

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **March 5, 2004** at 1:30 p.m. Acting Chair Nancy Kenney presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the February 20, 2004 FCAS meeting.
2. SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs).
3. The Graduate School: Gail Dubrow, Associate Dean for Academic Programs; and Augustine McCaffery, Manager, Academic Programs.
 - Approval process for new professional doctorate programs.
 - Review process for undergraduate programs.
4. Enrollment Capacities Survey: Approval of questions. (George Bridges has agreed to send the follow-up survey to departments that did not respond to the first survey.)

Approval of the minutes of the February 20, 2004 FCAS meeting

The minutes of the February 20, 2004 FCAS meeting were approved as written.

SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs – Steve Keith

Proposal addressed by the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) – February 27, 2004:

[THIS PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP]

1. College of Engineering – Mechanical Engineering (M E-021004). Revised Program Requirements for the major in Mechanical Engineering. “Due to the restructuring of the Mechanical Engineering undergraduate curriculum, we wish to increase the number of M E option (technical elective) credits from 18 to 19.”

The Graduate School: Gail Dubrow, Associate Dean for Academic Programs; and Augustine McCaffery, Manager, Academic Programs

Kenney said that Gail Dubrow and Augustine McCaffery were invited to today’s meeting to discuss “an issue that has cropped up on FCAS for ten years, that of the Graduate School’s approval process for new professional doctorate programs, and its review process for undergraduate programs.

Kenney said the council wanted to know “who is responsible for reviewing which programs in the Graduate School.” She said she was aware that research-oriented doctoral programs are reviewed by the Graduate School, but that professional doctorate programs do not always receive similar review. And the council wanted to know the Graduate School’s role in evaluating undergraduate degree programs.

Dubrow asked about the “impetus” of today’s meeting. Kenney said, “With respect to the review of undergraduate programs, when we *approve* undergraduate programs in the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP), we’re acting at the beginning of the process. We have questions about the *later* part of the process, but we’re not involved in that part of the process. We’re interested in information pertaining to the process at that stage.”

Dubrow clarified the scope of the Academic Program review processes managed by the Graduate School, noting the scope includes all graduate programs, and the comprehensive review of programs that combine undergraduate and graduate programs. “The Graduate School also carries out other reviews of centers and other entities at the request of Deans,” she noted.

Dubrow discussed opportunities for improving communication between the Office of Academic Programs and the council, including annual transmittal of the list of programs under review (also available on the Graduate School’s Website) and welcomed council advice and comment on issues of concern related to programs scheduled for review.

“Some effort to identify free-standing undergraduate programs, that are not covered by existing processes of Academic Program Review, is needed,” she emphasized.

Dubrow said, “Future discussions also need to focus on which body will review Professional Doctoral Programs. They are probably most appropriately covered under the review processes managed by the Graduate School, since they are essentially graduate programs and need to be understood in relation to other offerings in their units.”

Dubrow suggested that FCAS could forward a letter to the Graduate School when it approves a degree program. “We’d like to know how the program is playing out.” She noted that the Graduate School maintains reports on its accreditation Website. Kenney said, “That’s most important. We’d like to have an input into questions that are asked, and also some closure. Hopefully a system can be developed that would allow SCAP to be informed of programs in the Graduate School that are coming up during the academic year: a kind of annual report.”

McCaffery asked, “How does SCAP work with the undergraduate dean and with the provost? He needs to hear your questions.” Dubrow said, “[Undergraduate Dean] George Bridges could be a liaison.” Robert Corbett [Coordinator of New Programs: Office of the Provost] said, “The Office of Undergraduate Education doesn’t provide the same service for undergraduate programs that the Graduate School does for graduate programs.”

Nyquist asked, “What about the UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma campuses? There is major growth there; but FCAS doesn’t talk about those campuses.” Kenney noted that FCAS Chair Carolyn Plumb frequently attends meetings of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP). Dubrow said, “Our philosophy [in the Graduate School] applies to UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma as well as to UW, Seattle.” She also said, “There are aspects of our mission that *are* – and other aspects that are *not* – enshrined in the University Handbook.” Kenney said, “We’re on the same page: looking for better communication.”

Dubrow said that, regarding certificates, “We review and approve graduate certificates that appear on students’ transcripts; thus, there is a formal approval process for graduate certificates just as there is for other degree programs.” McCaffery said, “We started to review those graduate certificate programs that have at least 15 credits.” Kenney said, “FCAS took up the issue of undergraduate certificates several years ago.” Washburn noted: “The council voted *against* undergraduate certificates. So we don’t see them. We don’t have undergraduate certificates that are recorded on transcripts.”

Kenney observed: “It’s *costly* to do these reviews; it takes energy, time and resources.” Dubrow said, “It’s a fundamental process, and a process that needs consequential review.” Newell said, “The emphasis is always on the graduate component; the undergraduate program disappears.” Dubrow demurred: “I respectfully disagree. The charges *clearly* articulate that both graduate and undergraduate reviews are equal.”

Buck asked: “What is to be done about the professional programs? Which way should we head?” Dubrow suggested that “the first step is procedural: to take an inventory; to find out how many professional programs there are. A synoptic, holistic review is best: an integrated and relational review.” She emphasized that “there is a *gap* with respect to stand-alone undergraduate programs; this question must be considered.” Corbett said that he would make a list of such programs, including when they were last reviewed. Janssen said, “The accreditation board *is* more concerned with the graduate aspects of programs.” Kenney said, “*I’ve* been involved with two of these; they *were balanced*. So it must be department-based.”

Bridges said, “There is a shift in *emphasis* in the last three or four years towards greater balance. Historically, it hasn’t been so balanced, but the reviews [for undergraduate and graduate degree programs] *are* balanced now.”

Enrollment Capacities Survey

Janssen distributed a revised version of the Enrollment Capacities Survey. Question number 8 [“What is your Departmental capacity?”] “will get more honest answers, and be more useful to us,” he said. He pointed out that “we already have numbers 1-7 from most departments.”

Janssen sought approval from the council to approach the departments that did not respond to the initial survey, *or* to submit this revised survey to all departments. Bridges recommended pursuing question number 8 with all departmental advisors in a separate e-mail. “But don’t send it to all again. Call up departments that didn’t respond [to the survey in its original form] and ask their response.” Kenney concurred with Bridges on this strategy.

Bridges said, “We’ll go back to question number 7 [“How many students [were] enrolled in the major in 2002-03?”]. We’ll contact departments who didn’t respond by phone. And we’ll go to all departments this spring and ask question number 8. Question number 8 was not on the first survey.” Janssen asked the council: “Is this survey adequate? Are the categories too wide?” Bridges said, “We’re asking departments: What is your capacity for majors? [i.e., upper division capacity] This information is *not* adequate for legislative purposes; but it *is* helpful for council purposes.” Washburn said, “We’ll pull questions number 6 and 7 out of our data base; thus, there is no need for them in the survey.” Bridges said, “This information will help us.”

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, April 2, 2004, at 1:30 p.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall. [Council members were asked to review the RCEP draft legislation that was sent to them as an e-mail attachment.]

Brian Taylor
Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Kenney (Acting Chair), Buck, Fan, Janssen, Keith, Newell and Stygall;
 Ex officio members Bridges, Castic, Navin, Pitre, Washburn and Wiegand;
 Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs;
 Guests Gail Dubrow, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, and Augustine McCaffery,
 Manager, Academic Programs, The Graduate School.

ABSENT: *Professors* Labossiere, Plumb, Reusch, Simon and Woods;
 Ex officio members Erickson-Brown and Richards.