

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards Meeting Minutes
Friday, 18 November 2005
36 Gerberding Hall

Chair Don Janssen called the meeting to order at 1:35 pm.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Announcements, revision, and approval of minutes
2. SCAP
3. Admissions
4. General Questions for 10-year Reviews

1. Announcements, Agenda, Minutes

The agenda and minutes were revised and approved.

DJ: I would like to entertain a motion to extend ex-officio voting rights to Henry and Ms. Navin.

S: **So Moved**

SK: **Seconded**
Unanimous in favor

DJ: I would like to entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

DW: I have two small changes, and I apologize for not reading through these minutes before the meeting, but on page 2, the correct title is Faculty Council & Educational Outreach. Second, on page 3, it is SDB data, not STB.

DJ: So with those changes, is there a motion?

SBU: **So Moved**

GD: **Seconded**
Unanimous in favor

2. SCAP: Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs

The committee discussed making the submittal process electronic and setting up a permanent email account for FCAS.

DJ: Is there anything new or old in limbo?

SK: The Africa minor changes are still in limbo. Most of our time was spent talking about 1503 process and trying to put together a way to bump this process into the electronic age. Possibly, we would like to make it a requirement for electronic submission.

DJ: So, basically, minor revisions were discussed and no policy? Part of those minor changes will be making sure that Rob's name appears in place of Brian's.

RC: If we require an electronic submission, we need to have an email address.

SK: As part of that, we would like to make an FCAS email that is permanent. We could set up a permanent account.

RC: I can take care of this; I'll talk to Scott.

SK: If we need approval of anything, we will make sure that we meet before the FCAS meeting.

DJ: We might want to put together something for a potential DL degree supplement

form, for the future. It might not be a bad idea for SCAP to take the first stab at putting together the form. At least, they could identify in bullet points form what will, eventually, need to be added to the form.

SK: That sounds fine.

DJ: Also, the Undergraduate Experience Committee's report will help determine, to some degree, whether we will be heading for degrees on campus or DL. As soon as I get it, I'll forward it on to this group. In the end, I would like something to send to Szatmary's office [UW Educational Outreach] for a preliminary understanding of what we would want for a future submittal.

RC: Do we need to include FCEO?

SBU: FCAS, FCEO—both need to see something for DL prior to approval. They aren't divorced from curriculum issues.

DJ: I'll make sure that I keep the chair in the loop on this process. We need to get a set of questions to start out the process. Honestly, I hope we are years away from actual implementation. I would like to see a trial run, so we can work out all the problems before we start an actual program, but, in the meantime, we'll start with support for the 1503.

3. Admissions

Phil Ballinger summarized the UW change in Admissions. They are moving away from the Admissions Index, towards ratings on academic potential and personal qualities of students.

DJ: Phil is going to provide us with a summary of the new steps in UW admissions' policy.

PB: Well, we have finished the initial process with the faculty committees. Over the course of three meetings, we met with representatives from: English, Nursing, Civil Engineering, Sociology, Education, Oceanography, Mechanical Engineering, Forest Resources, Architecture, Applied Mathematics, and Chemistry. The committee looked at 33 applications and focused on the applications with clearly divergent reviews. We will be training readers, both professional staff in admissions and also graduate students. The graduate students are both master's and Ph.D. students from the following areas: Public Health, Public Administration, Education, International Studies, Creative Writing, English, Anthropology, Architecture, Construction Management, and Social Work. I know that there are not many from the physical sciences, but we have selected an outgoing, high achieving group, and I am pleased. We received 120 applications. I should say we received 190 applications, but only 120 were reviewed because they were complete. From the 120, we selected 20. In the next meeting, we will be working with the training staff to train readers and to start the assessment of professional staff. Our training will last about 40 hours.

DJ: I think for clarification, we might talk about the rating process. It is a single number rating system from 1-9, one being on the bottom. The students are being evaluated on their academic potential and personal qualities. There is not necessarily a relationship between the single readings and the average of the two.

PB: The sub assessment helps with consistency. Consistency, of course, is our target, but it is also elusive. I think success rests in continual testing of our readers. For the next while, the FCAS Admissions Subcommittee will meet more frequently for difficult applications.

SK: For two divergent ratings, is a third reader called?

PB: Yes. The third reader will be a senior reader.

DJ: I asked Phil to tell us about this for two reasons. First, I think it is a good idea for us to know about things like this, since admissions' decisions affect our interests as a group. Second, I think this meeting is a good intermediate step in the process, since it is a public meeting, between going through the process and taking it to the public.

PB: There is public concern over leaving an objective criteria and leaning towards subjective. There is also criticism about how this move is undermining I200. We can't guarantee the outcome, since race and ethnicity are not part of the decision. Socioeconomics, of course, are.

DJ: So, the information on race and demographics is not provided for consideration?

PB: For the next cycle, readers will not be able to access information. Right now, they can see that information—it has been that way ever since I200.

DJ: Of course, if a student starts the essay out as "As an African American, I . . ."

PB: Then, that information is legitimately provided, but it is not part of the official assessment.

SBU: I have had several conversations with people in the community. In general, people seem happy about the decision, and most seem to think that their kids have strengths that don't show up in grades and test scores.

PB: I have seen a similar reaction, which has been heartening. Sally Jewel, in the Board of Regents, asked whether this process would affect the behavior of students? At Ohio State and Michigan, they have seen changes—there was a decrease in applicants. The actual perception of our change has yet to be seen.

SBU: I think it will push kids to have a wider range of activities. . .

PB: or better classes, and not to just take classes to protect their GPAs.

DJ: In fact, isn't the strength of the senior year one factor? Since they apply their junior year, aren't they required to list what they are taking until graduation, and then you have the ability to check?

PB: Yes. We have heard a lot of support from teachers and counselors. The Admissions Index relied $\frac{3}{4}$ on GPA out of context. For all we knew, the student could be taking Introduction to Breathing rather than Calculus.

DJ: In a related issue, is the HECB [Higher Education Coordinating Board] still pushing towards a four-year math requirement?

PB: That has been tabled. In the Superintendent's Office, we are trying to push the math requirement and lab science requirement. [Note: The HECB had been proposing to revise their [minimum college admission standards](#) until the Governor requested that the issue be taken up by [Washington Learns](#). In a few years, we were going to have to get rid of the Admissions Index any way, regardless of curriculum; we had to find different options.

SW: Who was going to get rid of it?

PB: The HECB.

SW: Do we have predictions for high schools, similar to what we have with community colleges? It would be helpful to predict success.

PB: This is a sensitive issue, just as predicting community college transfer success—this is something the press has been looking around for, some kind of rating system of high schools.

SW: It would be nice to have predictability of knowing whether a student, coming from one high school, will drop a GPA point their first year of college.

DW: I am concerned about the accuracy and function of this data—would we be looking at it by the major they are studying or by the community college or high school they are coming from?

SW: I would want both.
PB: I think we could put together this information, but for what would we be using it?
SW: For admissions.
PB: Predictability for high schools and community colleges is not the same; they are two different situations, with different considerations, but we certainly could get the information.
TM: I'll talk to the data management group, and we will work on a report mock up.

4. General Questions for 10-year Reviews

DJ: Any ideas that we need to formalize?
SW: There is no question on the major's demographics: age, ethnicity? Native student or transfer? Also, there is nothing to describe the curriculum.
DJ: I attached the current version of approved curriculum that has come through here. Last time I tried to get a hold of the curriculum, I got a stack of changes. There was no new curriculum compiled, just a record of changes. I think we need wording that will explain the curriculum.
DW: The wording for the curriculum is provided in the catalog description.
SW: In my earlier two-hour meeting for my recent review, he wanted me to walk him through, quarter by quarter, a typical student's load: what are they taking? What is it like, quarter by quarter?
DW: It sounds like the student information sheet that we give out at Gateway, which asks for a four-year plan.
SW: But, currently, there is no question that asks for the nuts and bolts of the program.
DJ: Any comments?
SW: Also, how do we know that FCAS approved? Do they look for changes? Should we be able to see what has been changed?
DJ: At our last meeting, we discussed making this an electronic process. SCAP will accumulate questions and our committee will accumulate questions, and then we will attach them in a field in a more useful database. Right now, we have to go back to minutes.
DW: If 1503 is submitted electronically, we could just dump it into the field, rather than retyping.
SW: It would be nice to have—as one of the questions—what program changes occurred in the last 10 years or since the last review, and what has been the effect?
RC: That would be an interesting question to ask Forestry.
DJ: Back to SW comment, how about we also add: Attach copy of program requirements with sample student pathway, along with a narrative, explaining the program and curriculum changes.
GD: This might work for sciences and nursing, but it wouldn't work in all areas.
DW: Yes, some majors, when they started studying the student pathway, they found that their students were taking a random walk, rather than working towards graduation.
SW: I still think it would be helpful to provide a typical pathway through the major.
SBU: Pathway is different than typical load—as long as we keep that mind. I have two changes, if we are ready to move on in the discussion. On Point E, I think we should add: How are you making this information available to current and prospective students? Another addition, I think needs to be added to Point C. It needs to be more general: In what ways have you been able to involve

undergraduates in educational opportunities based outside the classroom or beyond the campus? We might want to make this a whole other questions, placing it between Point B & C, or C & D.

DW: Either way, I think we should also ask for an assessment of their results.

SBU: We might want to rearrange sentences, and a better grouping might be a good idea.

DW: Continuing with that, I think Point C, and this new point that Steve has suggested need to also have an adjoining questions asked: how have you integrated this into the curriculum and how do they “enrich” the curriculum?

DJ: Even though the final wording on C is not finished, I would like to send our corrections onto the committee to wordsmith. Do I have a motion for that?

SK: **I move to send the corrections onto the committee.**

SW: **Seconded.**

Unanimous in favor

DJ: On a final note, I am hoping to get to a point of support for FCAS by the Office of Shared Governance, at least like last year. When I agreed to be chair, I was agreeing on the condition of the same support. If not, I will not have time to chair the committee, and there will have to be a new chairman appointed. I just wanted to make you aware. . .

According to an informal poll of faculty present, no one else on the committee would be willing to chair without the same support as last year.

The meeting was adjourned at (2:42 pm). *Minutes by* (l. Whitney Thompson, Office of Undergraduate Education, iwt@u.washington.edu)

Present: Faculty members:

Woods, S., Dillon, G., Janssen, D., Buck, S. Keith, S.

Ex officio members:

Lee, J., Navin, M. Louie, H.

Regularly invited guests:

Ballinger, P., Wiegand, D., Corbett, R., Mildon, T.

Guest:

Dunbar, L.

Absent: Faculty members:

Brixey, S. (excused), Stygall, G., Tripathi, A., Montine, T.
Newell, L. (excused)

Ex-officio members:

Ingebriksen, C. (excused), Nyquist, J., Trudeau, M.