

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

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **May 14, 2004** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

**Synopsis**

1. Approval of the minutes of the April 30, 2004 FCAS meeting.
2. Announcements – Carolyn Plumb.
3. Update on e-mail discussion with co-chairs of FCAS regarding Electronic Devices in the Classroom resolution.
4. Student Learning Goals (Guests: Gerald Gillmore and Cathy Beyer, Office of Educational Assessment). Update on recent efforts and proposed joint resolution (FCIQ and FCAS) supporting these efforts.
5. Community College credits vs. transfer credits from four-year schools.
6. Recommendations from Satisfactory Progress Task Force.

**Approval of the minutes of the April 30, 2004 FCAS meeting**

The minutes of the April 30, 2004 FCAS meeting were approved as written.

**Announcements – Carolyn Plumb**

1. The remaining FCAS meetings will take place on:
  - April 28, 2004: 1:30 p.m.: 142 Gerberding Hall
  - June 4, 2004: 1:30 p.m.: 36 Gerberding Hall
  - June 11, 2004: 1:30 p.m., 36 Gerberding Hall (if necessary)
2. Don Janssen: FCAS Chair for 2004-2005. Janssen will chair the June 11<sup>th</sup> council meeting, if that meeting is deemed necessary. (Plumb will not be available for that meeting.)

**Update: e-mail discussion/FCAS co-chairs re Electronic Devices in the Classroom resolution.**

Co-chairs Jeffrey Schwartz and Clark Pace of the FCAS, both said they feel the current Student Conduct Code sufficiently addresses the issue of electronic devices in the classroom. Faculty are allowed to dismiss any student whose behavior (which would include his or her particular use of electronic devices) proves disruptive to the class. The council concurred, and decided it was necessary to adopt a resolution concerning electronic devices at the Seattle campus.

**Student Learning Goals: Update on recent efforts and proposed joint resolution (FCIQ and FCAS) supporting these efforts – Catharine Beyer, Research Scientist, Office of Educational Assessment**

The following is the revision of the Learning Goals Joint Statement from FCAS/FCIQ (DRAFT) that the council agreed on at the conclusion of today's meeting with Catharine Beyer:

Learning Goals Joint Statement from FCAS/FCIQ

FCAS and FCIQ endorse the value of departmentally-created learning goals, primarily as a means for improving student learning and developing curriculum. Faculty developed goals and objectives can form the basis on which departments assess the outcomes of their instructional efforts. This assessment can guide future educational efforts as well as satisfy the requirements of our accrediting bodies. FCAS and FCIQ support the recent efforts of the Office of Undergraduate Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and many professional schools and colleges to work with departments and faculty to develop

meaningful learning goals for their students and to develop Web-based technology appropriate for sharing these goals with the UW community. Both councils commend these efforts because they will foster:

- Learning goals that are departmentally developed and embraced by faculty in those departments
- Learning goals that can be linked to those of individual courses, to those of departments and colleges, and finally, to those of the University in undergraduate education.
- Assessment processes for measuring progress on learning goals that can yield information that is both meaningful and useful for the improvement of teaching and learning at all levels.

FCAS and FCIQ applaud this approach, which is discipline specific, involves faculty input, and has, as its primary focus, the advancement of student learning.

Plumb pointed out that the Accreditation Committee – in the report based on their visit last year – stated that the University was a long ways from establishing the student learning goals that ought to be in place. Plumb said, “I feel strongly that we should put forward a statement (the Learning Goals Joint Statement from FCAS/FCIQ) that suggests that this is a better approach to student learning goals than what we have had.”

Plumb introduced Catharine Beyer, Research Scientist from the Office of Educational Assessment, who was invited to discuss Student Learning Goals with the council.

Beyer distributed a “Relational Model of [Undergraduate] Learning Goals in the College of Arts and Sciences.” Beyer said Arts and Sciences asked Gerald Gillmore [Director Emeritus of Educational Assessment] and her to talk to them about Student Learning Goals. And Arts and Sciences asked Beyer to work with faculty and students in an effort to integrate learning goals and, ultimately, to achieve more compatible learning goals. “We’re working with foreign language curriculum also,” said Beyer. “We’re developing new methods to work with student learning goals.” She said Arts and Sciences Dean David Hodge “is pushing integration of student learning goals *at every level*. As the Relational Model shows, learning goals are threaded through the entire curriculum, while leaving integrity in *individual* areas.”

There are five basic processes delineated in the Relational Model. They are not templates: departments “can mix them, alter them, or create additional processes.” The “Notes” accompanying the Relational Model suggest that “all processes are rooted in the understanding that faculty members have learning goals for students in their courses, whether or not they articulate those goals, and that departments have learning goals for majors embedded in their required curricula, whether or not those goals are stated.” The best process “is the one that best fits the culture of the department and the needs and energy of the faculty.”

The five processes are suggested as follows in the Relational Model: 1) Some departments have already identified learning goals at the departmental level.; 2) Departments can begin developing goals for majors at the “track” level.; 3) Departments can begin by asking faculty to articulate what they want students to learn and to learn how to do in their courses; 4) Departments can also begin by considering what their course requirements suggest about what faculty expect majors to know and know how to do; 5) Another beginning point is the capstone course. Faculty can consider what the courses suggest about learning goals in the major and work backwards.

Beyer stressed the importance of “letting departments and individual cultures decide for themselves which process is best for them.” She said, “Our overall goal is to improve student learning and to make curriculum planning easier.”

As for “Information Sources for Assessment of the Major,” Beyer pointed to three questions departments and programs can ask themselves to “illuminate needed curricular or pedagogical change”: 1) “Where in

the curriculum are we teaching these goals and where in our curriculum are we asking students to practice these goals?"; 2) "Where in the curriculum do we ask students to demonstrate that they have met our goals for their learning?"; and 3) "What do students (and others) say about how well our program is meeting the goals we set for it?"

Beyer said, "Departments and faculty can bring exit surveys into the process as well." She said, "We want faculty to think about *and articulate* learning goals for their students. We think these processes will help them do that."

Beyer distributed "An Integrated Educational Information System: Purposes and System Elements." The overall goal is "to ensure that education is delivered with high quality and integrity, to ensure that students are progressing through the system efficiently, and to communicate to constituents that this quality, integrity, and efficiency are occurring." Beyer said, "This system also will help advisers." She said the system is not yet in place. "We hope soon to take a program and put it into this system, and see how it goes."

Beyer said, "There's a big conversation out there; and, to reiterate, we want to see an integration of student learning goals *at every level*."

Plumb said, "This is a huge undertaking — to get a flexible enough system to suit diverse departments and cultures. [This system] will help departments *be set up* to assess student learning. Then, you're *set up* to take your information and apply it to your specific curriculum needs and learning goals." Beyer added: "Departments can learn about what they *want to do*." Washburn observed: "We're just not used to articulating our learning goals." Newell suggested: "It's hard to get across to faculty the importance of justifying their courses with respect to learning goals. The College Curriculum Committee is not insisting on seeing these justifications. That's a problem."

Woods said, "We need to use data for programmatic improvement; that's the missing piece in this handout. And it's unimaginable that courses *don't* have a learning objective." Castic said, "*Many* courses I've had had no articulated learning goals or objectives." Newell said, "Students think too often: 'What do we have to learn?' (in terms of information needed)." Castic added: "A lot of courses don't try to convey a specific learning goal, even if they *have* one."

Woods said, "A first step is to *state* the objectives." Beyer said, "Faculty *know* what the goals are at the course level, but they don't articulate them to students." Washburn suggested: "We could link this, and articulate it as part of the quarterly curriculum process."

Plumb asked the council to read the draft of the "Learning Goals Joint Statement from FCAS/FCIQ." The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (FCIQ) had already approved the statement. "I'd like to send it to the provost, to George Bridges, to Dean Hodge, and to the Faculty Senate chair," said Plumb. "The Accreditation Committee said that articulation of progress in Student Learning Goals must be articulated by Spring 2005. We could have Class 'C' Legislation, too." Newell said, "The draft needs to be better *linked*: the *goals* need to be linked." [Cf. the revised draft at the beginning of this section of the minutes.]

The council discussed possible revisions, and approved Newell's suggestions for establishing better linkage.

KEITH MOVED TO APPROVE THE REVISED DRAFT OF THE LEARNING GOALS JOINT STATEMENT FROM FCAS/FCIQ. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY WOODS. THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE REVISED DRAFT.

### **Community College credits vs. transfer credits from four-year schools**

It will be recalled that, in the April 30, 2004 FCAS meeting, after discussion, **THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS:**

- 1) **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE POLICY THAT 100% OF TRANSFER ADMISSIONS WILL BE BASED ON A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW;**
- 2) **UNANIMOUSLY ENDORSED THE TRANSFER ADMISSIONS POLICY AND PROCEDURES (EFFECTIVE WINTER QUARTER 2005) IN GENERAL.**

Today, Washburn distributed a memorandum entitled: "Transfer Credit Policy Changes Necessitated by SHB 2382." Washburn writes: "Substitute House Bill 2382 was approved in the 2004 legislative session and signed by the governor to take effect 90 days after the close of the session. The effective date of this legislation is June 10, 2004. SHB 2382 requires Washington public baccalaureate institutions to treat the transfer of lower-division credit from community colleges the same way it treats such credits from baccalaureate institutions. The current University of Washington transfer credit policy limits transfer credit from community colleges to 90 credits, but places no limit on lower-division credit from four-year institutions. This policy will have to be changed to comply with SHB 2382."

Janssen observed: "The only limit on the 90 credits [in the current policy] is on the community colleges." Washburn said, "If you look on the bottom of the second page [of the memorandum], you'll see that we only have to treat them the same for both two- and four-year institutions. I suggested wording for the Handbook." Washburn noted that, as this legislation becomes effective June 10, 2004, "it is too late to change the Handbook [at the present time]."

Janssen said, "You might want to add the sentence: 'This is not meant to *wave* any requirements of the residency.'" Washburn said, in response to a question about residency: "You need 45 of the last 60 credits at the University of Washington. The individual college, however, can waive 10 credits. *This* would be a much more restrictive process, but it puts us in a good position. We'll be able to say to transfer students, 'We'll accept your credits *if* they're applicable to your degree requirements.'" "

Plumb asked the council: "Does anyone disagree with Tim's recommendation? ["My recommendation is to place a 90 credit limit on all lower-division transfer credit and allow credit beyond 90, for both groups, only after the student has declared a major and the major adviser certifies that the additional credits will apply to the student's degree requirements. I recommend this alternative because allowing more than 90 credits from a community college will cause students to stay at community colleges longer, delaying the very beneficial effects of baccalaureate advising, instruction and upper-division student engagement."]

Hearing no objections, Plumb said the council will vote on the first part of the recommendation: placing a 90 credit limit on all lower-division transfer credit.

**WOODS MOVED TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION TO PLACE A 90 CREDIT LIMIT ON ALL LOWER-DIVISION TRANSFER CREDIT. KEITH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THIS MOTION.**

### **Recommendations from Satisfactory Progress Task Force**

Plumb said the report from the Provost's Task Force on Satisfactory Progress "did go out in January 2004," and that "a lot of effort is being made to get students through their undergraduate degree program in a timely fashion (210 credits or fewer for one degree, and 240 credits or fewer for two degrees)." She said that the proposed recommendations, which have been developed over the past month, "will be sent out widely."

Plumb said that, additionally, there is an Undergraduate Advisory Council under the direction of George Bridges, Dean of Undergraduate Education. Buck, who served on the Advisory Council, said, “We were inclined to drop 2 and 3 from Recommendation #1, and 2 from Recommendation #2.” Navin asked, “What happens if we exceed the 210 or 240 limits? Washburn replied: “You can’t admit them to the major.” Navin said, “We need more flexibility for programs like ours [in the Information School].”

Plumb asked council members to e-mail her with any suggestions or comments they have.

**Next meeting**

The remaining FCAS meetings are as follows:

Friday, May 28, at 1:30 p.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall, Friday, June 4, at 1:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder

- PRESENT:** *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Buck, Janssen, Keith, Newell and Woods;  
*Ex officio members* Castic, Navin, Pitre, Richards, Washburn and Wiegand;  
*Regular guest* Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs;  
*Guest* Catharine Beyer, Research Scientist, Office of Educational Assessment
- ABSENT:** *Professors* Fan, Kenney, Labossiere, Reusch, Simon and Stygall;  
*Ex officio members* Bridges, Erickson-Brown and Nyquist.