

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Academic Standards Meeting Minutes**  
Friday, 13 January 2006  
142 Gerberding Hall

Chair Don Janssen called the meeting to order at 1:33 pm.

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Announcements, Agenda, Minutes
2. Subcommittee Business: SCAP, Other
3. Other Old Business: Review of General Questions for 10-year Review
4. New Business: Definitions of Degrees
5. Adjourn.

**1. Announcements, Agenda, Minutes**

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

**2. Subcommittee Business: SCAP**

DJ: George will provide a summary of SCAP business. I took what you sent and asked Whitney to include it in an agenda. Whitney, I think, in the future, we'll just add it as an attachment.

GD: It was old issues, housekeeping concerns. 1. Chinese non-heritage/heritage option: it was not a question of action, but only a request for advice on denying 111 credit for heritage. Typically, the heritage student takes 111,112,113, but the Chinese department wondered if heritage Chinese students, who took high school Chinese, should be denied credit. Recommendation: approved advising the Registrar to allow credit for Chinese 111 (Introduction to the Heritage language sequence) even if the student had taken Chinese in High School, as being more rigorous and accelerated than Chinese 101. However, this advice did not require FCAS action. 2. Question on the headers for International Studies tracks, which state that the programs require 100 credits, when they only require 75 credits and language proficiency. Approval: approved rewriting the headers for International Studies tracks, dropping any mention of 100 credits required and substituting in its place. "language proficiency through the second year level, plus 75 hours of course work." 3. Changes on 1503 to create campus neutral language. Rob has been working on them. The aim was to be inclusive of all three campuses. As SCAP we advised Robert Corbett that there were no objections to his putting up those portions of the revised 1503 suite of pages that did not address different circumstances in the Tacoma and Bothell campuses.

RC: First, we needed a form to create changes on all campuses. My suggested changes were an effort to make this process non-Seattlecentric. For example, there are different signatures required on different campuses: Chancellor/Dean titles are comparable.

DJ: Is a Chancellor signing these changes?

RC: Chancellors haven't been signing the 1503, but these are proposed changes.

DJ: The only signature required after FCAS review is the President's.  
LN: Another question, on the web, is there a link defining what an option was?  
DJ: Yes, there is an active link.  
LN: What about "continuation policy"--what does that mean?  
RC: Some programs have requirements, which require progress through the major. It is defined on other pages; it was also something that was already on the form.  
DJ: I suggest that you get the other pages up.  
RC: I am going to run them by Nancy Bradshaw.  
DJ: Todd, we have already mentioned the difficulty of finding the forms, especially for those that are mildly aware of the UW online forms section. What is happening with the form to change/propose new course?  
TM: They will be there, or will be there shortly. This form will be AJ's—so no hesitancy.  
DJ: Will the course proposals form be a standard .pdf?  
TM: A .pdf file offers a lot of versatility, search features, etc. Their dynamic capabilities make them helpful for Tri-Campus data.  
DJ: I think that we should encourage one place on the UW website for all forms.  
TM: I support that.

### **3. Old Business**

DJ: Did everyone receive the email on the 13 programs to be reviewed? It should have gone to voting faculty, but I didn't get it.  
LN: Neither did I.  
DJ: Were you on sabbatical?  
LN: No, I was on half time research.  
DJ: Well, I just want to say that I was overwhelmed by the list. The proposed new major in environmental studies bothered me. 90 credits, 15 lower division, and no required credits from a list. Only 9 courses had to be taken from a series of lists. Most are 5 credits; some are 10 (I can't image a 10 credit undergraduate class). I figured that a student could meet the requirements by only taking 40 credits from the list. Is there not a minimum of required courses for a major?  
DW: 50 is the lowest, but I don't know if that is specified anywhere.  
DJ: The HECB glossary states that a major is to have 45+ credits. 45 credits for a major should have to have requirements on them.  
JL: I vaguely remember 50 credits being said somewhere, but where, I don't remember.  
DJ: HECB says 45; Debbie says 50. We'll probably need to sort that out. But, there is an even bigger problem that I see. Not one individual course is required; it is all a series of lists.  
SBR: No core requirement is a problem.  
DW: There is nothing that says that you have to have a core.  
SK: Maybe they don't need to be specific: they might all have disciplines.  
RC: Remember, the background is different. They come from an Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences. They had concentrations, which are now in the process of being changed to majors.  
LN: There was a similar case six years ago with the Middle East department. They proposed only 3 or 4 different options without any core. SCAP turned it down initially, and they revised.  
SBU: Do we have jurisdiction?  
DJ: We have indirect authority. We are able to post comments, and Tacoma must read them: these are not minor concerns. I think it is our obligation to raise

- concerns over a degree that is going to say University of Washington. There should be a specified minimum of hours in major, and there should be a core.
- LN: Has Environmental Studies from here given their input?
- DJ: We should let them know that Tacoma has a minimum significantly lower than Seattle, and that they should comment.
- SK: Before “majors” and Tacoma just had “concentrations,” was there core curriculum?
- RC: It is the same requirements. Until the legislature gave them permission last June, they didn’t know if they were going to have freshman. Concentrations are constructed around a target group of AA degree-holders. But, if you feel that this significant, there should be a corporate comment from FCAS and not individual.
- DJ: I would be willing to post on behalf of FCAS. My concern is that two people get environmental studies degrees and have nothing in common: no core, no meaning.
- CR: Are those courses in place to be required? It appears that they want the flexibility of no core classes: that is their intent. I have heard many people complain over being forced to take classes that they didn’t want to take. It seems that this is Tacoma’s answer.
- SBR: The problem is that this is not just one or two students; it is multiple people and an inordinate amount of work. The core guarantees the rigor, and without it, anarchy. We all have had to take classes we don’t want to take, but it’s part of the rigor; it is not just hazing.
- LN: It appears to me that they don’t know what they want to do with Environmental Studies. What are their goals?
- DJ: Well, there is a positive: 75 credits are at the 300-level or above.
- SBR: This could be a temporary stop gap before they ramp up. They may be trying to weave this into a four-year program.
- DJ: I’ll look at list and try and make selection on majors.
- SBR: Does no one else see the irony of our last meeting, when we all agreed to sign off on approving changes?

#### **4. 10-Year Review**

- DJ: On this sheet, I have added our suggestions for additions to the 10-year review questions.
- SBU: The Undergraduate Advisory Council meeting is next Thursday, 19 January. Would they be welcome to come to the next meeting?
- DJ: Yes, forward me the names and emails, and I’ll send them the email.
- SBU: Also, if you could send me an electronic copy.
- DJ: For you who were not here last quarter, Todd will check when FCAS last reviewed the program and gather our concerns. Todd’s office is keeping track of those concerns electronically and entering them into a database field, so we can recall them on the next review. We hope it will be less cumbersome than the paper trail.
- SBR: Also, we don’t have to rely on institutional memory, where we can easily get distracted by putting out fires right in front of you.

#### **5. Degree Definitions**

- DJ: I contacted the Secretary of the Faculty and Tim Washburn for definitions of degrees. They gave me nothing. Then, I emailed Robert and asked if HECB had anything. Nothing. So, we thought that it might be easier to start with defining

what a Fine Arts degrees was and then move out from there. How do we proceed with this? I imagine that we need to come up with some internal definitions.

- SBR: I can go out and dig around to find out what is the general language used to define BA and BS.
- DJ: We had talked earlier about getting a smaller group together. Robert, we would want you to participate since you are familiar with the resources. Any one else? Shawn Brixey, I think you already mentioned you would be willing. I think it would be good to go out and bring your own perspective and then present it to the larger committee. It is easier to revise. We are just looking for initial definitions of BA, BS, and fine arts.
- LN: You might want to compare BA and BS in psychology, since they have both degrees. Start with their commonalities and then to their differences.
- RC: We should probably start with a few select case studies in social sciences.
- DW: Another good place might be in advising documents.
- DJ: Would Robert have access to those or would you need to provide them?
- DW: I'll look around and see what I can find.
- SBU: I think we have on the psychology web page advice on how the different degrees serve different purposes.
- DJ: I think this will help so we can make it clear to students what degrees will serve them best.
- SBR: When is this due?
- DJ: Next meeting we will have a guest speaker, so probably after that.
- SBU: What is the status of the DL degree?
- DJ: Last I heard was after the FCEO meeting end of last quarter. I haven't heard anything since.
- DJ: Todd, you were going to look at course approval process, delivery of course material method. We talked about letting students know about how course materials would be available: less than 50% traditional method. I suggest that you meet with members from FCEO and FCIQ to get some feedback on this process. We talked about last month setting up a small working group to move this along: SBR and SK as additional members. The ultimate goal is to let students know what they are signing up for when they choose a class.
- DJ: Is there a motion to adjourn?
- SK: **So Moved**
- SBR: **Seconded**  
**Unanimous in favor**

The meeting was adjourned at (2:45 pm). *Minutes by* (l. Whitney Thompson, Office of Undergraduate Education, iwt@u.washington.edu)

**Present: Faculty members:**

Brixey, S.  
Buck, S.  
Dillon, G.  
Janssen, D.  
Keith, S.  
Newell, L.

**Ex officio members:**

Lee, J.  
Louie, H.  
Rickerson, C.

**Regularly invited guests:**

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

**Absent:**

***Faculty members:***

Woods, S. (excused)  
Stygall, G.  
Tripathi, A.  
Montine, T.

***Ex-officio members:***

Nyquist, J. (excused)  
Navin, M. (excused)  
Trudeau, M.