

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **April 18, 2003** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the April 4, 2003 FCAS meeting.
2. Update on continuing issues:
 - proposal for changes to decennial review self study
 - faculty council reorganization
 - honors legislation
 - tri-campus program approval process
3. SCAP: 2 “routine” proposals: and one “deferred” proposal.
4. Enrollment capacities.
5. Gus Kravas: Vice Provost / Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of April 4, 2003 were approved as written.

Update on continuing issues:

- **Faculty council restructuring**

Plumb said the Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee met recently and discussed, among other things, the possible restructuring of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, and the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach to form a University Council on Undergraduate Education, and the possible role of the Advisory Committee in that Council. Plumb will keep FCAS members apprised of further developments in this discussion.

- **Proposal for changes to decennial review self study**

Plumb said the Senate Executive Committee approved the Proposed Changes to Decennial Review that were presented as an informational item at the SEC meeting on April 7, 2003. Plumb will be meeting with George Bridges, John Slattery and Donald Wulff (Director of the Center for Instructional Development and Research, or CIDR), to discuss the proposed changes.

Proposal for Changes to Decennial Review Self Study

Approved and Proposed by:
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
Faculty Council on Instructional Quality

I. GUIDELINES FOR SELF-STUDY: MAIN TEXT

No change

Section A: General Self-evaluation

(Change in title of section from Self-evaluation to General Self-evaluation.)

Section B: Teaching

1. For each faculty member, please list: number of courses taught per year, number of credits taught, and total student credit hours. Numbers may be approximate and should illustrate a typical year. (#5 from current “Research and Productivity” section).
2. How are teaching responsibilities allocated? *For interdisciplinary programs:* How are teaching loads negotiated and balanced between home departments and the interdisciplinary unit? (#6 from current “Research and Productivity” section).

3. How does the department evaluate the instructional effectiveness of faculty? (new question).
4. What procedures, such as mentoring junior faculty, does the department use to help faculty improve teaching effectiveness? (new question)
5. Other than classroom teaching, how are faculty involved in student learning and development (for example, advising, mentoring, supervising independent study)? (new question)
6. How do faculty involve students in research and scholarship? (new question)
7. Are faculty rewarded for enhancing students' academic experience? If so, in what ways? (#7 from current "Research and Productivity" section.)

Same except questions 5, 6, and 7 removed.

- **Honors legislation**

The proposed changes to Honors Awards (Class B Legislation), approved by FCAS at its October 11, 2002 meeting, were approved by the Senate Executive Committee at its April 7, 2003 meeting. [See the minutes of the April 4, 2003 FCAS meeting for the text of the proposed changes in its SEC-approved final form.] Plumb will present the Honors legislation to the Faculty Senate at its meeting on April 24, 2003. She will present the rationale for the proposed changes, and address the concern expressed at the SEC meeting about the possible dilution of the prestige of the President's Medal if another Medal were to be awarded to a transfer student, and the minor concern that 60 credits from Washington State community colleges were stipulated in the legislation. Though it was pointed out that Legislative Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative Gail Stygall suggested that this 60-credit stipulation could be looked upon favorably in Olympia – by the state legislature – as a sign that the University is granting recognition to community college students. Janssen said, "We thought other campus awards should have equal status to those of this campus."

- **Tri-campus program approval process**

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy will be meeting on April 21st to discuss an updated version of the proposed changes in legislation on the tri-campus approval process. The proposed changes will not go forward to the Senate Executive Committee until Autumn Quarter 2003.

SCAP: 2 "routine" proposals: and one "deferred" proposal

Two SCAP proposals were deemed "routine" and one proposal was "deferred" for further supporting documentation. It's not known if the department talked with the Program on the Environment (PoE) and other programs or departments who are interested in, and whose curricula are involved with, the environment. "We want to see what language is being removed," Woods added. This proposal is also subject to the RCEP process. "It's not a good application as it is," said Woods. Plumb asked Faculty Senate Vice Chair Doug Wadden about the first of the two Business proposals, and was told that it does not need to go through the RCEP process.

Proposals addressed by the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP)

**April 11, 2003 SCAP Meeting
(for April 18, 2003 FCAS Meeting)**

Proposals deemed "Routine":

1. School of Business Administration – Business Administration School (BUSAD-022503). Revised Admission Requirements. "In 2002 the funding for the Evening Degree Program was merged with the day program, causing the Business Administration School to cease offering a separate Evening Degree Program. We continue to offer evening courses to the admitted students to help them finish their degrees but could not guarantee our ability to offer the same to new students. Therefore we need to remove references to the Evening Degree Program from the catalog. In Winter 2003, most OE and HRMOB and B POL courses received a new course designation, MGMT. Three of the core courses need to be changed to reflect the new designation."
2. School of Business Administration – Finance and Business Economics (FINBUS-012903). Revised

Option Requirements. “FIN 495 (Finance Internship) should not satisfy the requirements of the Finance Option as currently conceived by department faculty.”

Proposal “Deferred” for further supporting documentation:

1. College of Forest Resources – Environmental Science and Resource Management (ENVSCI-040403). New Major. “This new major will replace six existing majors in the College of Forest Resources (CFR). The four proposed new core courses will provide all new majors with foundational concepts. 35 CFR general credits will allow students to focus their specific education in existing specialized areas of the college or to have a broader experience across the environmental and natural resources sciences.

Enrollment capacities

Plumb suggested the council share their reflections on the March 7th visit and presentation by Marsha Landolt, Dean of the Graduate School.

At that meeting, Landolt said, “During the last few years, managing graduate enrollment has not been a particular problem because the University was growing. But now we’re over-enrolled. The Regents want enrollment brought back to the state-supported level. *We have* to cap our enrollment now.” Asked why the Graduate School is over-enrolled, Landolt told the council, “The primary reason is that students are not graduating at the rate we thought they would.”

Today, Janssen said, “It seems like something is controlling enrollment at the front end, but not much after that. What’s the overall effect? Is quality of education being sustained? It seems like there is often nothing but administrative whim. Is it *possible* to set controls?” Janssen said there was not much in the way of rationale from Landolt. “They just allocated a fixed number of spots.”

Wiegand said, “Art is an open major, for the most part. At their last registration, their classes were filled by the time juniors could enroll. That is a problem.” Plumb asked, “Besides becoming a competitive program, what can be done? There are lots of different kinds of programs and departments. Sometimes, enrollment capacities are affected by physical constraints, or the number of computers in a particular class.”

Woods said that she is on the Advisory Committee on Accountability (ACA), and that Gail Stygall informed the committee, at its last meeting, that House Bill 2076 in the state legislature (“requiring a statewide strategic plan for higher education”) is concerned with faculty productivity, defined in the bill as “student hours,” or the number of contact hours that faculty have with students, and particularly, how much time faculty spend in the classroom.

Woods said it raises the question: How do you determine what productivity *is*? Woods said ACA is trying to collect “metrics” from all over campus. She added, “They’re interested in student credit hours per FTE. That’s what Olympia is looking at.” Wiegand said, “We’re adding a piece if we’re talking about capacity for majors.”

Janssen said, “Most lower-division courses are service courses across major, as opposed to being for students only in that major. These classes ‘take away’ from a department’s capacity for majors.” Woods said, “They’re also paying attention to the number of students in class. We had a 10 rating in Nursing.” Plumb said, “In our department [Technical Communications], we received the numbers 11 and 8: 11 for an undergraduate course and 8 for a graduate course. If fewer students register for a course, the faculty member teaches an added section of a service course. There are some positive things to say about that, but it does, as Don says, turn service courses into punishment courses.”

Woods said, “We need to think of how we can defend the number of FTE’s in our departments.” Plumb said, “How do your departments determine this?” Janssen said, “We [in Civil and Environmental Engineering] have physical space criteria. We’ve dropped our enrollment capacity from 90 to 70, but added a second class with 30-40 enrollment capacity. Thus we’re actually increasing our enrollment. When we initially decreased enrollment, our chair was criticized.”

Janssen said, “The provost could easily play dean against dean where enrollment capacity is concerned.” Labossiere said, “We [in Mechanical Engineering] graduate 140 undergraduates, but Bioengineering – which graduates far fewer – gets higher allocations.” Wiegand said, “There needs to be a place for ‘resources’ in the metrics being used.” Labossiere said, “Dollars per FTE, and students per FTE (the number of students you graduate): This is the measure we use. We need to compare *peer* departments and units, and not, say, Mechanical Engineering and Art.”

Plumb asked, “Is the Advisory Committee on Accountability thinking about resource allocations as part of the criteria?” “Yes,” said Woods: “It’s a benchmark.” Plumb asked, “What do we want resource allocations to be based on? Should they include the review process (the decennial review)?” Janssen said, “That’s too far apart: every ten years.” Woods said, “We don’t just teach: evaluation, advice, measurement, all of this is in addition to student credit hours. Every department needs to consider this carefully. The legislature doesn’t understand everything we do.”

Janssen said there is one thing in particular that should be carefully noted. “In English (and in many other departments), positions that are tenure-track *on paper* are probably split up among TA’s and non-tenure track faculty such as lecturers.” Labossiere said, “Students do complain about TA’s teaching stand-alone classes.” Wiegand said, “It’s mostly in English and in language departments that TA’s do stand-alone classes.” Plumb asked, “Where might we take it? We can’t make recommendations to departments.” Woods said, “But we can inform individuals. The question is: How do we *want* to be measured?”

Janssen asked, “What should be the *weighting* of lower- and upper-division undergraduate courses, and of graduate courses? What percentage of faculty members’ work (FTE) should specifically be teaching? The answer, of course, is that it would vary by department. What should a department be, in the dean’s mind, on this issue? 80% teaching? 60% teaching? Or whatever. There could be overall target numbers by college and department.” Woods said, “There used to be a so-called faculty analysis form for individual faculty to complete.” Asked what the Advisory Committee on Accountability chiefly does, Woods said, “Its primary function is to advise, on issues related to accountability measures, the Associate Provost for Academic Planning, in the Office of the Provost, a position currently held by Debra Friedman.”

Plumb said, “All of this could be helpful. It’s important for departments to know this is brewing.”

Plagiarism and academic integrity: Gus Kravas: Vice Provost / Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations

Plumb introduced Gus Kravas, Vice Provost / Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations, and welcomed him to the council for a discussion of plagiarism and academic integrity at the University of Washington. Plumb said she is a member of the Arts and Sciences Writing Committee, and in thinking about writing-related issues, the committee recognized plagiarism as a major focal point.

Kravas said, “I’ve been involved with the issue of academic integrity at the University for two years. It’s been a pronounced problem, and a problem not unrelated to the rise of the Internet as an academic resource.” Kravas said he has checked with his colleagues across the country, and has found that plagiarism is a pronounced problem – and a problem on the increase – at universities nationwide.

“Cheating is as old as the world,” Kravas said. “There are numerous ongoing studies on plagiarism at both the high school and university level. As many as 85% of high school students report to *have* cheated in high school; only 7% report to have been caught. At universities, students *come* to us with this background. Some studies show that 25% of all university students engage in some form of cheating; other studies suggest upwards of 70%.”

Kravas said that, when he visited a freshman Philosophy class at the University of Washington, he was struck by the “candor of the students” regarding this topic. Most of the students in the class reported that they had cheated at some time in their high school career. “Again, because of the Internet, it’s become worse. This is especially the case in courses with a heavy emphasis on writing. It’s *tempting* for students.

And students often rationalize their cheating. They can tell themselves: The professor is a ‘jerk,’ or ‘not fair.’ ”

“There are dynamics like that in our student culture,” Kravas stressed. “There are some students who are angry that others are cheating, but they don’t want to *tell on* other students.” Kravas also pointed out that, if instructors “don’t confront a problem, they may risk losing the respect of those who are hard-working and honest.”

Kravas distributed a six-point response to the question: “How do we, at the University of Washington, combat academic misbehavior?”

The first point of response is that, “As an institution, we affirm the importance of academic integrity.” He emphasized that “we need to communicate this to our students: that this value is important.” He said, “Our instructors constantly remind students of their expectations. *Most* students are law-abiding, *if* they know the rules (up to 70% of all students).” Kravas averred, “Faculty also try to create a joy of learning, to provide a vibrant learning environment that encourages a love of learning.”

“Most crimes are crimes of opportunity,” said Kravas. “We’re trying to *creatively* discourage students from cheating.” Many instructors implement strategies that seek to prevent cheating from occurring in the first place, e.g., different versions of exams. And instructors “try to eliminate cheating as a ‘crime of convenience.’ ”

“Most instructors are vigilant in confronting academic dishonesty,” Kravas insisted. “But it’s harder in large classes to observe cheating. There is an obligation to intervene whenever possible. And there are both formal and informal ways of intervening.”

Kravas said, “A lot of this behavior [on the part of students engaging in plagiarism] is passive-aggressive. It’s easy to deal with aggressive behavior (relatively speaking), but much harder to deal with passive-aggressive behavior.” He said it is important to be consistent. “When an instructor *sees* cheating, he or she must *react* to it.” The student must not be accorded perpetual lenience, especially not late in the quarter, or *after* a second violation, and having been warned.

Kravas pointed out that “disciplinary probation does not appear on the student’s academic record, e.g., transcript. If a second violation occurs, the ruling of the Academic Integrity Committee can be tough: A year’s suspension, or a penalty even more severe, may result. On a third violation, the student is expelled.” Kravas said an excellent disciplinary system has been developed at the University of Washington “that respects the rights of an accused student,” and whose focus is educational rather than merely punitive.

Most all issues involving academic misbehavior are dealt with at the level of the college, said Kravas. “The case would go to the dean’s office, and to the dean’s representative. This system seems to work.” Kravas continued: “We want to be doing even more than we are doing, both at the University of Washington and at all universities across the country. But we are doing more all the time, and *need* to be doing more,” with the ambiguous ethical issues created by the Internet (i.e., the lack of clarity as to what precisely constitutes plagiarism: any article or essay placed on the Internet, as has been pointed out, is public property, and undergraduate students do not always understand that taking even large passages from a document on the Internet, without proper attribution, constitutes plagiarism).

Kravas included as the fifth point in his response the following proposed Honor Pledge: “Now that I am a student at the University of Washington I understand that I am now a part of a learning community that is committed to the highest academic standards. I pledge on my honor that I will respect and abide by the University’s guidelines that call for personal honesty and integrity in all academic endeavors.” The student’s signature would be accompanied by that of a witness.

The proposed Honor Pledge will be considered by a yet to be formed Task Force on Academic Integrity. “The members of this Task Force will be primarily students, as will be its leaders,” Kravas said. “Its chief purpose will be to monitor the academic integrity climate on the campus; to serve as an advisory board to

the academic integrity processes; to promote academic integrity throughout the UW community through presentation to students, faculty and staff groups.” As an educational tool on campus, there could be a two-hour seminar on the issue of plagiarism and academic misbehavior, he noted. “The University may not be ready for an ‘Honor Code’ yet,” he observed, “but we will talk to the ASUW and see where it stands.”

Plumb noted that record keeping can be an issue with respect to academic misbehavior. “I’ve had three-time offenders, but their first and second offences were not reported.” Kravas said, “There *has* to have been a formal due-process hearing, or it is not considered ‘an occurrence.’ We see about 200 students per year, and it is remarkable how great an impression this disciplinary process makes on them. They almost invariably become better student scholars because of this process. *If*, however, an occurrence of academic misbehavior can be dealt with *informally*, that’s good too.”

Buiké noted that it can be particularly helpful if students hear from their peers about academic misbehavior. “Students will *listen* to their peers, in ways they often will *not* listen to others,” said Buiké. It was also observed that, if students have been forewarned, and still engage in plagiarism and other academic misconduct, “we’re perhaps being too lenient.” Asked about the parameters of discipline a faculty member may administer, Kravas said, “The *only* direct punishment an instructor may administer is grade-related, and that grade-related punishment must bear specifically on the individual assignment in question. That in turn can be factored into the final grade at the completion of the course.”

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, May 2, 2003, at 1:30 p.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Fan, Janssen, Labossiere 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* Buiké, Gianola, Kenney, Newell and Simon.
Ex officio members Adams, Gerhart, Liston and Morales.