

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on **January 10, 2003** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the December 6, 2002 FCAS meeting.
2. SCAP: Discussion of a proposal from the School of Drama to delete a Minor Option. This proposal was deemed non-routine by SCAP.
3. Option/Track Clarification Proposal.
4. Update on DL Course Approval.
5. Ten-Year Review Self Study: Discussion of a possible proposal for changes.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of December 6, 2002 were approved as written.

SCAP: Discussion of a proposal from the School of Drama to delete a Minor Option. Deemed non-routine.

Woods said Drama majors were having trouble getting into classes required before becoming a major. Part of the problem is that minors are competing with pre-majors for spaces in these courses. There was some question as to whether this proposal would qualify as an RECP, in that it was reducing options for students. Plumb said Doug Wadden told her that the Faculty Code defines what RCEP applies to, and minors do not trigger any of the RCEP mechanisms.

Kenney said that Women's Studies has a minor, and that it has presented no problems. Plumb said, "We just tell our students [in Technical Communications] that we can't guarantee that they'll finish their minor, since majors naturally take precedence over minors in regard to access to courses."

Woods asked, "How will this save money [for Drama]? We might ask them. It sounds like they have to close off enrollment." Plumb said, "The minor competes with the major; it increases the rate at which intended majors can declare their major, and affects the graduation rate of Drama majors."

Plumb said, "We'll wait two weeks to approve the proposal. I'll ask the department about the proposal and bring it back to FCAS. I'll try to find out more about how students register for the pre-major courses and how, specifically, the department feels that continuing the minor is affecting students who want to major in Drama."

Option/Track Clarification Proposal

Plumb said "Option" vs. "Track" needs clarification in the Web site's 1503 form. "What exactly do these terms mean?" she said. "I'll make a proposal that it would be good to have this written down more clearly."

The "Options" Web page was distributed to the council for review. It was noted that options are almost always transcribed, with certain exceptions. (English is an exception.) It was agreed that no one is wedded to the words they are using in their descriptions in proposals submitted to SCAP.

Plumb proposed to keep the word "option" for programs that are less than a major, but that are transcribed. "If a department *thinks* of its proposal as a 'concentration,' that's OK. But on the 1503 form, and in the description, it would be helpful if it is made clear that it is an option, if that's what it is. If the department does *not* want its option to be transcribed, they can call it whatever they want to."

Newell said, "We [in Anthropology] have recognizable tracks, so students know which courses they should be taking. This is helpful, but those tracks did not go through any special approval process. And these are not transcribed programs." Kenney said, "In Women's Studies, most of the track courses are not actually Women's Studies courses." Newell said, "In Anthropology, these courses aren't required; they're recommended."

Plumb said, "We'll just mention these choices on the Web page. There are so many ways for these kinds of courses to be set up and accounted for. I'll work with Robert Corbett on revising the Web page."

Washburn said, “It will work fine. But changing the definition should *not* change what comes through SCAP. We don’t want to change the process.” Plumb said, “These changes shouldn’t change what comes to SCAP. It should even *remind* people to go through SCAP.” Washburn added, “We still have to maintain the communication process. That is essential.”

Update on DL Course Approval

Plumb said she attended a meeting of Tim Washburn’s University Curriculum Committee, along with FCEO chair Steve Buck.

She said an example of the kind of thing that could be appearing more frequently in the future is a Distance Learning proposal that came before the Curriculum Committee recently. The proposal sought to gain approval as a University of Washington course an Asian Language course run by a group at the University of Hawaii. There would be no UW instructor involved in the course.

Washburn said the Curriculum Committee accorded the course transfer credit, but nothing more. “Our faculty need to be involved in our courses,” he stressed. Plumb said, “This is only the tip of the iceberg of DL courses to come.”

Washburn said, “We’ve refined the Distance Learning course application form.” Janssen said, “There should be a way to review the course if there is a change of instructor of record.” Washburn said, “We added to the form the inclusion of the instructor who would be responsible for the content of the course.”

Ten-Year Review Self Study: Discussion of a possible proposal for changes

Plumb distributed the “Guidelines for Units Under Review” from the Office of Academic Programs, and specifically directed the council to “II. Guidelines For Self-Study: Main Text, Section B: Research and Productivity.”

Her “Draft Proposal for Changes to Ten-Year Review Self Study” includes: making no changes to Section A other than adding the word “General” to the title, which would become “General Self-evaluation”; changing Section B to Section C (removing questions 5, 6, and 7), and creating a new Section B: “Teaching.”

Plumb said that changes in the Self Study are meant to address the concerns expressed by William Gates, Sr. in his visit to the council in the last academic year. “This will be something concrete to show that we’re doing something in response to Gates’s concerns.”

Plumb said George Bridges, Dean of Undergraduate Education, will be sending Gates positive letters about how well particular faculty are doing at the University. She said the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (FCIQ) will be involved too, working on changes on the new course form, and on determining how instructional quality will be maintained in undergraduate education. “I suggested revising the Ten-Year Review Self Study,” Plumb said.

Regarding II., Section A, the [proposed] “General Self-evaluation,” council members agreed that no changes need to be made in the body of this section, other than adding “General” in the title.

Plumb said it was “a bit odd” that there was no section entitled ‘Teaching.’ “It’s what we [faculty] do and report on.” Council members agreed that it would be appropriate to have a separate section called “Teaching,” and to move #5, #6 and #7 from “Research and Productivity” to [the newly proposed] “Section B: Teaching.”

Labossiere suggested taking out the word “Productivity” from “Research and Productivity,” because “teaching is *also* productivity; productivity is not just research.” Kenney said many faculty “are supporting students being involved in research, but its *their* research – the students’ – and not the faculty’s research. How do faculty encourage students getting involved in research; that should be included in the ‘Teaching’ section. Student development and learning *other* than classroom learning should be noted.”

Newell said, “499 is not recognized as teaching in *any* department, at *any* level, and yet departments have been urged to require their faculty to teach 499. Many faculty have to cut back on the number of students they let in to 499 (*I* have had to do so), as it counts nothing toward meeting their official teaching obligations.”

Plumb said she would add two more new questions: one about teaching outside the classroom, another about involving students in research. She read from Section 24.32 in Volume Two in the Faculty Code (in the University Handbook) regarding teaching elements.

Plumb said she would take these changes and show them to George Bridges. She asked for specific input to questions #3 and #4 in the Draft Proposal, as they are the new questions. [Question #3: “How does the department gauge the instructional effectiveness of teaching faculty?” and Question #4: “What procedures does the department use to help faculty improve teaching effectiveness?”]

Kenney suggested deleting the word “teaching” in front of the word “faculty” in Question #3. “Just say ‘Faculty’ alone. Some research faculty *do* teach, though they’re not paid on an instructional basis.” Labossiere said, “Page 5, third paragraph [of the Self-Study] mentions involving students in research.” Kenney said, “It’s good to put ‘Teaching’ in the forefront, because it’s a good message for the state legislature.”

Plumb said, “We’ll go with ‘Research and Scholarship,’ but different departments will have different emphases. I’ll make some changes and add ‘other kinds of teaching’ to Section B.”

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, January 24, 2003, at 1:30 p.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Janssen, Kenney, Labossiere, Newell and Woods;
 Ex officio members Bridges, Croft and Washburn;
 Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs.

ABSENT: *Professors* Buike, Eastin, Fan, Gianola and Simon;
 Ex officio members Adams, Gerhart, Liston, Morales, Ver Steeg and Wiegand.