

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

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **April 2, 2004** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the March 5, 2004 FCAS meeting.
2. University Courses.
3. RCEP: Draft of Revised Procedure.
4. SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs).
5. Implementation of Tri-Campus Executive Order - Coordinated Review of New Programs.
6. Update on Undergraduate Advisory Committee.

Approval of the minutes of the March 5, 2004 FCAS meeting

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

University Courses – Carolyn Plumb

Plumb asked the council to look over the document entitled “University Courses: Request for Proposals: March 15, 2004,” and consider offering a University Course.

RCEP: Draft of Revised Procedure – Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

Vaughn spoke to the Council about proposed revisions to *Faculty Code*, Chapter 26: Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP). The original language was written in the early 1990’s, in response to a financial crisis. In the past, the administration has been reluctant to invoke the RCEP process, fearing it would be too cumbersome. “Last year, however, there were three RCEP procedures and this experience allowed us to test what worked and did not work about the process,” said Vaughn. In turn, this led to the proposed draft she had distributed to members.

The Senate drafting committee decided that the original RCEP philosophy, based in financial emergency, had to be changed from one of crisis management to planning. The goal is to make Chapter 26 a “planning document, so that change can come from the bottom, from faculty and students, *or* from the top, from the deans or administration.” The document was streamlined, using the canons of good drafting. There are now four levels of review and the chapter’s internal inconsistencies were eliminated. Finally, the document was reorganized into the following sections: preamble, definitions, planning procedures and procedures for financial emergencies.

The revision process started last summer. Those serving on the drafting committee include Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden, Faculty Senate Vice Chair Ross Heath, former Secretary of the Faculty Miceal Vaughn, and former Faculty Senate Chairs Brad Holt and Sandy Silberstein. Vaughn wrote the various drafts. The plan now is to seek input on this draft from various faculty councils. Additionally, the administration has appointed a committee composed of, at least, Associate Provost for Planning Susan Jeffords, Dean of Engineering Denice Denton, and Associate Vice Provost Cheryl Cameron. This group will meet with Senate leadership to discuss the draft. The draft will also be circulated to President-designate Emmert. It is hoped that this process will be completed this summer and that the final decision will be submitted to the Senate in the fall.

After explaining the drafting process, Vaughn described the actual revisions. The preamble of the document is new and focuses on planning rather than on emergencies. Second, the definition section is also new and designed to bring together in one place all of the terms that are used in Chapter 26 and assign them consistent definitions. For example, it now defines the documentation that “schools should

be routinely assembling as they make program changes.” Another major change was to suggest that the planning process should ideally begin in Autumn Quarter, but certainly no later than January 31. Currently, RCEP procedures can begin in Spring Quarter.

Another focus of major change was to examine what should trigger an RCEP review. The draft, in Section 26-3, specifies “actions and procedures [that] shall initiate a planning procedure.” For example, it can be triggered at a Dean’s request, a vote of a majority of the Faculty in an affected program, at the request of FCAS where a program, over the course of three years, loses 50% or more of the courses that form the core curriculum, or at the suggestion of an accrediting agency. The Council suggested that the FCAS portion be changed to read, “Where a program, over the course of three years, maintains less than 50% or more of the Faculty assigned to teach in that program.

After a review has been triggered, Section 26-4 specifies that the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) determine what level of review is appropriate and whether it is to be confidential. Section 26-5 sets out the four possible levels of review: 1) Procedures for Minor Reorganization and Consolidation of Programs; 2) Procedures for Limited Reorganization and Consolidation of Programs; 3) Major Review; and 4) Procedures for the Elimination of a College of School (this last category is rarely invoked). Vaughn observed that, with the three-campus University, “there is a greater need to coordinate program planning between the campuses” in the entire program review process. Finally, no changes were made to the “Procedures for Planning in Times of Financial Emergency” except to move that section to the end to de-emphasize its importance.

In discussion of the document, Plumb pointed out that most consolidations arise from mergers rather than from new programs. She also raised questions about where the Board of Regents and HEC Board come into the process. Vaughn responded that this could be inserted into Section 26-3, the events that trigger an RCEP. Janssen noted that this draft focuses on undergraduate programs, and needs to address graduate programs as well. There was also a lengthy discussion of what constitutes a program for the purposes of RCEP, and whether the draft captures that. One person suggested that examples be provided in the text. Vaughn did note that the document provides that disagreements about program status are determined by SCPB. Washburn asked that more thought be given to the meaning and definition of “core” curriculum, and Woods recommended that at Section 26-3.A.5 “courses” be replaced with “credits.” Finally, one person noted that the status of minors needs to be clarified. Student member Castic asked that an RCEP “trigger” at the “request of a student organization” be added.

Vaughn thanked the council for their comments, stating that this was just the kind of feedback she needed. She asked council members to e-mail her at secfac@u.washington.edu with further comments or changes. Plumb said, “Overall, the changes in the draft are good. And the references to FCAS are helpful.”

SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs – Nancy Kenney

The following proposal was deemed “routine” by SCAP at its March 12, 2004 meeting.

1. College of Arts and Sciences – Dance (DANCE-100803). Revised Admission Requirements for the Major in Dance. “The Dance Program has three main purposes in revising our current admissions requirements, specifically: 1) We are trying to make pre-existing admission procedures more explicit, in particular, the presentation and content of the essay that all applicants to the major are required to write. We will be putting the four essay questions on our Website and application procedures (including essay questions) will be available in the Dance Program Advising Office.; 2) We wish to streamline the admissions process by moving to one application date per year. This will help us to plan the number of sections offered as well as set enrollment limits for courses.; 3) We currently require students to be enrolled in a technique course. Instead of requiring this, we have added an assessment class once a year

(in coordination with the spring application date) so that full-time faculty can sit together, after having reviewed transcripts and admissions essays, and come to a consensus on admittance to the major and student placement in technique classes. This will better serve transfer students and double majors. Alternative arrangements can be made to accommodate out-of-area applicants.” **DANCE-100803 WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP.**

Plan for Implementation of Tri-Campus Executive Order Regarding Coordinated Review of New Programs – Marcia Killien

Plumb said, “The question has come up in FCAS discussions: Why don’t we – FCAS and SCAP – see program proposals from UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma? Faculty Senate Chair [and former FCAS Chair] Doug Wadden thought it preferable that FCAS saw programs from all three campuses. I thought collaboration was proper, for FCAS’s role in the review process [of program proposals from the other campuses], rather than approval. The new Executive Order Revising Tri-Campus Policy stipulates that new program proposals ‘will first be referred by the President to the Faculty Senate for coordinated review by all three campuses.’ ”

Today, the council looked at the April 4, 2004 draft of the “Three Campus Curriculum Review Procedures” recommended by the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP). Plumb pointed out that UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma “have a similar approval process to that of UW, Seattle, for their new programs,” and that, since the inception of the other campuses – or for the past twelve years or so – UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma have been approving their own programs, while informing and consulting UW, Seattle as an informal part of that process. “It’s just the way things developed,” said Plumb. “We see UW, Seattle program proposals, and UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma see their own program proposals.”

FCTCP Chair Marcia Killien said, “This process, and the issues attending it, have been in discussion for two years. Former FCTCP Chair Jacqueline Meszaros started a document last academic year to set down the current program review practices. The challenge is that all of this has existed within the changing nature of the three-campus University. Meszaros traced the historical documents comprising the establishment and development of the UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma campuses.”

Killien emphasized that “there is chaos behind the whole history of the three-campus curriculum review.” “We are seeking order. Our current draft tries to relate the relationship between the campuses with respect to curriculum review procedures, and to change the tenor of the discussion [on this relationship] toward enhancement of the quality of academic excellence (and the spirit behind this).”

Killien referred the council to Appendix A of the draft, a chart delineating the “Level of Review” [first column] for “Courses” [second column] and for “Undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, certificates and substantive changes” [third column]. The chart sets out “what we are talking about,” said Killien, and it refers to undergraduate programs only. Like FCAS, the proposed review process “does *not* deal with courses, *only* with programs.”

Killien told the council that “faculty review is in the third column; and FCAS is listed at the ‘Campus level’.” She pointed out that, at the “University level,” there was no faculty review across campus. The Executive Order mandates it, so there will now be faculty review at the University level across all three campuses.

Plumb said, “We [FCAS and SCAP] would focus on *early* program review; the final review would be compliance review, and *not* program review.” Corbett said, “The HEC Board review is more robust, and only occurs every two years. It would not be good to hold up the HEC Board process.”

Killien went over the most significant steps of the review process. “The initial stage is the pre-proposal stage. This is the first chance for communication across campuses. At this stage, ideas for new proposals will be posted [on a Website, possibly in University Week and other venues]. In the second stage, ideas will become written proposals. They will come to FCAS and to the analogue bodies at UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma [the Executive Committee of the GFO, the General Faculty Organization, at UW, Bothell, and the Faculty Assembly Sub-Committee on Academic Programs at UW, Tacoma]. There will be a set time period for comment (anywhere from 14 – 30 days, as yet undetermined).”

Killien said, “This will be a new role for campus curriculum bodies. We will find out what kind of communication does take place between campuses. The review by FCTCP at the University level will be quite specifically a review for adherence with the process. Ours will *not* be a curriculum review, but a *process* review. We will be asking the question: Was the process done right? And if it was not, we will note the problems.” Killien said that if problems are discovered, FCAS will be notified. “You could send that comment to the other campus’s program; but they would not be compelled to accept your suggestion. And the president would be informed that there is a disagreement, if that is the case, or that there is a complication with a particular proposal.” Plumb said there are only four to five new comprehensive program proposals per academic year: what SCAP considers “non-routine” proposals.

Killien said, “This document says that there are three autonomous approval processes, but it sets out the means for communication between them. If, however, there is a major dispute involving a three-campus program approval problem, the president alone can resolve it.”

Janssen said, “If there’s something that needs our looking at [that is: FCAS], it needs to be *sent* to us. We can’t just depend on scanning the Web to see if there’s something there. It wouldn’t be at all as effective if we had to find it.” Corbett said, “There *is* an informal sharing process.” Richards said, “University Libraries is not mentioned in the draft. And the Libraries is affected by this. It would be good to mention the Libraries in the document.” The council concurred with Richards. Plumb said, “With some things, now, you’d have to hear from the provost if there’s a problem.” Killien said, “A fundamental conflict is: Does the campus have authority to affect another campus’s program? As it is now, the answer is ‘No’. This document attempts to achieve a better communication early in the review process. But the earliest stage still needs work.”

Buck noted that “at the middle level, it is *explicit* about sharing and posting. But on page three, item two, the campus faculty organizations should be specifically noted (FCAS and the analogue bodies at UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma). And in page three, item four, the phrase ‘from their respective campuses’ should be added after ‘final proposals,’ so that the sentence reads: ‘Each Campus curricular review body will review final proposals from their respective campuses for the following elements, etc.’ ”

Killien said, “We have the Executive Order with no implementation, and we – in FCTCP – think faculty *should be involved* in determining that implementation.”

Update on Undergraduate Advisory Committee – Steve Buck

Buck reviewed the recent meeting of the Undergraduate Advisory Committee, on which Plumb also sits.

Further revisions of the Executive Order policies on course fees are still being considered. The *intent* is to ensure that both students and faculty have input, and that there is adequate lead time. (The original statement was drawn up and approved in 1988, and revised in 2004.) Castic said, “It’s important to ensure broad University policies on course fees, and to have adequate lead time.” Woods said, “You need to clarify the document.”

As for the Organizational Structure revision proposed by Dean of Undergraduate Education George Bridges for Student Athletic Academic Services, Buck said that Bridges suggests that Student Athletic Academic Services be integrated with Undergraduate Advising, under the direction of Undergraduate Education. Wiegand said, “There’s also tutoring and assessment in Student Athletic Academic Services; it’s important to keep that in mind as well.”

As for Student Learning Objectives, Buck said, “The proposal, which comes largely from discussion within OUE and FCIQ, envisions course- and program-specific learning objectives that would be generated by instructors and their units and that would be entered in a new ‘Integrated Educational Information System’ that students would access before, during and after taking a course. Thus, student learning objectives would be established at many different levels but, most importantly, primarily by instructors, which is not now the case. Students would have this information available to them when they’re shopping for classes and would have a better sense of the learning objectives. George Bridges also hopes the new system will be useful for tabulating broad objectives across campus for purposes of institutional review. But it will take some time for the whole system to be in place. In the meantime, it seems that the information being entered into the present system all over campus is of questionable utility and may in fact not ever be used. My suggestion is that the present system be dismantled and that units and instructors be saved from wasting their time on it.”

Plumb said, “There are also departmental learning objectives. And Cathy Beyer, who visited the council last academic year, has been brought in to help with the implementation of these objectives, which is excellent news.”

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, April 16, 2004, at 1:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

- PRESENT:** *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Buck, Janssen, Keith, Labossiere, Newell and Woods;
Ex officio members Castic, Navin, Nyquist, Richards, Washburn and Wiegand;
Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs;
Guests Marcia Killien, Chair, Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy; and Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.
- ABSENT:** *Professors* Fan, Kenney, Pitre, Reusch, Simon and Stygall;
Ex officio members Bridges, Erickson-Brown and Pitre.