

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

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **May 6, 2005** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Don Janssen presided.

**Synopsis**

1. Approval of April 22, 2005 Minutes.
2. Old Business:
  - SCAP.
    - One “routine” proposal.
  - ROTC Courses.
  - Upper-Division Requirements.
  - Dual-Degree Requirements – How to proceed?
  - FCAS subcommittee positions for the 2005-2006 academic year.
3. New Business.
  - Admissions Update.
  - Future Meetings.
    - May 20 – Curriculum Committee – Wiegand.
    - June 3 – Arts and Sciences (Dual Degree/Major Discussion): LaPore.
    - October? – EOP Update: Pitre.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the April 22, 2005 FCAS meeting were approved as written.

**SCAP: Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs**

The following proposal was deemed “routine” by SCAP at its May 29, 2005 meeting:

1. College of Arts and Sciences – Economics (ECON-022405). Revised Program Requirements for the Major in Economics within the Bachelor of Science. “The department has submitted materials for a new course, ECON 424 – Computational Finance and Financial Econometrics. The application has been approved by A&S, and we are awaiting approval from the University.

This course meets the department’s theoretical and quantitative requirements to be included as a Theory and Methods course for the Bachelor of Science degree program, and includes a considerable amount of mathematics. This course was previously taught under an alternative course number, ECON 483 – Applied Econometrics, which is approved as a Theory and Methods course.

Currently, the Bachelor of Science program requires that a student take ECON 300 and 301, an advanced topics course (ECON 400 or 401), 10 credits of theory and methods (435, 473, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486) and 15 credits of additional 400-level ECON courses. Including ECON 424 in the options will help the BS students to finish their requirements in a timely manner. **SCAP DEEMED THIS PROPOSAL TO BE “ROUTINE”.**

**ROTC Courses – Steve Keith**

Keith distributed the following letter to FCAS from Keith and two other faculty in ROTC:

To: Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS)

From: Colonel Robert Coe, USAF, Professor and Chair, Aerospace Studies  
Captain Stephen Keith, USN, Professor and Chair, Naval Science  
Lieutenant Colonel Paul Wood, USA, Professor and Chair, Military Science

Re: Credit for 100/200-level ROTC courses

Under current University policy, 100- and 200-level courses in Aerospace Studies, Military Science, and Naval Science (ROTC) are offered for credit, but do not count toward graduation. This policy does not appear in the University Handbook, but is found in the Adviser Information File under "first- and second-year ROTC courses":

"100- and 200-level courses in Aerospace Studies, Military Science, and Naval Science are offered for credit, but credits earned in such courses do not count toward the 180 credits required for graduation. The grades in these courses will, however, be counted in the student's grade-point average."

We believe this restriction may date from a time when the lower-division ROTC courses had less academic rigor. This is no longer the case, as these courses have evolved over the years into regular classroom offerings, which meet national ROTC program standards as well as those of the University of Washington. Accordingly, we request that FCAS authorize the Curriculum Committee to review the 100/200-level ROTC courses for regular University credit toward graduation.

By recognizing effort comparable to that required for lower-division courses in other departments, we believe this change would be fairer to both the ROTC and non-ROTC students enrolled in these courses. By reducing the number of extra credits beyond 180 required for these students to graduate, it would also be consonant with the University's Satisfactory Progress policy and initiatives, and make prudent use of both University and Government resources.

We propose that only the regular classroom component of these courses be counted for University graduation credit. As currently constituted, some of them include laboratory or other non-classroom requirements that are mandatory for ROTC students as part of their military training, but not for other University students taking the courses. We will clarify this distinction by changing the course descriptions and syllabi to remove the laboratory components.

Thank you for your attention to this issue. We will be happy to present our lower-division courses to the Curriculum Committee for review at its convenience.

c: Steven G. Olswang  
Cheryl A. Cameron  
W. W. Washburn  
Debbie Wiegand

-----

Keith said, "The letter proposes that only the regular classroom component be counted for University graduation credit." Keith noted that his students "are scattered across the University". Newell said, "You could propose this as a minor, and use that as a vehicle to then get the courses to be considered regular University credit courses whose credits count toward graduation." Washburn said, "The thing that is interesting is that we allow 15 'gray-area' community college credits to be transferred to the University.

We're generous with *them* [with the community colleges], but not with ROTC. If we approved these courses as counting toward graduation, it would certainly be more equitable."

Janssen said, "There is no reason to limit the number of credits that could count toward the degree (toward graduation)." Washburn said this policy has been around so long that it is hard to know where it came from originally or what curriculum committee was responsible for it.

Janssen made the following MOTION:

"THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COUNT 100- AND 200-LEVEL ROTC COURSES (IN AEROSPACE STUDIES, MILITARY SCIENCE, AND NAVAL SCIENCE) TOWARD GRADUATION, AS APPLICABLE FOR SPECIFIC MAJORS."

Woods seconded the MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

### **Upper-Division Requirements – Steve Keith (and SCAP)**

Keith distributed the following summary of the SCAP discussion on upper-division requirements:

#### THE UPPER-DIVISION REQUIREMENTS QUESTION SCAP, April 29, 2005

The subject breaks down into two questions:

- 1) concerns about existing programs, prompted by the data we reviewed, and
- 2) whether we should prescribe / suggest / define requirements for new programs.

We felt these two questions are better dealt with in sequence, so we started with existing programs. There are many different issues involved, such as:

- desired outcomes (what should a given degree / major represent?), noting that many programs were likely built or evolved from the ground up (adding to what we have already) and not from the top down (an outcomes-based approach),
- the differences between disciplines (for example, some require broader knowledge and others go for deeper knowledge),
- the differences between a BA and a BS in the same discipline,
- the relationship of requirements of the major to the general education requirements, and
- the difference between the university experience and the community college experience.

We felt that the way ahead is probably for FCAS to go to the colleges (A&S, in particular) with our concerns ("FCAS invites your attention to..."). This is appropriate for the faculty body charged with academic standards, as we observe recent graduation data and discern a potential issue. It is also appropriate because the faculty of the college owns the curriculum and presumably knows a lot more about it and why it is the way it is than we do.

We thought it would be useful to review our data again and bring our analysis to FCAS. (Mariko will review it again for us.) We also thought it would be useful to hear other views on the subject, and to that end, we suggest inviting Christine Ingebritsen, since she will be the acting dean of undergraduate education. There may be others you can suggest we bring into the conversation. Then we will draft a letter for FCAS to send. The letter might be just to A&S or to all the colleges and schools.

-----

Keith said, “SCAP’s position is that FCAS should go to schools and colleges and talk with their curriculum people, and go with specific data in hand.” Washburn said, “There are courses that are numbered 300- and 400-level at the University of Washington that are numbered 200-level at community colleges. Philip Ballinger [Director of Admissions, Office of Admissions, and a guest at today’s meeting] will go to departments and ask them if they think they should renumber certain of their upper-division courses to lower-level courses.” Ballinger said several departments (Biology, English, and Languages among them) have courses such as those just described.

Newell noted that, in Anthropology, “Our students tend not to take 400-level courses if they don’t have to. That’s a problem in several departments.” Washburn said, “We’ll test the waters and go to just a couple of departments with this 200-300-level issue.” He observed that 400-level courses are open to both undergraduate and graduate students.” Janssen pointed out that prerequisites for 400-level courses is another issue to be addressed. Washburn stressed that “often they are called ‘introductory’ classes (for 400-level courses)”. In smaller programs, he emphasized, “you may not find a large number of upper-division courses.” Washburn said Todd Mildon [University Registrar, Office of the Registrar, and a guest at today’s meeting] can research peer institutions to see where they stand on this issue. It is known that many such universities require that 60 out of 180 credits in undergraduate education be upper-division courses.

“This is principally an Arts and Sciences issue,” said Washburn. “We can check with peer institutions on lower- and upper-division requirements.” Janssen said, “We could use this data, and will follow up on this in Autumn Quarter 2005.”

#### **Dual-Degree Requirements – How to proceed?**

Janssen said, “We will talk with Paul LePore [Assistant Dean, Dean’s Office, Arts and Sciences, and head of the Curriculum Committee] and arrange for him to visit the council at a forthcoming meeting. One thing to be discussed is whether to get rid of the 45 credit requirement [discussed in recent FCAS meetings], or to beef it up.”

#### **FCAS subcommittee positions for the 2005-2006 academic year**

Newell said she will chair the Honors subcommittee in the 2005-2006 academic year. Keith said he will chair SCAP next year. And Woods volunteered to chair the Admissions subcommittee. Janssen – who will be returning as chair of FCAS – expressed his appreciation, and the council’s, to Newell, Keith and Woods for taking on these important positions within the council.

#### **Admissions Update – Tim Washburn, Philip Ballinger and Todd Mildon**

Washburn pointed out that the Faculty Council on Academic Standards is officially responsible, according to the Faculty Code, for giving direction to administrative policy on admissions at the University. “FCAS determines what share of students will be admitted by comprehensive review.”

At present, Washburn told the council, half the students who are admitted receive a “full, comprehensive review”. But there is a move afoot to have all students reviewed comprehensively. (This review, if adopted, would begin in 2006.) As for the question: Why go to a full comprehensive review for all applicants if criteria such as race are not being looked at, Washburn replied: “Because many students are caught right on the line (around an index number of 70 or so).” And this is complicated, he emphasized, by the fact that many students have had rigorous courses in developing their GPAs, while other students have chosen to take more “safe” courses, and have deliberately gone out of their way to avoid “difficult” courses.

Ballinger said, “The comprehensive review is, of course, the ideal. Curriculum alone would be a good reason to go to full comprehensive review. It would be good from a public relations point of view as well. And we should be able to keep diversity up.” Washburn said, “We could change to a truly holistic review. Berkeley and many other universities are now conducting full comprehensive reviews.” Ballinger noted that there *are* issues related to the concern about losing particular populations, such as American Indian and Latino. “We can’t use race as a criterion for admission,” Ballinger reiterated a point made earlier. “We’ll be working on these issues.” One definite positive, he stated, “is that we will be able to take curriculum much more into account.”

Washburn said, “If you *say* you’re going to do a comprehensive review, you *have to do* a comprehensive review on all students.” Janssen said, “It may be better to review three-fourths of them with comprehensive, holistic reviews, and work towards reviewing all of them comprehensively.” Washburn averred, however, that “if we use the funding set aside for this [project], we need to do it.” He added: “We won’t have to use double reads on all the applicants.” Ballinger suggested: “I think we can get it to 10-12 minutes per student [i.e., per application].”

Janssen said, “I’d like to see a comparison of students who *would* have been admitted under ‘AI’ vs. those admitted on holistic review. There will be demographic shifts that will affect some departments more than others.” Ballinger said, “We’ll be able to do sortings once we have all the applications completed. The deadline was January 15<sup>th</sup>. It should be kept in mind that early applications are not representative of the whole group of applications.”

Ballinger stressed that there *is* weight given to socioeconomic and other factors in the comprehensive review. Woods said, “You need *both* the computer results *and* the holistic review.” Ballinger said, “In the next academic year, we will need good representation from faculty.” Washburn remarked: “We would like to consider students within the context of their particular school environment. We want to be as equitable as we can be, and evaluate the data from various high schools equitably.”

### **Future FCAS Meetings**

Janssen said that, at the May 20<sup>th</sup> FCAS meeting, among other agenda items, Debbie Wiegand will present an update on issues pertaining to the Curriculum Committee that are of interest to the council.

And at the June 3<sup>rd</sup> FCAS meeting, Paul LePore, Assistant Dean, Dean’s Office, Arts and Sciences, will join the council in a continuation of the Dual Degree/Major discussion.

Janssen also said that, in October 2005, FCAS ex officio member Emil Pitre, Assistant Vice President, Office of Minority Affairs, will present an EOP update.

### **Next meeting**

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, May 20, 2005, at 1:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder

- PRESENT:** *Professors* Janssen (Chair), Keith, Newell and Woods;  
*Ex officio members* Navin and Washburn;  
*Guests* Philip Ballinger, Director of Admissions, Office of Admissions; and Todd Mildon, University Registrar, Office of the Registrar.
- ABSENT:** *Professors* Buck, Labossiere, Montine, Reusch, Simon, Stygall and Tripathi;  
*Ex officio member* Bridges, Nyquist, Pitre, Siddiqui, Trudeau and Wiegand;  
*Regular guest* Robert Corbett, Office of the Provost, Coordinator of New Programs.