

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on **January 24, 2003** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the January 10, 2003 FCAS meeting.
2. Update on the proposal for changes to the Ten-Year Review document.
3. Tri-Campus Program Approval Process: Update on progress and discussion.
4. SCAP: Vote on Drama department's proposal to drop the minor, plus additional issues.
5. Update on changes in the language for options/tracks.
6. Undergraduate Certificates.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of January 10, 2003 were approved as written.

Update on the proposal for Changes to the Ten-Year Review Self Study Guidelines

Plumb said there have been no further changes in the Ten-Year Review Self Study Guidelines. The revisions that already have been made "look fine." She received feedback on the proposal from Jan Carline, Chair of the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality. One suggestion Carline had was a mentoring of students or something specific about advising. Another suggestion from Carline was a statement about departmental expectations of scholarship regarding pedagogy in the field.

Kenney said the distinction might be noted between student research and faculty research *involving* students. Newell said the 499 course should be included in question #5, with independent study. It was also suggested that advising, mentoring, and supervising student research could be included in #5.

It was suggested that the phrase "academic experience" replace the phrase "student learning" in #7. Newell said she did not see the need for question #6 ["How do faculty involve students in research and scholarship?"]. Hazard Adams, however, said, "As I read it, #6 involves the ways in which faculty get students involved, which is different from question #5."

Plumb said #6, in her eyes, relates to the University's effort to get students involved in research. "We want to keep the big picture in mind," said Plumb. "We want to suggest revisions that allow departments to put more emphasis on teaching responsibilities during the review process."

Plumb said question #7, as she interprets it, "relates to teaching," and includes "excellence." She said FCIQ [Instructional Quality] chair Jan Carline emphasized the importance of departmental expectations on teaching, which she believes "is inherent in question #7."

Adams asked, "Are not research and scholarship a subset of student learning?" Plumb said, "I agree; they are to me. But the same language in #5 (the use of the same phrase "student learning") creates a problem for some."

Plumb said, "I'll tweak #5 and send it back to you and we'll review it on February 7th. I will then send it to Jan Carline, who will ask for FCIQ approval on February 7th. Once both councils have approved the proposal, I'll take it with George Bridges to Marsha Landolt."

Tri-Campus Program Approval Process: Update on progress and discussion

Plumb said there are two different opinions on the Tri-Campus Program Approval Process: specifically, as to how it should proceed after the early University-wide notification period, or posting.

"There won't be a final resolution on this issue for right now," Plumb noted. "Changes *will* be made on the early part of the process (when general information is posted University-wide before and after the 'idea' stage of a new proposal)."

“UW Bothell and UW Tacoma, however, did not agree to bring their programs through FCAS or an FCAS subcommittee (SCAP) as part of the approval process. Because of the significance of the presidential search (it cannot be known what the new president will want to do with respect to the three campuses on this or any other issue), and because of the potential significance of the outcome of the Rose Report decisions on University Councils, Plumb said, “We will wait to see what the new president has in mind, and to see what decisions are made regarding reorganization of the faculty councils, and make the small changes in the early part of the program approval process over the next several months.”

Part of the stalemate is that the other campuses have been approving their own programs. “But being in compliance with the Faculty Code is important too,” Plumb added. The further complication is that the other campuses were under the assumption for many years that they would have more autonomy. That changed when President McCormick came to the University in the mid 1990’s and reversed the process.

Corbett said, “I see it in their best interest to be part of the University.” Plumb said, “It would be helpful to have a new president in place. That is expected to happen by Autumn Quarter 2003.”

SCAP: Vote on Drama department’s proposal to drop the minor, plus additional issues

The following three proposals were approved as “routine” by SCAP:

1. College of Arts and Sciences – Communication (COM-111902). Revised requirement within existing program. “The new journalism requirements provide more structure to the major and serve to better link journalism with the general Communication major, providing more depth and breadth to the Journalism major.”
2. College of Arts and Sciences – Earth and Space Sciences (ESS-112602). Revised program requirements. “The ESS Curriculum Committee has determined that the content of alternative physics courses taken in conjunction with the mathematics requirements provides sufficient background for the Bachelor of Science major in Earth and Space Sciences.”
3. Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Programs/College of Arts and Sciences – Program on the Environment (ENVIR-112702). Revised admission requirements. “The Program on the Environment (PoE) proposes making the B.A. in Environmental Studies an open major that any matriculated UW student in good standing (not on academic probation) can declare at any time. All Environmental Studies students would still be required to complete the current Admission Requirements, but students would not have to complete the Admission Requirements before officially declaring the major. This change would be in line with current admissions policies in many of PoE’s peer departments (Fisheries, Oceanography, Forestry, etc.) and in many larger departments (Chemistry, Geography, etc.). Currently, PoE advises approximately 100 majors, but less than half of them are declared in the major because they have one or more Admission Requirements left to complete. Many of our double degree students are delayed in completing the requirements due to scheduling complexities in completing the two degrees. As an open major, PoE could present a more accurate picture of its program size and program needs, and more effectively project future programs needs and growth.”

The council further discussed the following proposal, which SCAP considered “non-routine” (see the FCAS minutes of January 10, 2003 for the initial discussion on this proposal):

1. College of Arts and Sciences – School of Drama (DRAMA-032802). Delete minor. “Delete minor option for the School of Drama. Courses on the minor requirement list are oversubscribed, so the faculty of the School of Drama feel this action is prudent.”

Plumb said, “I spoke with Sarah Nash Gates [Executive Director of the Drama department] about the proposal to drop the minor option. Gates said they do all their courses by entry code; they enter pre-majors first, then Drama minors, then all others. Gates stated that this [dropping of the minor option] would give them more flexibility.”

Newell said, “It’s *not* an academic issue if it involves a programmatic change regarding non-academic factors.” Adams said, “But it has academic implications; and we should say something about those implications.” Kenney asked, “Would students *lose* if *all* minors were dropped? They’d still be getting the same course material; it simply

would not have the nomenclature of ‘minor’.” ASUW representative Cammie Croft said, “Yes, students *would* lose. They want the recognition on their transcripts that they’ve taken these courses.”

Kenney said, “Both the Provost’s Office *and* FCAS should see a proposal such as this. [It was decided in council deliberations a couple of years ago that the council would only approve or disapprove new or revised academic undergraduate proposals. The council would send any non-academic based proposals – such as proposals based on budget issues – directly to the Provost’s Office.] The Provost’s Office needs to know that the minor option is being dropped for budgetary reasons, and act on the proposal with that knowledge in mind.”

Plumb said she would write a letter to the provost explaining the council’s decision: that the proposal does not fall within the purview of SCAP and FCAS, but that it is important that SCAP and FCAS be made aware of any such proposal. Washburn said he would draft a letter to send to the president and a memo to send to the provost. Those would be sent under his own name. Plumb’s letter will go out under her name and speak on behalf of the council.

Adams said, “We shouldn’t approve *or* disapprove it. We should offer some comment. If it is not in the council’s purview, but that of the Provost’s, we should offer comment and send it on.” Washburn suggested Plumb might sign, but write “No action taken” above the signature, and *then* recommend that it go to the Provost’s Office, and not to the council. Adams said, “It could be workable to pass it on with an FCAS opinion.” Plumb said she could acknowledge the proposal by signing and then “refer action” to the Provost’s Office.

Kenney said, “We need a letter, not a form. FCAS does not approve this because it’s a drop of a minor for a non-academic reason, that of budget. It’s not our purview to decide other than academic issues. That is the purview of the Provost’s Office.”

A MOTION was made by Don Janssen to approve this proposal based on academic merits and to delete the minor. [Janssen suggested it was important for the council to make a motion, if only to show that it was not approved, but was formally called to question.] Newell seconded the MOTION.

Plumb, at this point, said, “I won’t sign it, and will refer it to the Provost’s Office because it’s a budgetary issue and beyond our purview.”

Adams said a straw vote could be taken and Plumb in her letter could indicate the council’s feelings. Plumb said, “We could take a straw vote. I would not sign the proposal, and would send a letter to the provost. I must say that I am uncomfortable with the elimination of the minor because it limits student access, and the proposal, even if it bears on academic issues by implication, bears directly on budgetary issues.” She added that she would “have trouble voting on this; it doesn’t seem positive in any way.”

Newell said, “Take a vote strictly on academic merit.” Kenney said, “The department’s statement pits the minor’s academic access *against* the major’s access. Which side do we come down on?” Adams said, “The distinction between fiscal and academic issues is a real one. And there is a positive side to *doing something* about this proposal. We need to speak out on something like this.”

Janssen said, “Yes; a *No* vote would show that we think the program *is valuable*.” Kenney asked, “When would we *approve* a department’s dropping a minor? We could express *regret* that this kind of request is being made for fiscal reasons, and voice our opinion that it is a poor reason to begin *or* end an academic program; and to say that we forwarded the proposal to the Provost.”

Plumb said, “I’ll sign, but say that the FCAS MOTION to approve the proposal based on academic merits was *not* approved [as opposed to ‘disapproved’].”

Plumb called the MOTION to question. The MOTION did not pass.

Washburn said he will seek President Huntsman’s signature on his letter to Provost Thorud.

Update on changes in the language for options/tracks

Two handouts were distributed to the council: 1) Robert Corbett's double-column table showing the "Existing Language" and the "Revised Language" on "Majors," "Options," and "Minors" in the 1503 Form Web site; and 2) the same language in regular paragraph form.

Plumb and the entire council thought the revision "excellent: a vast improvement." Corbett and Scott Winter are working on the 1503 form, where the language will appear.

Undergraduate Certificates

Plumb said that, in 1997, FCAS said *No* to undergraduate certificate programs [cf. FCAS minutes, April 4, 1997], approving minors and options instead.

Plumb said last year and this year, "Coordinated Studies: UW Restoration Ecology Network" has *had* a certificate program, and they want to make it a "competitive admission certificate." Plumb asked: "Should this go through FCAS?" Plumb, answering her own question, said, "It *should* come through us. But, will we be *recognizing* certificate programs?"

It was pointed out that the students in this program are matriculated, and that the program is housed in the Program on the Environment (PoE), and thus is housed on this campus. The certificate is *not* transcribed. It is a 25-credit concentration. There are "various degree programs involved" in the certificate program. Corbett said this is "significant for the students participating in the program." And Plumb said, "It's more akin to what their major is." She said the certificate is also available at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

Plumb said Faculty Senate Chair Sandra Silberstein referred to this as a "high profile program": a "poster child of tri-campus cooperation." Kenney said, "Certificates have meaning that's pseudo-academic; it's better to call a program such as this one a 'specialization' or an 'emphasis'." Plumb said, "Let's do more research on this."

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, February 7, 2003, at 1:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

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

ABSENT: *Professors* Buike, Gianola, Simon and Woods;
Ex officio members Bridges, Gerhart, Liston, Morales and Ver Steeg.