

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
December 2, 2005

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

Synopsis:

1. Announcements, revision, and approval of minutes
2. SCAP
3. Tri-Campus Review
4. Revision of form 1503 links, Attachments A-F

1. Announcements, Agenda, Minutes

The agenda and minutes were approved.

DJ: Is there a motion to approve the minutes?
SK: **So Moved**
GD: **Seconded**
Unanimous in favor

2. SCAP: Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs

DJ: There were no new SCAP proposals, correct?
SK: Correct.
DJ: However, next Friday, I believe, there will be a number of proposals that we'll have to look at in our December 16 meeting.

3. Tri-Campus Review Process

DJ: Also, Environmental Studies is pending Tri-Campus Review. It closes on December 10, and there are some questions that need to be addressed, something else to take care of in our next meeting. Moreover, Todd's and the Provost's office are still working on the procedure for the Tri-Campus council. We aren't sure if this should be done as an Executive Order or through the Senate.

RC: Then, we will need to convey the information to Marsha.
DJ: We will need to give something in writing to Todd's office.
RC: This isn't an Executive Order; it's an interpretation; it's a how-to guide.
DJ: So, I guess this won't be included in the handbook: all handbook items have to go through the Faculty Senate or passed as an Executive Order from the President. Now that we have decided that, I would like to move onto discussing the wording on the Tri-Campus Review: there is nothing about *if* something even needs a Tri-Campus Review—there are no guidelines to determine whether it even needs a review. So, I suggested something on behalf of this group: Changes requiring Tri-Campus review include:

1. Changes that would alter the degree information that appears on a student transcript – for example new or changed degree titles, minors or options, etc.
2. Changes in pre-requisites that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students admitted to the major, minor or option.

- 3. Changes in graduation requirements that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students completing the major, minor or option.
- 4. Any change on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs at one of the other two campuses.”

SK: An administrative question—who is going to maintain these changes? And, can we make recommendations on who we think should keep track of it?

DJ: I’ll need to find out; I’ll check notes from when I was talking with Leah last year. Anything else on Tri-Campus Review process?

DJ: For all of you not at the Faculty Senate meeting, Philip gave a report on the new enrollment policies, which he talked about at our meeting. I made copies of the handout for everyone. I was wondering if the summer number’s included athletes.

TM: I would imagine that those numbers include the athletes; I don’t see why they wouldn’t.

SK: Do transfer students come in as juniors?

DJ: Generally, yes. They have to have 85 credits to fit highest priority.

DW: And an associate’s degree.

DJ: No. The language got modified to recognize that for some majors, completing the Associate’s degree resulted in coursed that didn’t count; so now it is it just 85 credits or an Associate’s degree.

4. Revision of Form 1503 links, Attachments A-F

DJ: Rob has agreed to take over SCAP and Program Changes revisions, and we are in the process of updating information. Form 1503 is the official form to add/change major, minors, and options, and I have included the information from the web pages for us to review. In the past, Brian was the contact, and so we are in the editorial process of taking his name off the documents and replacing it with an FCAS email. I’ve gone ahead and set up an email account for FCAS: it’s fcas@u.washington.edu. I added Robert, Steve, myself, Debbie, SCAP chair, Matt, Todd, Scott, and curriculum office to receive the appropriate emails. Eventually, we hope that all forms will be submitted via email. So that being said, I would like to get feedback on these forms; The 1503 form has a half dozen links, which take you to different pages, and I copied all of that information into Word documents. So, if we could all look at the options section.

TM: Options are only transcribed: that will need to be taken out of the first paragraph (that also mentions non-transcribed options).

DJ: Okay. And these alternative areas need to be called something other than options. I was thinking of “path.”

LN: What about “track”?

RC: The graduate school uses “track.”

DW: They use “concentration” at Tacoma.

DJ: So, some wording would be: “Departments may recognize their own areas of emphasis, which are not transcribed within degree programs, such as “concentration” or “pathway” but these should not be called “options”. . . .”how does that sound?

Another issue that Todd mentioned before the meeting is whether or not there should be an upper limit on overlap between options. Currently, there must be a minimum 50% overlap, but no maximum. We are worried about students getting two or three options with mostly overlapping coursework.

SK: Why 50%?

RC: HECB. Every program, of course, will have that main, vanilla option to be the standard.

MW: We have had programs with nothing but options, no standard.

DJ: Can you graduate with more than one option?

DW: Even better, can you transcript two options?

JL: Yes. In political science, you have the option of political communications and political economy, and I believe there is a third one.

DJ: Is it legitimate to get a single degree and see that they fulfilled more than one option?

DW: On the transcript, it will show major: option; major: option—does it make sense to show that you are double majoring in the same major—at least, that is how it appears?

DJ: Do we need a minimum percent of requirements that are non-overlapping? Is there a problem with taking the same set of courses and then claiming two options?

SK: I think we could come up with a random percentage of differentiation, but I think we should reach a number through researching this situation a little better.

TM: Should we just mention that this group is mindful of this situation, and then leave it up to discretion of individual academic units?

DJ: I think we need to change the wording to say: “multiple options within the same major should be significantly different to justify separate transcripting.”

MN: I have another, non-related question: did we settle on an electronic version?

RC: Yes, I will include in the separate sections, “strongly advise electronic copy be sent to FCAS@u.washington.edu.”

TM: It would be easier for the Tri-Campus review, and we can just make the copies.

SK: Why not submit just the hardcopy signature, and also send the electronic copy.

TM: Yes. We could forward the eight copies.

DW: We could just electronically distribute them to SCAP and then print them out.

DJ: We are going to be transferring that cost because it is cheaper to Xerox than to print, but I don't think there will be enough submitted to make this a large concern. Is this form still a Word .doc?

RC: It is on track for a .pdf.

DJ: On another note, if you know where to find the 1503 form, you can find it. If you don't know and search the website for Form 1503, you can find it. If you are moderately aware and remember that there is a forms page, and go to that page, you will not find it.

TM: I'll look into that.

RC: There is another concern about timing: it seems that FCAS takes a year to review these things, where I have seen them take a month from submittal to finish.

DJ: What's realistic? It is still one month + FCAS two weeks.

RC: The language just seems confusing.

DJ: How about “many new option proposals that do not require significant revision, are approved within two months.” We'll leave the final wording up to you, Robert.

TM: How about “it is advisable to allow 2-4 months for program approval prior to implementation.”

DJ: We should include a statement like that for all of these that have timing issues. Robert, you can put in the amount of time you consider appropriate.

JL: I have a separate concern on New Degrees: can a student double major under

180 credits?

RC: Discussing double majors has no business being discussed on this sheet. I suggest we take that entire paragraph out.

DJ: Since last year's report and the implementation plan, we have not had any work done on double majors. We need to talk to Ingebritsen about the implementation of that report. We need to find out what is the timeline on that implementation.

DW: What action would you want from the Provost?

DJ: She could encourage us to proceed with it: I'd want her feelings on it.

SK: Whose task force was leading that report?

DW: Provost's.

MN: I think that this double degree information does belong in the New Degree section. Remember what we went through with music—I think this kind of information would be helpful for people not to confuse double major with the double degree concept.

RC: I don't think it belongs in documentation designed to advise faculty.

MN: How about a link in this document to the advising website? For instance, when a student is pursuing majors in Psych and Econ, they may think it's a double major, but if it's a BS and a BA, it is a double degree, not double major.

DW: You are right. There should be guidelines to state the difference between a BS and BA.

DJ: Is it appropriate to have a link to the difference between a BS and BA in the new degree section?

MW: This document also needs to contain information on upper and lower division courses.

DJ: I'll put a request in to find out where those definitions are. I have a question under the Admissions Requirements section—these are policies for majors, not departments.

DW: We need to synchronize the term selective and minimum admission requirements.

DJ: Where did selective come from?

DW: It is listed as minimum admission requirement in the student planner to new students, but I prefer the term "selective".

DJ: I agree. I like selective better.

RC: Going back to New Degree section, I think we need to point out that a degree is awarded by college, and major is awarded by department.

DJ: So, you want to say that a new degree is offered by the college or school, and the individual programs define the major terms?

RC: I'll rewrite this page and then get with SCAP for feedback. I'll check Northwest Association for definitions.

DJ: But I think that Admissions Requirements is getting closer to home. SCAP is working on it.

SK: It works.

DW: One question, the major section has the process description, but most others do not: is there a reason?

LN: We included the process, because the process itself was the holdup.

DJ: In addition, I think we need to modify second paragraph to include something like, "we advise you to coordinate with HECB documentation required for new majors."

LN: Probably on 1503 form, we should include a heads up that they need to be coordinated through HECB.

RC: On the minors' section, we need to remove the Dean of Undergraduate

MN: Education, and instead of approval, put signature of FCAS and president.
On the Major Requirements section, the information on changes in lower
division requirements seems unclear.

DJ: Can you come up with wording to forward on to Robert since we are out of time?
MN: Sure.

DJ: Is there a motion to adjourn?
LN: **So Moved**
SK: **Seconded**
Unanimous in favor

The meeting was adjourned at (3:00 pm). *Minutes by* (l. Whitney Thompson, Office of Undergraduate Education, iwt@u.washington.edu)

Present: ***Faculty members:***
Newell, L., Dillon, G., Janssen, D., Keith, S.

Ex officio members:
Lee, J., Navin, M., Louie, H.

Regularly invited guests:
Wiegand, D., Corbett, R., Mildon, T.

Absent: ***Faculty members:***
Woods, S., Brixey, S., Buck, S., Stygall, G., Tripathi, A., Montine, T.

Ex-officio members:
Ingebritsen, C., Nyquist, J., Trudeau, M.