new proposal considerably narrowed the language. Holt wanted to know if FCAS wants to take a stand on this altered legislation. Cunningham raised a question about what the impact would be in taking a stand. Holt explained that this will go to the senate. He has been involved with faculty governance for a long time and has not seen this done before. Dillon explained that the rationale refers to the diversity definition as a result of collaborative efforts amongst various faculty councils including FCAS; there is no mention that the councils endorse this language. Holt responded that the rationale implies that the diversity proposal received FCAS' approval, but it never did.

Janssen stated that he opposed changing the term from "might" to "should" because the way it is worded now there will not be any classes that encourage critical thinking on diversity issues. "Might" is a term that implies "suggesting", and "should" is a term that applies to "everything". Dillon suggested that the language could be reworded to "and/or". Discussion ensued about how to reword the language. Dillon reminded the council that the diversity language was already approved by SEC and sent out to the senators. Discussion ensued about of the legislative process. Janssen stated that the background/rationale insinuates that FCAS is happy about version and wants to know if that is correct. Keil asked Kutz for the students' perspective. Kutz stated that SEC's language is consistent with previous

student language on diversity. Janssen asked if ASUW endorses this language. Kutz replied that there is a formal process to endorse any language which takes time.

Pengra asked for clarification amongst all the versions. Holt provided an update and encouraged the council to decide which version to support. Kutz stated that the reference to FCAS and other councils collaborating on the diversity language is correct because each council spoke on the issue. Taggart agreed. Holt restated that FCAS never approved the language and that the definition is dramatically different. Taggart stated that she objects to having Jim Gregory giving them an ultimatum to pass diversity language that was entirely different from FCAS' original definition. Cunningham expressed her opinion that she does not want FCAS appearing that they want to stop this diversity language. Keil stated that the ship will go down if FCAS tries to beach it; FCAS should just stop the conversation now. Janssen restated his original position that "might" needs to be changed to "should". Keil explained that they won't do well if FCAS comes into the senate meeting with new wording to the diversity definition.

Dillon asked if FCAS wants to challenge the diversity language during the senate meeting. Cunningham stated that she would like to see this move forward. Cunningham moved to approve the SEC language which was seconded. Cunningham explained that she wants to move this forward because it is an issue that can be discussed forever. Holt stated that SEC's language narrows the definition and he will not endorse it. Koeller asked if the "and/or" change would be okay. Holt replied that the council is voting to support Cunningham's motion. Taggart asked if the council has the option to edit the language now. Holt replied the option is just to endorse the language. Melin asked if it is reasonable to assume the senate would recognize the differences. Holt replied no, the senators will just know that FCAS agrees to this definition and is happy with the way it was written. Cunningham explained that there is no such thing as perfect wording and the definition will always occasion controversy and asked if it would be detrimental if FCAS does not support it at the senate meeting. Keil stated that he will vote no on the motion if Holt stands up during the senate meeting and endorses SEC's definition. Discussion ensued about how this motion would impact the senate meeting. Cunningham withdrew her motion explaining that she only wanted to see this move forward.

Koeller asked that if some version of this definition gets approved by the faculty, can an amendment be made without another faculty vote. Janssen explained that if this language is approved by the faculty, then any future amendments to the definition would require Class B legislation. Janssen raised the question about how the wording will be interpreted by the curriculum committee. Discussion ensued. Anderson explained that either way it was written, whether it includes the term "should" or "might", the definition will be open to interpretation. Discussion ensued about how "should" and "might" could be interpreted according to the intent of the diversity requirement.

6) Request by Economics Department for an English Writing Skills Assessment Admission Requirement

Dillon provided a background of a presentation made by Jacques Lawarree, department chair of the Economics Department, requesting FCAS to approve an English writing skills assessment as part of the department's admissions requirement. This differs from a general literacy test and Dillon went into detail about the history of the Economics Department and how they handled the issue in the past.

The question FCAS must decide is whether to approve this proposed writing skills assessment. Discussion ensued and several concerns were raised. Janssen brought up a point, that from observing the presentation to FCAS, Lawarree listed three skills in descending order based on importance to the department:

1. Critical analytical thinking skills
2. Communication skills
3. English

From Janssen's point of view, the proposal is addressing a third level issue. Dillon stated that the Economics Department recognizes that. Janssen replied that they are testing for the wrong thing. In the past, the department's student body was homogeneous. Now it is very diverse. The first step the department needs to take would be to change English 131 to an entry requirement if they have these new expectations. Perhaps they can try it out and come back in a few years if it is not working. Dillon stated that it is a plausible strategy, but it did not seem like they were going to do that. Janssen suggested that is the next best step because the department did not demonstrate that the English test would solve the problem they identified. The proposed solution is disconnected to the problem. Discussion ensued about communication versus critical and analytical skills. Janssen explained that there was a disconnect between the problem and solution. Holt explained that he understands there are people who are math whizzes but simply cannot describe their understanding to others. Taggart stated that her main concern is taking international students out of the program. She would be open to the department to try it, but if it's because they don't like Chinese students then it is not okay. Janssen said he would be more comfortable if the English 131 course was an admission requirement rather than a graduation requirement.

Holt moved that FCAS approve the exam for a three year trial period which it will then expire. The department can then come back to FCAS and report the impact. This is their opportunity to try it once and correct any mistakes. Cunningham asked if FCAS needs to clarify what kind of data needs to be provided to FCAS in three years. Holt stated that the department just needs to convince FCAS that this new assessment works. Keil stated that this will be expensive and liked Janssen's point that the proposed solution is disconnected to the problem. FCAS might advise the department about the English 131 admission requirement and keep tabs on them as an alternate method. Court asked if this is an amendment to Holt's motion. Keil stated no, this is something separate that FCAS can communicate to the department. The motion was unanimously approved by the council.

Janssen moved that the chair of FCAS communicate with the economics department that FCAS strongly encourages them to change English 131 from a graduation requirement to an admissions requirement. The motion was unanimously approved by the council.

7) **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dillon at 3:55 p.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Dillon (Chair), Cunningham, Melin, Holt, Janssen, Keil, Pengra, Taggart
Ex-Officio Reps: Kutz, Anderson, Kollet, Wensel

Absent:Faculty: Almgren, Kramer, Stroup, Schaufelberger
Ex-Officio Reps: Fugate, Randall
President's Designee: Ballinger

Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) Summary

1:30-3:00 pm

April 12, 2013

Gerberding 036

Old Non-Routine Business:

1. **School of Music** - ([MUSIC-20121025](#)) New option in Music Theory within the Bachelor of Arts degree in Music.

Background: The School would like to include an option in Music Theory to go along with the existing options in Music History, Voice, and Early Music.

Action Taken: 03/01/2013 - Approve and forward to FCAS.

Action Taken: 04/12/2013 - Post Tri-Campus Review. Approve and forward to FCAS.

2. **Atmospheric Sciences** - ([ATMS-20130123](#)) New options in Meteorology, Climate, and Chemistry within the Bachelor of Science degree in Atmospheric Sciences; revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Atmospheric Sciences.

Background: The department has maintained the proposed options as tracks and having them approved as options will increase the visibility for prospective graduate schools and employers. The department is also making changes to the core requirements to comply with the requirements for establishing options.

Action Taken: 03/15/2013 - SCAP would like the department to justify existing grandfathered grade policies within the major (minimum 2.0 in each course and 2.5 cumulative GPA) as this 1503 is requesting substantive changes within the major. Pending.

Action Taken: 04/12/2013 - Pending - Department was willing to drop minimum grade of 2.0 in each course and keep 2.5 cumulative GPA. SCAP has countered with minimum 2.5 cumulative GPA in non-ATMS courses and a 2.0 cumulative GPA in ATM S courses applied to the minor. Waiting for response from the department.

NEXT MEETING: April 26, 2013

Report of March and April Admissions and Graduations Subcommittee Meetings

I. March 11 meeting

1. Online courses and the residency policy - (last 45 credits on campus).

An issue about whether online courses can be considered for the residency requirement is occurring with increasing frequency as more and more courses are offered online. The committee discussed the issue and a variety of opinions were expressed. Registrar Virjean Edwards will look into how the AAU public schools are approaching this issue and the committee will discuss it again and come to a decision. In the interim, it was decided that Ms. Edwards will send individual petitions to the committee via e-mail for a vote.

2. Holistic review process as applied to domestic, non-resident students

The holistic review policy was created at a time when non-resident student applications and enrollments were much lower than now and were not of primary concern. Non-resident application numbers and enrollment goals have changed dramatically. We wonder whether applying the socio-economic-related factors to non-resident applicants in the same way as we do for resident applicants leads to undesirable, though unintended, consequences for some students and for the institution. The key problem is that financial aid is not available for domestic non-resident students, so students who are selected using socio-economic factors are at great risk of incurring a large debt and may not realize the future impact of that burden.

This issue was not resolved, and the committee has requested consultation with the office of financial aid as it continues its consideration of this issue.

II. April 11th Meeting

1. The committee reviewed and declined two appeals from students who were denied admission to the UW for Fall 2013.

2. The committee discussed and approved language that will be available online related to how applicants to the UW undergraduate program will be given credit for A-level examinations. These examinations are typically taken at the end of a two year program of intensive study on particular topics. Initially used in the UK, these programs and examinations are now being taken in many other countries. The goal was to have a clear policy that could be posted online and which should make the UW's position transparent to applicants. The suggested wording for the policy is:

Online Policy Statement Recommendation:

Policy Overview

In general, up to 15 quarter credits will be granted for each A-level exam with a passing grade of E or higher. Up to 7.5 quarter credits will be granted for each AS-level exam with a passing grade of E or higher. No more than 45 quarter credits (one year) from all A-level and AS-level exams can be applied towards a UW degree. No grades are posted for A-level or AS-level exams. General elective credits in the subject area will be awarded unless the discipline's academic department has previously approved UW course equivalencies. General elective credits can be applied towards the Areas of Knowledge (general education) graduation requirements. If UW equivalent courses are needed for a specific major, students will need to consult the academic department once they arrive on campus to have them evaluate the syllabus/content of the A-level or AS-level exam. Duplicate credit for the same subject taken on different exams like A-level, AS-level, AP, or IB will not be granted.

Submitting A-Level or AS-Level Exams for Credit

The UW can only award credit once the official A-level or AS-level exam certificate has been issued. Preliminary results, Statement of Results, and unofficial photocopies cannot be used to grant credit. Once you have received your official A-level or AS-level exam certificate, either have your school make an official photocopy of the original by stamping the copy as official or submit the original exam certificate to the Office of Admissions. Once an official copy of final exam certificate is received, the Office of Admissions will post credit to your student account. Once credits are posted, information about courses and credits awarded will be accessible via MyUW on your unofficial UW transcript. Please allow 2-4 weeks for exam certificates to be processed and credit posted.