

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **April 4, 2003** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the March 7, 2003 FCAS meeting.
2. SCAP: 4 “routine” proposals: and Biology degree proposal (Barbara Wakimoto: Dept. of Biology).
3. April 7th Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting.
 - Action: Approve changes to President’s Medal legislation approved 10/11/02.
4. Feedback for writing committee.
5. Update on continuing issues:
 - honors legislation
 - proposal for changes to decennial review self study
 - faculty council reorganization
 - tri-campus program approval process
6. Future FCAS agenda item: UW courses whose facilitator is not a UW faculty member.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of March 7, 2003 were approved as written.

SCAP: 4 “routine” proposals: and Biology degree proposal (Barbara Wakimoto: Dept. of Biology)

Barbara Wakimoto, Professor, Biology, joined the council to discuss the following proposal from Biology:

College of Arts and Sciences – Biology (BIOL-121302). Revised major requirements; new option. “The Biology Program, the Department of Botany and the Department of Zoology are consolidating to form a single department. The combined faculty worked together this past year to design an integrated undergraduate curriculum and proposed that it replace the B.A. and B.S. programs in Botany and Zoology and B.S. program in Biology Track I and Biology Track II. The proposed curriculum leads to two degrees, a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Science in Biology. These programs provide broad training in biology at the entry level, a focus on fundamental concepts and skills at the intermediate levels, and opportunities for specialization in one of five sub-disciplines of Biology at the advanced level. The hallmarks of curriculum are coverage of biology from all levels of organization, an appreciation of diversity of animal, plants and other organisms, and an emphasis on the analytical approaches that biologists use to understand the natural world.”

Plumb reiterated that SCAP had deemed the Biology proposal “routine,” but since the proposal involved a consolidation of three departments – and was thus subject to the RCEP process – SCAP thought FCAS should discuss the proposal.

At the March 7, 2003 FCAS meeting, Bette Nicotri, Associate Director, Undergraduate Programs, Biology, told the council that “it was felt that the programs could work more efficiently under consolidation and that the old division along taxonomic lines doesn’t reflect how modern Biology functions,” and that “we tried to learn from other mergers such as the consolidation of Speech Communication and Communications into Communication.” Though, as she pointed out, that consolidation was not voluntary, whereas the Biology consolidation *is* voluntary.

Two concerns were expressed by the council at the March meeting: 1) access to lower-level Biology by non-majors; and 2) the need to have Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Anthropology, and

perhaps other departments, look at the environmental aspect of the Biology proposal. Overall, however, SCAP and FCAS found the consolidation to be well-conceived and effective.

At today's meeting, Wakimoto said, "As to the rationale for the change [the consolidation], we've talked about curricular reform for three years. We realized we needed to coordinate these three programs [Zoology, Botany and Biology] so that students could get their foundation courses (300 tier foundation courses). This change would also be good for community college transfer students. They could better acclimatize themselves to the program at the UW. Also, degrees would now reflect that Zoology, Botany and Biology students would all be attaining their degrees in a single department. This consolidation also is a reflection of the reality that the field has changed to an integration of the disciplines of Zoology, Botany and Biology."

Wakimoto noted that the Board of Regents signed off on the consolidation in February 2003. Dean David Hodge of the College of Arts and Sciences and Doug Wadden, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, have both helped facilitate the proposal's passage through the necessary reviews and the RCEP process, which will be completed in April 2003.

Plumb said, "This proposal is about *programs*: the consolidation of programs." Wakimoto said, "I think it's all-encompassing; it shouldn't be a problem." Plumb said, "We tabled a council vote on this proposal until today. This allowed for consultation with Anthropology and Civil and Environmental Engineering, who may have had concerns about the environmental aspects of the consolidation, since they also offer environment-related courses. I would like for us to vote on the proposal today."

Wakimoto said, "Our proposal was also looked at – approvingly – by Psychology. And it should be noted that there will be an 'option' on the degree: e.g., a degree in Biology with an option in Plant Zoology." Plumb said, "The program has also been signed off by Ocean and Fishery Sciences, the Program on the Environment, and other departments. And it does seem like a good program for Biology students."

Newell said, "It seems like these courses are being made more accessible for their own majors [Biology majors], more than for other students, who may have trouble getting into some Biology courses. I'm concerned not just for Anthropology, but for other departments. Will non-majors be shut out of 300-400 level courses?" Plumb said, "It's a huge department. If it makes academic sense for *their* department, for *their* students, then that's good." Newell said, "But, *we* [in Anthropology] make sure we have courses that are available to non-Anthropology students. I do understand the reorganization. It's the other, embedded, factors that are problematic."

Wakimoto said, "Students *can* petition to get into the 300-400 level courses; and there are intermediary steps as well." Plumb said, "There is a mix of access and budget issues involved. We need to separate out these issues. This program *will* help their students get into graduate school programs." Newell said, "I could follow through to see what Anthropology signed off on." Plumb said, "*But*, we shouldn't hold this program up. We should look at the program itself and how it serves their students."

Plumb recommended that the council vote on the proposal. "And we'll send a memo on Laura's specific concerns – a memo from the council – to the Biology department."

A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE BIOLOGY PROPOSAL CONSOLIDATING THE DEGREE PROGRAMS OF ZOOLOGY, BOTANY AND BIOLOGY INTO A SINGLE DEGREE PROGRAM, WITH THE PROVISION THAT A MEMORANDUM FROM FCAS WILL BE SENT TO THE CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY EXPRESSING CONCERN ABOUT NON-MAJORS HAVING DIFFICULTY GAINING ACCESS TO 300-400 LEVEL BIOLOGY COURSES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED AND THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS IN FAVOR OF

APPROVING THE PROPOSAL. THE PROPOSAL WAS THUS APPROVED, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PROVISION WILL BE ADDRESSED.

The following proposals were deemed “Routine” at the 3/28/03 SCAP meeting

1. College of Arts and Sciences – Law, Societies & Justice (LSJ-020303). Revised Admission Requirements. “1) Require all four core courses to graduate with an LSJ major. This is to correct the catalog to reflect the initial intention of the program requirements. In addition, to list just the four main LSJ core courses, and, instead of listing substitutes, the wording “or approved substitute” will be added to give the department flexibility in choosing appropriate substitutes that are viable options and available to students in particular quarters. 2) Reduce methodology to one course (5 credits). The available methodology courses in other departments are not always appropriate to the LSJ major. Additionally, the Political Science major does not have a methodology requirement so we felt that two was too much.”
2. College of Arts and Sciences – School of Music (MUSIC-110502). Revised Admission Requirements. “We wish to change the admission into the Bachelor of Music Four-Year Undergraduate Composition Program from the freshman year to the junior year. This is justified by the level of applicants we have seen in the last 5 or 6 years: students are not prepared to become composition majors in their freshman year, either technically or intellectually. By having them enter the program in their third year, we would ensure that students have enough general knowledge in modern music to make an informed decision about their main course of study. The MUSIC 216-217-218 sequence will offer the best preparation for that purpose. The total number of credits changes from 120 to 114-120 (depending on the level of MUSAP classes).”
3. College of Arts and Sciences – School of Music (MUSICa-110502). Revised Admission Requirements. “We wish to change the admission into the Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Music Five-Year Undergraduate Composition Program from the freshman year to the junior year. This is justified by the level of applicants we have seen in the last 5 or 6 years: students are not prepared to become composition majors in their freshman year, either technically or intellectually. By having them enter the program in their third year, we would ensure that students have enough general knowledge in modern music to make an informed decision about their main course of study. The MUSIC 216-217-218 sequence will offer the best preparation for that purpose. The number of credits changes from 129 to 123-129 (depending on the level of MUSAP classes).”
4. College of Arts and Sciences – School of Music (MUSIC-111202). Revised Major Requirements. “Updating degree requirements and catalogue description for the BA/BM in Music Education. The addition of 12-14 techniques courses to the catalogue description does not represent an increase in credits to the degree, but the correction of an oversight in previous descriptions. We have always required those courses as part of the degree as required by our certifying agency the National Association of Schools of Music.”

As to the revised admission requirements for the Law, Societies and Justice proposal, it was noted that there was some concern about the prerequisites existing at the upper division level, and not at the lower division level. Thus, upper division success is required of students *before* they are allowed into a major, which can prove particularly difficult for transfer students. Washburn said, “It would be good to think about a possible model for undergraduate admission programs: to get the admission to major straightened out. This kind of requirement can cause unnecessary delays.” Plumb said, “We’ll put this on a future agenda: a model for guidelines for admission to major; and the problem with upper division requirements as a basis for admission to major.”

As to the specific LSJ-020303 proposal, Washburn said, “The relevant courses were approved as 300 level courses (and not 200 level courses) in October of 2001.”

April 7th Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting

- **Action: Approve changes to President’s Medal legislation approved 10/11/02**

Plumb said, with respect to the proposal for changes to the decennial review self study, that a “Recommendation regarding questions for the decennial report” will be brought to the Senate Executive Committee Meeting on April 7, 2003, as a “Discussion Topic.” At the February 21, 2003 FCAS meeting, the council “unanimously voted to approve the ‘Proposal for changes to decennial review self study’ with the emendations made at the February 21, 2003 FCAS Meeting.”

Also, at the SEC meeting, a “First Consideration” for Class B Legislation will be held for changes in the Honors Awards at all three campuses. These changes in the University Handbook (that would not call for a change in the Faculty Code) are as follows [this is the document approved by SEC on April 7, 2003].

Present Code Language	Proposed Changes
<p><u>Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11: Grades, Honors, and Scholarship</u></p> <p>Section 3. Honors Awards</p> <p>A. The President's Medal shall be conferred Commencement upon the graduating senior has the most distinguished academic record transfer student who is eligible for University honors may be considered for the President's Medal.</p> <p><i>S-B 86, November 1961; S-B 138, December 1981: both with Presidential approval</i></p>	<p><u>Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11: Grades, Honors, and Scholarship</u></p> <p>Section 3. Honors Awards</p> <p>A. Four Medals shall be conferred at the annual commencement ceremonies.</p> <p>i. At the Seattle commencement ceremony, President's Medal shall be conferred upon graduating senior who has completed at least three-fourths of his or her degree requirements at the University of Washington Seattle campus and who has the most distinguished academic record among such students. The President's Medalist shall be selected from among graduating seniors eligible for University Honors.</p> <p>ii. Also at the Seattle commencement ceremony a President's Medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior who entered the University of Washington Seattle campus at least 60 transfer credits from a Washington community college, and who has the most distinguished academic record among such students. The President's Medalist shall be selected from among graduating seniors eligible for University Honors.</p> <p>iii. At each of the Bothell and Tacoma</p>

	commencement ceremonies, a medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior with the most distinguished academic record.
--	---

Feedback for the Arts and Sciences Writing Committee

Plumb said the Arts and Sciences Writing Committee, appointed by Dean David Hodge, is coming to the close of its work. She said, “If you have feedback, please give it to me.”

Plumb said that the committee has discussed several possible recommendations, including: 1) the possibility of asking people who have SAT scores below a certain number to take a diagnostic test; 2) the possibility of requiring a particular level of writing proficiency; 3) the possibility of expanding the Interdisciplinary Writing Program; 4) the possibility of creating a central writing coordinator or writing coordinating committee; and 5) the possibility of changing the writing requirement itself.

“We hope to make recommendations by May 1st,” said Plumb. She asked the council for suggestions.

Ver Steeg said an issue that is becoming increasingly significant is that of plagiarism. “I have to be a kind of policeman in my classes,” he stressed. “Students don’t seem to realize that I can find the material they’re plagiarizing by using the same search mode – say Google – that they do.”

Croft said, “I’m on the Academic Conduct Committee, and many students think anything on the Internet is simply public information.” Ver Steeg responded, “And it *is* [public information].”

Bridges said that, to his best recollection, official University policy – as maintained by the Committee on Academic Integrity – is that plagiarism can be the cause of immediate dismissal of a student who is culpable; or an instructor or professor, if she or he chooses, can work informally with a student to see if an understanding can be reached, and further plagiarism prevented.

Washburn said, “Another course of action is for the instructor or professor to fail the particular paper involving plagiarism, and to factor that failure into the final grade at the end of the course.” Plumb said, “This is what we do [in the College of Engineering].” Asked whether action taken because of plagiarism remains on a student’s record, Washburn said: “Disciplinary records are retained *separate from* academic records. But yes, the disciplinary record *would* be retained.”

Bridges said, “Plagiarism is a problem everywhere: at the University and beyond. We’re planning to discuss this issue with incoming freshmen. Faculty need to be educated on how best to deal with these matters.” Bridges recommended that the council ask Gus Kravas, Vice Provost/Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations, or Steven Olswang, Vice Provost, to visit the council to discuss this issue.

Ver Steeg said, “It would be nice to know exactly what the University’s policy is on plagiarism.” Plumb and others noted that, in many instances, individual departments decide what their course of action, and parameters of response, will be. Wiegand said this issue should go “to the Academic Conduct Committee.”

Ver Steeg said, “I’d love to see the council discuss this, and come up with a policy.”

Plumb said, “I’ll ask Gus Kravas to visit the council. And let’s hear from each of *your* groups [in council members’ departments] what your academic integrity policies are. The determination comes from within each department. For an appeal, it can go beyond the department.”

Bridges said, “Two years ago, this process moved to the Provost’s Office. The rate of incidence [of plagiarism] has gone up 20%. This is largely because of the Internet. It is largely an Internet issue now.” Plumb said, “University Libraries could offer instruction on this issue, as part of information literacy education.” She said she may contact the Faculty Council on University Libraries and ask someone from that council to visit FCAS and discuss that possibility.

Plumb said, “It’s very time-intensive to scrutinize writing, and there’s little funding available for such programs. This is partly a resource issue, which is not our concern as a council.” She repeated her request that council members send her their views and suggestions on this issue.

Update on continuing issues:

- **Honors legislation**
This has already been covered in the meeting (see above).
- **proposal for changes to decennial review self study**
This has already been covered in the meeting (see above).
- **faculty council reorganization**
There is nothing new to report on the possible reorganization of faculty councils. The chair of the follow-up committee on faculty council restructuring is meeting with the Undergraduate Advisory Committee.
- **tri-campus program approval process**
It has been decided that early notification of proposed new or revised programs will be posted on all three campuses. An ongoing issue under consideration is final authority of program review and approval. The Bothell and Tacoma campuses want final approval of their programs.

Future FCAS agenda item

Washburn said there are courses being offered as University of Washington courses that do not have UW faculty as instructors. Since the facilitator of any UW course must be a UW faculty member, the outside instructors of these courses have simply been made adjunct faculty members. Washburn said, “There is a question as to whether or not we want to let this happen.” Several council members said they most definitely do *not* want this to happen. It was agreed that this is an issue the council should address at a future meeting.

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, April 18, 2003, at 1:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor

Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Fan, Janssen, Labossiere, Newell and Woods;
Ex officio members Bridges, Croft, Ver Steeg, Wiegand and Washburn;
Guest Barbara Wakimoto, Department of Biology;
Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs;

ABSENT: *Professors* Buike, Gianola, Kenney and Simon.
Ex officio members Adams, Gerhart, Liston and Morales.