

## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **March 11, 2005** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Don Janssen presided.

### Synopsis

1. Approval of February 25, 2005 Minutes.
2. Old Business:
  - SCAP.
  - Changes in Major, etc. – Wiegand.
  - Continuing Discussion, Double Majors and Credit Requirements.
    - Discussion for Arts and Sciences Deans – Woods.
  - Tri-Campus Program Approval – Corbett.

### **Approval of the minutes of the February 25, 2005 FCAS meeting**

The minutes of the February 25, 2005 FCAS meeting were approved as written.

### **SCAP: Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs**

The following proposal was deemed “routine” by SCAP at its March 4, 2005 meeting:

College of Arts and Sciences – International Studies / Jewish Studies (SISJE-122204). Revised Minor Requirements. “Adding two new courses outside the SISJE curriculum that are appropriate to the Jewish Studies minor (ENGL 312, Jewish Literature: Biblical to Modern; RELIG 460, Anti-Semitism as a Cultural System).

UW Tacoma wants to change their concentrations to majors. They will be going through the three-campus curriculum review process. Corbett said: “With respect to the HEC Board strategy, it would be best to send them all together as one proposal, and to do a preliminary process.” The entire proposal, he pointed out, needs two outside reviewers. Washburn asked, with the HEC Board in mind, “Should this be run through our internal process?” Corbett said that it should. “It will bring up any concerns that may be there.” He said Vice Provost Steve Olswang could write the letter to the HEC Board. Corbett said he will talk to UW Tacoma about the two external reviewers. Washburn said, “This is a one-time process for UW Tacoma.”

Janssen commented that since the two outside reviewers should have expertise in the specific subject of the new major, he thought that it would be better to send the degrees through one at a time. That way each major would have outside reviewers with appropriate expertise.

### **Continuing Discussion, Double Majors and Credit Requirements – Debbie Wiegand**

The Recommendation of the “Task Force on Academic Progress of UW–Seattle Undergraduates”, with revisions resulting from today’s council discussion, is as follows:

### **Task Force on Academic Progress of UW-Seattle Undergraduates Recommendation:**

**Institute approval processes for change of major, change of degree, and for enrolling in multiple majors or degrees.**

When an undergraduate enters a major he/she must complete a change-of-major form that requires the signatures of the adviser in the department they are entering and the adviser in the department they are leaving. The addition of an additional major also requires the change-of-major form with signatures from both departmental advisers. Currently there are no guidelines for adviser approval of changing majors or adding majors.

UW policy states that undergraduates must complete their degree(s) within 30 credits beyond what is required for graduation. For most degrees, 180 credits are required and graduation is expected by 210 credits. Current implementation of this policy involves requiring students who have earned 210 credits and have not applied for graduation to complete a graduation plan that includes graduation within two quarters (approximately 240 credits).

### **Changing from one major or degree to another**

Establish the following guidelines for departmental approval of change from one major or degree to another. A student whose plan falls outside the guidelines may request a review for approval from the dean of the college of the new major or degree.

- ♦ The student must articulate an acceptable rationale for how the new major relates to his/her educational plan and personal goals.
- ♦ The student's academic plan must include completion of the new major within a reasonable number of credits, not to exceed 210 credits. Change of major must occur before the student has completed 135 credits.

### **Adding an additional major**

Establish the following guidelines for departmental approval of multiple majors. A student whose plan falls outside the guidelines may request review for approval from the dean of the college that offers the majors.

- ♦ The student must be admitted to one major before applying for the addition of an additional major.
- ♦ Enrollment in an additional major must occur before the student has completed 135 credits.
- ♦ The student must articulate an acceptable rationale for how all majors relate to his/her educational plan and personal goals.
- ♦ The student must be able to show the commitment and ability to complete all majors within a reasonable number of credits, not to exceed 210 credits. For any major that is a coherent program through which students move as a cohort, the student must show how the proposed academic plan allows full participation in the cohort.

### **Adding an additional degree**

Eliminate the university's 45-credit requirement for concurrent degrees.

Disallow concurrent degrees in the same college when the programs lead to the same degree.

Formalize structured dual degree options, such as BA/BM in Music, to be entered as one code. Admission and graduation requirements for dual degrees are determined by the departments and are subject to approval by the colleges that offer the degrees and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, but are not subject to the guidelines below.

Establish the following guidelines for departmental approval of individualized concurrent degrees. The student whose academic plan falls outside the guidelines may request a review for approval from the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation).

- ♦ The student must be admitted to one major before applying for the addition of an additional degree.
- ♦ Enrollment in an additional degree program must occur before the student has completed 135 credits.
- ♦ The student must have sophomore standing and completed at least 30 credits at UW with at least a 3.0 GPA.
- ♦ The student must articulate an acceptable rationale for how all degrees relate to his/her educational plan and personal goals.
- ♦ The student must be able to show the commitment and ability to complete all majors within a reasonable number of credits, not to exceed 210 credits. For a degree program that is a coherent program through which students move as a cohort, the student must show how the proposed academic plan allows full participation in the cohort.

Encourage colleges to adopt an individualized-concurrent-degree policy in the context of the above guidelines.

Reduce the 45-credit requirement for post-baccalaureate students to 30 credits. A post-baccalaureate student must complete the residency requirement (45 credits out of last 60) only if he/she has not already done so for their first degree.

-----

Wiegand said it should be kept in mind that there is “a distinction between individualized double degrees and formalized double degrees”. Formalized double degree programs are defined as two degrees that are linked and/or structured such that many students complete the degrees concurrently. For the formalized concurrent degrees departments will be asked to have one degree code for both degrees.

Wiegand said transfer students who come to the University with 135 credits and want to enroll in a second degree “will have to go through a subcommittee to add another degree”. As the Task Force Recommendation states: “Enrollment in the second degree must occur before the student has completed 135 credits.”

The GPA is now set at 3.0, it was pointed out. [“In any case, a student must have sophomore standing and completed at least 30 credits at UW with at least a 3.0 GPA.”] Washburn noted: “One possibility under consideration is to stipulate no particular GPA requirement, and to have a committee review all such students [seeking a second degree].” Janssen said, “The original proposal was to have every single dual degree come through a committee.” Washburn said, “We’re talking about individualized programs.” Wiegand said, “Requirements may change, too, in some instances.” Navin said, “A concern would be whether or not a committee could handle this process in a timely manner. There could be a bottleneck.”

Wiegand said, “The Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation currently reviews petitions on admissions. Only those that fall outside established guidelines are brought forward to the committee. Do we want to allow advisers to approve them under certain conditions? Or should all petitions go through a central body?” Navin said, “A complicating factor is that some of my students are transfers. How do we consider a student who has a limited number of credits at the University of Washington?” Washburn said, “We’re just talking here about a screen: whether some students can go through [the enrollment process] without going through a central committee.”

Wiegand asked if there was a consensus from FCAS, substantively, on the version of the Task Force Recommendation that she showed the council today. She added, “Now, we’re asking for a degree plan; we had not been asking for one before. If it’s close” – and she directed this to Navin, by way of answer to her question – “you have to make a decision [as an advisor] or send it to the subcommittee. These are only guidelines.”

Janssen said, with respect to implementation of the guidelines, “We can publish the guidelines that go out to advisers (as FCAS guidelines).” He asked about the “3.0 GPA”; do council members want to leave it in? Washburn suggested: “Get the GPA’s of all dual-degree people. And defer this part.” Wiegand said, “We need something on the 45 additional credits issue. We need to address that.” Keith said, “Get rid of the 45 additional credit reference.” Janssen said, “The faculty I talked to did *not* feel like giving a second degree without an extra 45 credits [being earned by the student]. It wouldn’t go [through the Faculty Senate].” Buck said, “I’d help. It depends on how it’s framed.” Janssen said, “I prefer to proceed with a set of guidelines for double degrees without reference to getting rid of the 45 credit issue. We can have one set of guidelines and change *that* policy if necessary.”

Wiegand said, “There would be a similar set of guidelines on the second major. It doesn’t include a line about sophomore standing and the 3.0 GPA and at least 30 credits.” Washburn said, “Combine bullets 3 and 5 [under “Adding an additional major”] to now read: “The student must be far enough into his/her undergraduate studies to be able to show a commitment and ability to complete all majors within a reasonable number of credits, not to exceed 210 credits.” [And so on.]

Janssen said, “At the next meeting, we’ll do a cover letter.” Wiegand said, “There are a number of Task Force Recommendations. We’re working on a draft to go to the Provost. We will meet with advisers across campus. I’ll send out this revised version to the council. Let me know your comments.” Washburn said, “We’ll rewrite as we would for the campus [i.e., for advisers].”

Janssen said, “We’ll address the ‘Discussion for Arts and Sciences Deans’ after this has been rewritten.”

### **Tri-Campus Program Approval – Robert Corbett**

Corbett said a 30-day “Comment Period” is now in effect regarding a minor in Policy Studies from UW Bothell, a B.A. in Computing and Software Systems from UW Tacoma, and a minor in Applied Computing from UW Tacoma. The Web address for the proposals is:

<http://catalyst.washington.edu/webtools/pr/slogin.cgi?owner=secfac&id=2826>

The following delineates the portion of Stage I in the tri-campus undergraduate curriculum review and approval process that leads up to and through the Comment Period:

If the originating campus curriculum committee determines that the proposal is sufficiently developed to merit review, and that the proposed change of program, or proposed new program, is sufficiently substantive to warrant a tri-campus review, it will send the proposal to the Secretary of the Faculty. As Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn pointed out in her memo, materials to be forwarded to the Secretary include the applicable campus curriculum form and the rationale for the proposal. The Secretary will post the proposal for a 30-day “comment period”; it will be sent to the Deans, Directors, and Chairs (DDC) list serve; to the Chair of each campus review committee; and to the entire voting faculty.

The following delineates the remainder of Stage I:

At the end of the 30-day comment period, the Secretary of the Faculty will compile all comments made on the proposal and forward them to the Chair of the curriculum committee at the originating campus. That committee can then consider the inter-campus comments as part of their deliberative process. Killien said the comments from the other campuses constitute “another voice” in these deliberations. The originating campus’s curriculum committee’s deliberations complete Stage I of the process.

The following delineates Stage II of the three-campus review and approval process:

After a proposal has been approved by the curriculum body on the originating campus, it will proceed through the approval processes already in place. When it reaches the Office of the President, Stage II will take effect, in accordance with the Executive Order. In Stage II, the President forwards the proposal to the Chair of the Faculty Senate who, in turn, forwards it to FCTCP.

FCTCP’s review of the process will be conducted by either the FCTCP as a whole or by a subcommittee of the Council consisting of the chair (or designee) and two council members (one representing the faculty of each of the other two campuses). FCTCP will review the process of three-campus review and issue a report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, for forwarding to the President within 14 days of the receipt of the proposal. Their review will consider only the following issues: a) Was the final proposal made available for a 30-day comment period?; b) Were the comments received and responded to appropriately?; c) Did the campus curricular review body consider comments and responses in its review?

The home curriculum body will write a brief paragraph about any comments received and how they were considered. If FCTCP believed substantive comments were not addressed, they would forward the original campus’s rationale to the Provost, and note any comments.

The council decided that it should identify potential groups that would be affected by a particular proposal, and give heads-ups to those groups.

The council agreed that breaks between academic quarters should not count against the 30-day Comment Period. Janssen will communicate that preference to FCTCP Chair Marcia Killien and Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn.

Janssen said: *We* will look for: 1) what stands out for us; and 2) what groups we think we need to notify.

### **Next meeting**

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, April 8, 2005, at 1:30 p.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor

Recorder

**PRESENT:**     *Professors* Janssen (Chair), Buck, Keith, Newell and Tripathi;  
                  *Ex officio members* Navin, Richards, Washburn and Wiegand;  
                  *Regular guest* Robert Corbett, Office of the Provost, Coordinator of New Programs.  
*Professors* Labossiere, Montine, Reusch, Simon, Stygall and Woods;  
                  *Ex officio member* Bridges, Nyquist, Pitre, Siddiqui and Trudeau.