

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

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **May 28, 2004** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

**Synopsis**

1. Approval of the minutes of the May 14, 2004 FCAS meeting.
2. SCAP – Robert Corbett (for Nancy Kenney).
3. Transfer credit policy changes (SHB 2382).
4. Tri-campus curriculum review process.
5. Learning Goals Joint Statement.
6. Satisfactory progress recommendations.

**Approval of the minutes of the May 14, 2004 FCAS meeting**

The minutes of the May 14, 2004 FCAS meeting were approved as amended.

**SCAP – (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs)**

The following proposal was deemed “routine” by SCAP at its May 21, 2004 meeting:

1. College of Engineering – All Academic Degree Programs (ENGR-051204). Revised Program Requirements for all Bachelor Degree Majors in the College of Engineering. “Reducing the minimum credits required for mathematics courses from 24 to 18 for all Engineering degrees gives more flexibility to the Engineering programs – with the understanding that many programs will continue to require additional mathematics and statistics courses.

“The overall changes will provide a clearer statement of the College of Engineering’s core requirements, provides an approved and public baseline of core requirements to reduce confusion and uncertainty during future proposed degree program changes, and will be inclusive of all Engineering undergraduate degree programs as they currently exist.” **THIS PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED “ROUTINE” BY SCAP.**

**Transfer credit policy changes (SHB 2382) – Tim Washburn**

**THE FOLLOWING WORDING OF THE “TRANSFER CREDIT RECOMMENDATION” WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS (FCAS) AT THE MAY 28, 2004 FCAS MEETING:**

**Transfer Credit Recommendation**

**The University of Washington will accept in transfer toward a bachelor's degree no more than 90 lower-division credits.** *After a student has been admitted to a university major, additional lower-division transfer credit may be allowed when: (a) the additional transfer credit will advance the student to degree completion, and (b) the student’s school or college approves a petition filed by the student to allow more than 90 lower-division transfer credits.*

Plumb said, “We need to send this to the provost accompanied by a letter (which Tim Washburn will write) because SHB 2382 has been passed by the state legislature.” (Plumb said the recommendation would proceed from the provost to the president.)

The council agreed that the University will accept in transfer toward a bachelor’s degree no more than 90 lower-division credits, and that an exception will be made *if* an adviser attests that any additional credits accepted “will advance the student to degree completion,” and “the student’s school or college approves a petition filed by the student to allow more than 90 lower-division credits.”

Washburn said, “Most students will continue to transfer when they have 90 credits. I would estimate that more than half of transfer students have at least one course more than 90 credits.” Washburn said he would request that the provost and president authorize this recommendation as an “interim policy” until the Faculty Senate can address the recommendation in Autumn Quarter 2004. It was also suggested that the council may wish to consider limiting all transfer credit to 135 credits since an additional 45 credits must be completed at the University for a 180-credit degree.

### **Tri-campus curriculum review process**

The council reviewed the “Three Campus Curriculum Review Procedures” DRAFT of May 19, 2004. [These procedures apply to new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors (and certificates) and substantive changes to same.] These procedures apply to what is commonly known as “non-routine submissions.”

After council discussion, the council recommended that Phase I, Procedures #2 and #3 be combined as one procedure, and that [current] Procedure #3 be reworded as follows: “Comments from all three campuses are welcomed by the relevant Campus-level curriculum review body and the department/program proposing the offering.”

The council also recommended that Phase I, Procedures #3 and #4 be combined, and that [current] Procedure #4 be reworded as follows: “The originating Campus curricular review body will review its own proposals for the following elements, using its own processes and criteria.”

The council also recommended that Phase I, Procedure #5 be reworded as follows: “Before recommending approval of a proposal, the Campus-level curriculum review body will also ensure that all comments have received consideration and appropriate response.”

The council recommended that the title of Phase II be reworded as follows: “Final FCTCP proposal Process Review.”

The council did not approve the tables, and felt that they confused, rather than clarified, the written document.

The recommendations will be passed on to FCTCP Chair Marcia Killien for her council’s consideration.

Plumb emphasized that this document – delineating these procedures – will not necessitate a change in the University Handbook. “This is an interim policy. The new president may give more direction. I think this is a good step forward from what *has* been happening. This allows for communication. But it does not allow one campus to rubber-stamp a program at another campus. FCTCP Chair Marcia Killien would like to have this in place, to have something that faculty have supported be completed and sent forward in this academic year.”

Buck said he is supportive of the procedures, and made suggestions for changes in Phase I, Procedures #3 and #4 (cf. above).

Asked what would happen to comments made during the 30-day period [set aside for them], Plumb said, “All comments would come to SCAP, or SCAP-like bodies at UWT and UWB.” Buck said that the current wording, however, “suggested that all three campuses see everything.” Plumb said, “The intent is that, once SCAP approves a program from our campus, it doesn’t *then* go to Tacoma and Bothell.” (By then, it will already have vetted any comments that have been posted from other campuses.)

Buck said, that in Phase I, Procedure #4, “each” could be replaced with “all three” or “the originating” (cf. above).

Responding to a question, Plumb said SCAP would not be reviewing a UW, Tacoma or UW, Bothell proposal as part of Phase I, Procedure #4.

Plumb stressed that “the originating campus curriculum review body will review its own [non-routine] proposals.” She said, “I’ll send these suggestions to Marcia Killien, and mention that we do not suggest that the tables be sent along with the narrative, at least in their present wording.”

Plumb will send the revised suggested “Three Campus Curriculum Review Procedures” – with today’s suggestions incorporated into the draft – to the council next week.

### **Learning Goals Joint Statement**

Plumb said that the FCAS-approved “Learning Goals Joint Statement [FCAS/FCIQ]” – with the FCAS-approved changes – was sent to President Huntsman, Provost David Thorud, Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden, Faculty Senate Vice Chair Ross Heath, Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn, Dean of Undergraduate Education George Bridges, Dean of Arts and Sciences David Hodge, Director of Undergraduate Program Development in Arts and Sciences Paul LePore, Director of the Office of Educational Assessment Nina Lowell, Director Emeritus of the Office of Educational Assessment Gerald Gillmore, and Director UW SOUL in the Office of Educational Assessment Cathy Beyer.

### **Satisfactory progress recommendations – Debbie Wiegand**

Wiegand distributed a draft of the “Task Force on Satisfactory Progress, 2004” report. The report notes, at the outset, the following: “As stated in Volume IV, chapter 4, of the [University] Handbook, the University’s satisfactory progress policy requires students to complete their first undergraduate degree program within 30 credits beyond the minimum required for the degree. For students completing a degree with one or more majors, 180 credits is the minimum required. For students completing a double degree, a minimum of 225 credits is required.”

Wiegand said, “The satisfactory progress recommendations are not final yet. They are still being shopped around to advisers and faculty.” She then reviewed the individual recommendations briefly, and took comments from the council.

Regarding Recommendation #1, Wiegand said, “This is a path students can take *if* their course plan is not approved.” Washburn said, “We have to address the problem of students who *don’t* get into, say, Business or CSE, and then apply to Information Science, and thus will graduate with more than 135 credits.” Navin said, “Our faculty [in Information Science] *want* those students. It leverages what faculty can do with them (when, for instance, their CSE background is a good one).”

Wiegand said, “All of these recommendations are affected by satisfactory progress.”

As for Recommendation #2, Wiegand said, “Approval is based on 210 credits (for one degree) and 240 credits (for a double degree).” Washburn said, “We need to establish a limit of two degrees, including no more than three majors.” The council thought a better wording for Recommendation would be: “Establish a limit of two degrees including no more than three majors.”

Regarding Recommendation #3, Wiegand asked: “Should experiential courses be exempted? And if so, how much?” Castic said, in response to the question accompanying the recommendation [“Does this designation devalue these types of credits?”], “This does *not* devalue them.” Buck said, “I agree, this doesn’t mean these credits are devalued.” Plumb said, “Students don’t want to be penalized for taking these experiential courses.”

Wiegand quickly delineated the remaining recommendations. Recommendations #4, #5, #6, and #7 “set up criteria.” Recommendation #8 makes possible “better accuracy from advisers.” And Recommendation #9 urges that “sufficient funding be allocated to implement Recommendations #1 - #8.”

**Next meeting**

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, June 4, 2004, at 1:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder

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