

## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **April 16, 2004** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

### Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the April 2, 2004 FCAS meeting.
2. SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs).
3. Transfer Admissions Policy (Tim Washburn and Philip Ballinger).
4. RCEP: Revisions.
5. Curriculum Review Process for Three Campuses: continued discussion.

### Approval of the minutes of the April 2, 2004 FCAS meeting

The minutes of the April 2, 2004 FCAS meeting were approved as written.

### SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs)

1. Business School – Management and Organization (MANORG-021504). Human Resources Management Option within the existing Bachelor of Arts with a major in Business Administration. “With the shift from a manufacturing to service economy, the management of human assets has become increasingly important. Despite the importance of Human Resources to organizations generally, and the field of business administration specifically, the Business School currently does not offer an option in human resources management for undergraduate students. This stands in stark contrast to schools such as Northwestern, Cornell, Ohio State, Marquette, and, locally, Western Washington University, Central Washington University, Washington State University, and Seattle University, all of which offer majors in Human Resources Management (HRM). The purpose of offering an HRM Option is to fill this void. Without a defined course of study which covers the fundamentals of HRM, University of Washington students are unlikely to be competitive in the ‘credentialed’ job market. According to the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), employment in the human resources management field requires a college degree. As projected by the DOL, legislation and court rulings set standards in various areas which require implementation and monitoring. This will increase the demand for HRM, training, and labor relations specialists. Rising health care costs spur demand for specialists to develop creative compensation and benefit plans. As more firms move to arbitration and mediation as a conflict resolution strategy, the demand for negotiation specialists also will increase. Additional job growth will come from international expansion and human resources information systems. Thus, there is a strong demand for entry level personnel with specialized human resources management training.” **THIS PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP.**

2. College of Arts and Sciences – Chemistry (CHEM-020504). Change of name of program from Option A to B.S. in Chemistry. “The Department of Chemistry offers two B.S. degrees in Chemistry, currently called Options A and B. We want to eliminate the word ‘Option’ from the degree names. The current Option A degree would be called B.S. in Chemistry and the current Option B would be called B.S. in Chemistry-ACS Certified.” **THIS PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP.**

3. Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Programs – Program on the Environment (POE-012904). “The Program on the Environment has submitted course change applications to increase the number of credits for the two Pre- and Post-Capstone Seminars within the Capstone Experience requirement for Environmental Studies majors. ENVIR 490 and ENVIR 492 will be increased by one credit each. In order to maintain the overall 10-credit requirement for the Capstone Experience, Environmental Studies majors will now be required to complete only 5 credits of ENVIR 491 (variable credit, independent study

component of the capstone series) instead of the current requirement of 7 credits of ENVIR 491. The 10-credit Capstone Experience will then be comprised of the following: ENVIR 490 – 2 credits; ENVIR 491 – 5 credits; ENVIR 492 – 3 credits.” **THIS PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP.**

4. College of Arts and Sciences – Law, Societies and Justice (LSJ-012804). Revised Admission Requirements for the Major in Law, Societies and Justice within the Bachelor of Arts. “These changes to our admissions requirements will enable us to admit students earlier in their undergraduate career, and to encourage the development of those analytic writing skills that are emphasized in all of our courses. At present, the three core course requirements for admission is taking students much time to complete, and thus they are applying to the major as late as their senior year. We are reducing the admissions requirements from three core courses to one core course to enable earlier application. In addition, we plan to reserve seats in each of these core courses for sophomores and transfers. This way, students will be able to apply to the major as mid- to late-sophomores or early-juniors. This provides us a means to ensure that students move through the course sequence in the expected fashion. It also enables students unable to gain admission adequate time to pursue another major. The added requirement for English composition will help ensure that students possess the capacity to succeed with the high number of writing assignments typical of our courses.” **THIS PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP.**

5. College of Engineering – Technical Communication (T C-033104). Elimination of the minor option in Technical Communication. “Currently the Department of Technical Communication offers a 26-credit minor option (TC). Over the past few years it has become increasingly difficult for students who have declared the TC minor to finish the requirements in a timely fashion due to space limitations in required courses and priority registration for TC majors. As a result TC will discontinue the minor option and encourage interested students to pursue the TC major.” **THIS PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP.**

#### **Transfer Admissions Policy – Tim Washburn and Phil Ballinger**

Washburn and Ballinger addressed the April 14, 2004 draft of the Transfer Admissions Policy and Procedures (effective Winter Quarter 2005).

Washburn said the draft has already been reviewed by other committees, including the Admissions and Academic Standards Subcommittee of FCAS and the committee that included staff from the Undergraduate Advisory Center and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. He said, “I don’t think changes will be required in the Faculty Code, which was modified two years ago.” But he asked the council to review existing code to make this determination.

Washburn said, “We are changing the Transfer Admissions Policy because we have been unable to enroll all Direct Transfer Agreement students for the last year and a half. For Fall Quarter 2004 there are 700 applicants with Associate of Arts degrees from community colleges. Many of these are being deferred to Winter and Spring Quarters 2005. We need this new policy which replaces the entire previous policy. It’s an entirely new process. We’re assessing students’ preparedness for their major. Community colleges want ‘readiness for majors’ to be included. We will review applications to each college and school separately. In the past, there has been no differentiation between colleges and schools except for students applying for admission to selective programs.”

Ballinger said, “We felt it was important to have a ‘value statement.’ All else flows from it. Applications will come to the Admissions Office. Students who will apply to professional programs will go through a ‘core’ check. On applications for competitive programs, it will be indicated that these are competitive programs, and those applicants will be asked to request an alternative major, or an option. If applicants are denied, their applications will come back to Admissions and go into the ‘comprehensive pool’.”

Stygall said, "Community colleges will emphasize that transfer applicants need to have an alternate major; and that they want to be treated like students who are originally on the UW campus." Washburn asked, "When is an ideal time to tell students that they are accepted?" It was pointed out that Business sends out acceptance notices by the first of May, and Nursing even earlier, in April. It varies from department to department. It was agreed that the earlier the notification is sent out, the better.

Washburn said each transfer application will receive a "holistic reading" from two different readers. He referred council members to page two of the draft: "There are two kinds of questions: those in the 'Academic Assessment Area,' which are straightforward, and those in the Personal Qualities and Achievements Assessment Area,' which are open-ended." And on page three, Section 3.C, there is a "Holistic Admission Recommendation" that follows "a predetermined proportional distribution," using the categories of "Highest Admit," "Strong Admit," "Admit," "Admit with Reservation," and "Deny."

"We will ask readers to create a pool using the categories just mentioned. When the pool is completed, we are ready for screens," Washburn said. "We have two basic areas: academic, and personal quality. The question is: How, in the final distribution, do we decide what value to give to each of these areas? We will have a group of faculty discuss this. We need faculty involvement in this process (to represent the *value* of the faculty); we need to have faculty value reflected in the final recommendation. We will first use this evaluation in Spring 2005." Ballinger said, "There is a parallelism between academic and personal areas." Washburn added: "Some of these ideas were taken from the Regents policy statement that was adopted shortly after I-200. There's a big difference between the transfer process here, and the process for regular incoming freshmen. This admission evaluation results in one score. The admission evaluation for incoming freshmen has many sub-scores that are added and summed to result in two final scores. In the transfer process there are many factors to be considered, but the result of the holistic review is a single score."

Stygall said, "You have 'analytic' first, in this process; but it would be more effective if the 'holistic' came first, and then the 'analytic'." Ballinger said, "That's an interesting observation." Washburn concurred as well: "That's a very good point. It may be freer to have the 'holistic' first, especially where the writing portion is concerned. We may have to make some adjustments, if we can't take a whole block." Ballinger said, "A potential problem is not spending enough time on the 'norming' process. At Berkeley, they do a 'norming' session every week, to get consistency in the readings. We only read half the freshmen files now – about 7,500 – but all transfer applications will be read." Washburn said, "Also, with respect to readiness for major, we have developed 'transfer planning sheets' for each major. We will work with each department on this." Washburn noted, "Our plan was to deny students who were not ready for majors, but Arts and Science deans did not want to do that. Students will continue to be admitted as pre-majors."

As to ranking of transfer applicants, Washburn said, "We will complete the evaluation of all files before offers are made. This is not a rolling system." Washburn referred the council to page four of the draft, where there are "two major categories. A certain number [of admits] must come from Washington State community colleges. The Regents want us to bring the standards used for transfers from two- and four-year colleges together. We'll have a target enrollment goal for both categories, and we'll meet with separate colleges and schools and fix a goal. There will be resident and non-resident goals, as well as international goals. So, to summarize, we will: 1) complete the evaluations; 2) do the distributions across colleges and schools; and 3) admit as many as we can." In response to a question, Washburn said, "The minimum GPA for transferring students is 2.5."

Washburn said, "The 'holistic' method is a much better evaluation mode for transfer students who may have various [academic] results at community colleges over many years."

Plumb asked Washburn: “What would you like FCAS to do?” Washburn said, “You could assure us that we do not have to change the Faculty Code at all.” Plumb said she would find out if changing the Code is necessary. Plumb thanked Gail Stygall, Laura Newell, Debbie Wiegand, and Don Janssen for their work on this issue. Stygall volunteered to serve on the faculty group for which Washburn requested members.

### **RCEP: Revisions – Carolyn Plumb**

Plumb said the Class A legislation process for RCEP revisions would not begin until Autumn Quarter. (That process would involve review of the final draft by faculty councils [including FCAS], and would then proceed to the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Code Cops, the president, the Senate Executive Committee a second time, the Faculty Senate a second time, and a full Faculty Vote. Vaughn said the council would be kept informed throughout the revision process.)

Plumb said she would send an ‘FCAS statement’ to the RCEP Senate Drafting Committee asking that FCAS “be kept in the loop” for next fall. The council confirmed this strategy.

Castic said, “Students would like ‘dropping a minor’ to have to go through the RCEP process. Then, at least one student could have some input in the RCEP process.” Stygall said, “There’s a service to the University factor in that, too. Though it would not require a large-scale review.”

### **Current Review Process for Three Campuses: continued discussion**

Plumb said the Executive Order indicated that all program proposals will be “referred by the President to the Faculty Senate for coordinated review by all three campuses.” [Revisions to 13-23 C. Legislative Authority of the Faculty] “But this draft [of the ‘Three Campus Curriculum Review Procedures’] would not send it [a proposal under review] back to FCAS, but to FCTCP for a ‘Report on adherence to process,’ which would be sent to the President by the FCTCP Chair. FCAS and SCAP would review UW, Seattle proposals at the ‘Campus level’; the Executive Committee of GFO would serve a similar function at UW, Bothell; and the Faculty Assembly Subcommittee on Academic Programs at UW, Tacoma.”

Washburn said, “On page two of the draft [4/2/04], under ‘Procedures,’ the HEC Board should not enter into this part of the process. And ‘minor’ and ‘certificate’ should be removed from Procedures #1. It should be ‘major’ and ‘option’ only. And the Provost needs to be inserted into this part of the process.”

Plumb said, “It would be most productive if the concerns are voiced early in the process. Early communication is the best way to make this a collegial process.” Stygall said, “Word it so it will be *clear* when a dean or chancellor becomes aware of the programmatic idea.” Buck said, “*This* is just a notification; this is the preliminary stage.”

Washburn suggested that “it is not reasonable to put something in University Week that is not developed: something at a pre-proposal stage. Some kind of *internal* communication, yes, but too many people are involved here. People in the same area at UW, Seattle, Tacoma and Bothell can communicate.” Kenney said: “Talk to people at UW, Seattle; *then* to people at Bothell and Tacoma, at the pre-proposal stage. But how to legislate that. Phase one should be more informal.” Washburn noted that “deans and chancellors play a critical role in this process. This is what the Faculty Senate emphasizes.”

Washburn said that, under Phase II: Developed Proposal Comment, Procedures: 1., “Inter-institutional Committee on Academic programs” should be removed. “It doesn’t belong here,” he stressed. He suggested that, overall, there is “too much micro-management” in the review process outlined in the draft. “Some judgments have to be made about who would be informed.” The council felt it should be enough to send it to deans and chancellors, and to directors and chairs, but not to the others suggested in the draft.

Plumb told the council: “I’ll take our comments to FCTCP and recommend simplifying the pre-proposal stage, as well as other aspects of the review process. And I’ll recommend taking the HEC Board out of this part of the process.”

Plumb reiterated that FCTCP “is involved at the end of the review process, in this draft – at the University level – but “strictly to review for adherence with process.”

Washburn said a good flow chart [of the proposed curriculum review procedures] would be very helpful.

### **Proposed Minor in Hispanic Studies at UW, Tacoma**

Plumb told the council that UW, Tacoma has sent the following proposed minor in Hispanic Studies to the president. A copy has been forwarded to Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden from the president requesting comments be provided to him by April 30<sup>th</sup>.

Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences: University of Washington, Tacoma – Minor in Hispanic Studies.  
“*Definition.* Hispanic Studies combines proficiency in the Spanish language with a general knowledge of the cultural, historical and political framework of Spanish America. It also promotes an awareness of Hispanic culture in the United States. This interdisciplinary minor draws on traditional fields such as second language acquisition, history, literary analysis and criticism, film studies, art history, political science, and sociology. It emphasizes the interrelationship between language and culture and trains people to interact with native speakers of Spanish more effectively. Students of Hispanic Studies may choose to work in a field such as education, government, public health, social work, community services, banking, international business, law, the travel industry or any other area where the rapidly growing Latino community is involved. *Justification.* The Hispanic population is the fastest growing in Washington State and there is an urgent need for trained professionals who can communicate in Spanish. Studies show that linguistic proficiency is not enough to guarantee good communication. Cultural proficiency is also needed. It is important to understand the correctly linguistic codes and subtexts. ‘Heritage speakers’ of Spanish (second or third generation Latinos attractive to anyone who wants to work in the public sphere. This minor complements IAS concentrations such as Global Studies; Arts, Media and Culture; and Ethnic, Gender and Labor Studies. Benefits of an IAS minor in Hispanic Studies include the development of greater proficiency in the Spanish language, a better understanding of the Hispanic population in the United States, and an appreciation for the diversity and richness of Spanish American culture.”

Plumb noted that SCAP approved the proposal on principle. The minor would either have a 15 credit cultural component and a 10 credit language component, or it would have a 25 credit cultural component.

### **Next meeting**

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

Brian Taylor  
Recorder

**PRESENT:** *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Buck, Kenney, Labossiere, Newell, Stygall and Woods;  
*Ex officio members* Castic, Pitre, Richards, Washburn and Wiegand;  
*Regular guest* Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs;  
*Guest* Philip Ballinger, Director of Admissions, Office of Admissions.

**ABSENT:** *Professors* Fan, Janssen, Keith, Reusch and Simon;  
*Ex officio members* Bridges, Erickson-Brown and Pitre.