

## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **February 6, 2004** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

### Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the January 23, 2004 FCAS meeting.
2. FCAS legislation (Class A or B).
3. SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs): including new Executive Order.
4. Withdrawal policy and repeating courses:  
AAU institutions: repeat course policies – Van Johnson, University Registrar
5. Departmental enrollments and capacities: continued discussion.

### Approval of the minutes of the January 23, 2004 FCAS meeting

The minutes of the January 23, 2004 FCAS meeting were approved as amended.

### FCAS legislation (Class A or B)

Plumb said that if the council wanted to put forward Class A or Class B legislation, it would need to do so by the end of March if the legislation were to have a chance to go through the Faculty Senate and the full approval process by the end of the academic year. Class A legislation, which amends the Faculty Code, has a seven-step approval process: Senate Executive Committee; Faculty Senate; Present and Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations; Senate Executive Committee; Faculty Senate; Faculty (written ballot); and President (signature date is date legislation becomes effective). Class B legislation, which amends sections of the University Handbook *other* than the Faculty Code, has a four-step approval process: Senate Executive Committee; Faculty Senate; President; Faculty (legislation is effective 21 days after publication unless 5% of the faculty raise objections to it).

### SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs) – Nancy Kenney

SCAP looked at the statements in the University Handbook on graduate degree versus professional degree, and decided the Handbook needs to be amended. The list of professional degrees does not list the newer ones. Corbett said, “I spoke to Academic Programs, and was told that the new professional doctorate programs want to remain in the Graduate School, and want to leave the Faculty Code alone. The Code has no general definition of professional degree. It goes by particular program. It would be good to have someone from Academic Programs visit FCAS.” Kenney said, “We need to draw lines about who is in charge of what.”

Kenney said a second issue in SCAP concerned a new minor in Hispanic Studies at UW Tacoma. SCAP has an undetermined role in this, Kenney said. “We thought it was all right for SCAP to look at this proposal in a consultative role, but not in review role.” Plumb said, “When we speak of reviewing programs, we should make sure that we make the distinction between the type of review that FCAS does and the programmatic reviews that The Graduate School does. The Graduate School has a comprehensive review process for programs. And when they review graduate programs they also review undergraduate programs.” It was pointed out that the Graduate School has an “exhaustive” review process.

### Executive Order Revising Tri-Campus Policy: February 3, 2004

Plumb distributed the following “Executive Order Revising Tri-campus Policy”:

Executive Order Revising Tri-Campus Policy  
February 3, 2004

Original revisions to Section 13-23 C. Legislative Authority of the Faculty:

- C. A faculty action under provisions of paragraph A of this Section shall become effective upon its approval by the President, and, when taken by the faculty at the Bothell or Tacoma campus, the prior approval of the Chancellor of the campus.

Final revisions to Section 13-23 C. Legislative Authority of the Faculty:

- C. A faculty action under provisions of paragraph A of this Section shall become effective upon its approval by the President-, and, when taken by the faculty at the Bothell or Tacoma campus, the prior approval of the Chancellor of the campus, except, the approval of new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, regardless of campus of origin, will first be referred by the President to the Faculty Senate for coordinated review by all three campuses. Graduate degree proposals, regardless of campus of origin, are already reviewed by the Graduate School before being referred for Presidential and Board of Regents approval.

Plumb said, "I've been attending meetings of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) the last two years, during which time the council has worked on notification in the review process. The most important thing, of course, is effective communication: that UW Seattle and UW Bothell know if UW Tacoma, say, has a proposal for a new minor in Hispanic Studies, and that UW Tacoma and UW Bothell know if UW Seattle has a new proposal."

Kenney said, "As for what SCAP would be doing with respect to UW Tacoma and UW Bothell, I'm not sure if 'approval' is the right word for programs from the other campuses. 'Review' is perhaps the better word."

Asked about the Executive Order – which many in the council found somewhat ambiguous as worded – Plumb said, "The Executive Order is a 'done deal'. It is a statement of principle. The responsibility now falls back on FCAS and FCTCP to develop a procedure for that coordinated review. It does not mean that FCAS will look at every proposal." Kenney said that "it is all right for FCAS, and SCAP, to make suggestions on proposals that overlap. We would be advisory to FCTCP; we would not be giving a 'Yea' or 'Nay'." Plumb said, "It works both ways. A coordinated review is needed by all three campuses. The *intent* is that all programs have a coordinated review by all three campuses, including substantive changes in existing programs. We have to think how that would be done."

Kenney said, "We need a group equally represented by all three campuses. Our group is for UW Seattle." Plumb said, "UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have their own groups." Janssen said, "I would send it to FCAS first, and then to FCTCP, letting them know whether the FCAS academic review is good or not." Kenney said, "They would say our experience is no greater than theirs." Corbett said, "It looks like a new program goes to the president first, and then to SEC [by the wording in the Executive Order]. The HEC Board makes us go through a two-year planning process for new degree programs." Buck observed that "the president said that proposals starting on other campuses *will* come back to Seattle. There will be no change in the flow pattern of programs originating here."

#### **Withdrawal policy and repeating courses: AAU institutions: repeat course policies – Van Johnson, University Registrar**

It was pointed out that, with respect to course repeats related to University withdrawals, *if* a student withdraws by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of the course, their transcript will *not* show that they have taken that course. If the student were to take that course again, they would, officially, be taking it for the first time.

Van Johnson, University Registrar, said, "We don't know how many repeats we have each quarter, but it's a long list. There are a small number of withdrawals each quarter, but the number is sizeable if it's in a concentrated area. It is definitely bad in some lab courses." He noted that "anyone can repeat a course once."

Johnson said, "The drop policy changed in the late 1990's. Students can only drop one course per academic year after the second week." He stressed that hardship withdrawals have gone down in number; and that University withdrawals have not gone up. Asked how far into the quarter students can withdraw, he said, "Students can withdraw from the University up to the last day of instruction. Janssen said, "Individual course withdrawals, from weeks three to seven, and University withdrawals are something *we* can address." Johnson said, "The University Handbook doesn't speak to University withdrawals for reasons of hardship. It only addresses course drops."

Asked why a student would withdraw, not from the University, but from a single course, Wiegand said, "Students may be able to do two of three courses *only*, because of a personal hardship [and may therefore have no wish to withdraw entirely from the University]." Plumb said, "When this information is overlaid (2.4% withdrawals in weeks three through seven, and 1.1% University withdrawals: a total of 90,000 grades, thus a few thousand withdrawals overall), there *is* a problem for some courses."

Plumb distributed some “Comments from Advisors about Students Repeating Courses.” She said, “The practice of students repeating courses *does* create an access problem. There is support in the comments from advisors for asking students to see advisors *after* repeating a course once. People are concerned with counting a ‘W’ grade as an actual attempt at taking a course. It would be better if it only counted if a student has *completed* the course for the first time.” Kenney said, “I have no problem with a student asking for a department’s permission to repeat a course. *But*, we haven’t *enforced* this requirement. Though we *could* enforce it. We could have departments control their own entry code. Sometimes a course taken elsewhere [than the UW] should be repeated here because it is essentially a *different* course at the UW.”

Wiegand asked, “What’s a good process? And what’s available to *implement* the process?” Johnson said, “We can set it so that any student who got an actual grade in a course – and not a “W” – could *not* get in on an entry code.” Kenney asked, “You could have departments specify different bottom-end grades [say, 2.0] as non-grades.” Navin said, “It might serve as a deterrent if we empower departments to set criteria on grades.” Kenney said, “Period III is definitely too late.” Wiegand corroborated Kenney: “Yes, it must be done by Period II.” Plumb said, “Are we, then, enforcing our current policy?” Janssen said, “Yes, but we’re letting departments choose how they do it (with respect to requiring entry codes, having bottom-end grades, and the like).”

Johnson said, “A problem occurs when a student is repeating a course to get a higher grade.” Kenney suggested: “We must have different requirements for different courses *within* a major; it can vary by department.” Johnson said, “Yes, I agree.” Plumb observed: “It should not take too much programming to not let students take a course they already have a grade in. Or you could have an entry code at Period II. Or you could do nothing [different from what is being done now]. *And*, we should notify departments.” Janssen noted that “it should be the responsibility of the ASUW to make students aware of this.”

Plumb said, “I’ll talk to Tim Washburn and call these advisors back. And *you* can talk to advisors in *your* departments.” [She added that the Advisors’ Meeting will take place on April 14<sup>th</sup>.] Kenney emphasized that “the advisors are the critical component.” Buck said, “We can’t tell departments what criteria to use for their entry codes.” Kenney asked, “Does the entry code override all prerequisites?” Johnson affirmed that it does. Kenney said: “*If* we have this policy, students with a grade cannot get in.”

Plumb asked: “Are we preventing the second and third repetitions?” Kenney replied: “Yes.” But Plumb added: “We haven’t determined which interpretation we prefer. Don [Janssen] wants each department to be able to decide what they want to do.” Kenney said, “If we *tell* them, *this* is what you need to do, they should be able to do that: go with one of the options we suggest. If we announced it to all departments, and a department said: *We* want to be exempt from this, then that’s all right.”

Plumb said, “We need more input from departments before deciding.” Janssen suggested that departments be asked if they want an “opt-in” or “opt-out” version.

#### **Departmental enrollments and capacities: continued discussion – Don Janssen**

Janssen distributed an “Analysis of Departmental Applications, Admissions, Enrollments, and Capacities.” He told the council: “I’ve made progress in my analysis of enrollments in competitive departments. I need to double-check on some of these. I know which departments I don’t have information on [with respect to competitive enrollments].” Janssen emphasized that the data he has culled “uses only a small amount of data from the survey.”

#### **Next meeting**

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, February 20, 2004, at 1:30 p.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor

Recorder

**PRESENT:** *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Buck, Fan, Janssen, Keith, Kenney and Labossiere;  
*Ex officio members* Navin, Nyquist, Pitre, Richards and Wiegand;  
*Regular guest* Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs;  
*Guest* Van Johnson, University Registrar, Registrar’s Office.

**ABSENT:** *Professors* Newell, Reusch, Simon, Stygall and Woods;  
*Ex officio members* Bridges, Erickson-Brown, Mattson and Washburn.