

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

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, **June 13, 2003** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the May 30, 2003 FCAS meeting.
2. Vote on requiring the writing portion of the ACT exam for admission (in order to be consistent with future SAT).
3. Progress of students in the Bridge Program.
4. SCAP: Three “routine” proposals; one “non-routine” proposal (approved by SCAP).
5. Transfer Admissions.
6. Access to Majors.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of May 30, 2003 were approved as written.

Vote: Requiring the writing portion of the ACT for admission (to be consistent with future SAT)

Stygall said that all ACT scores from 2006 onward will have a writing portion. In order to make the entry requirements to the University consistent with future SAT protocol, it is necessary to require that those who take the ACT must complete the writing portion. It was noted that the writing portion of the ACT is “not a great writing test,” but will be good for those students “on the lower end” [of the SAT scores].” Washburn said the essay section of the ACT will be scored on a 2-12 scale. Stygall said, “I like the questions [suggested in the proposal]; they’re not so broad.”

Janssen asked if the proposal would result in an increased cost for students taking the ACT. Washburn said, “Yes, it would.” He added, “Other major universities – and in particular, our peer institutions – will be requiring this writing portion on their ACT scores.”

Stygall MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUIREMENT OF THE WRITING PORTION OF THE “ACT” SCORES FOR STUDENTS APPLYING FOR ADMISSION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON IN AUTUMN QUARTER 2006. JANSSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE COUNCIL VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MOTION.

Stygall said, “This sends a message that writing is considered important at the University of Washington.”

Bridge Program Report – Emile Pitre, Assistant Vice President, Office of Minority Affairs

Emile Pitre, Assistant Vice President, Office of Minority Affairs, distributed a “Summer Bridge 2002 Interim Report.” The Summer Bridge Program, modeled on the Georgia Tech Challenge Course and past EOP Bridge Programs, is an intensive, highly structured, five week program designed to build skills and help students meet UW academic expectations. Upon successful completion of the program, students are admitted to the University of Washington.

The overall goal of the program is to bridge the gap between the students’ competencies and the academic expectations of the University. Program goals are:

- To enhance student competencies in mathematics, science, writing and communications so that they can fully partake of freshmen class offerings.
- To build reading skills so that students can successfully participate in all college-level classes.
- To build networks of relationships between students and faculty.
- To establish an academic plan for each student.
- To foster a greater understanding of the connection between academic learning and lifetime career opportunities.

The ethnic distribution of the students in the Bridge Program is: 30% Asian; 23% Hispanic; 19% Black; 16% Caucasian; 7% Filipino; 4% Native American; and 1% Hawaiian Pacific. Gender distribution is 73% female and 27% male.

Student Pre-College Measures for the Summer Bridge Program 2002 show a high school GPA of 3.10 compared to 3.67 for the all-UW cohort. GPAs ranged between a high of 3.53 and a low of 2.42. 63% (51) entered with H.S. GPAs ranging between 3.0 and 3.49.

The average SAT score of participants was 769 compared to 1177 for the All-UW cohort. The combined SAT scores ranged between 520 and 1200. 45 of the 75 reported scores (60%) fell below 800 and just 3 (4%) were 900 or higher.

As for quantitative outcomes of the 2002 Summer Bridge Program, 81 of the 86 students who accepted offers enrolled and 80 (99%) successfully completed the Summer program and received six credits. Bridge participation contributed significantly to achievement of the regents' goal for underrepresented minorities.

Pitre said survey results indicate that almost all students appreciated the rigorous nature of the program. 81 participants completed Autumn and Winter quarters earning a cumulative mean GPA of 2.84, which is 0.31 grade points higher than their predicted freshman grade point average. 63% of participants have accrued between 30 and 40 credits; 11% have accrued more than 40 credits.

At the beginning of Spring 2003, 79 (98%) were still enrolled; 8 (10%) were on probation, and 2 (2%) were dropped due to low scholarship. To date, twenty Summer Bridge students have received certificates of merit presented at Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) quarterly recognition receptions.

As for qualitative outcomes, Pitre emphasized that students were able to utilize campus resources (computer centers, library, HUB, catering) which allowed them to become more comfortable in their new environment and acclimated to the UW community.

Positive changes were noticeable in students' views of the necessity of college and what is required for success, i.e., setting priorities, good study habits, follow-through, attention to detail, and class participation. Bridge students had the opportunity to form new friendships which will help foster the sense of a close community in the midst of a large student population.

Students learned effective techniques for time-management, registration, selecting majors, realistic course loads, personal safety and security, and for responding to other challenges that may exist in the campus environment. Pitre said the Summer Program was completed on a positive note.

With regard to retention measures, Pitre pointed out that Bridge Program students are taking advantage of support services. During Autumn and Winter quarters, counseling visits averaged more than 2 visits per student per quarter. Interactions between counselors and students via E-mail and phoning also occurred. In addition, students regularly met with the Bridge academic and program administrators during the two-quarter period.

Instructional Center (IC) visits averaged more than 20 visits per student per quarter with 100% participating during Autumn 2002 and 93% participating during Winter 2003.

20% participated in the EOP voluntary mentoring program. In order to improve this outcome, selected 2002 Bridge Cohorts along with QUE 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 FIG leaders will be recruited to serve as peer mentors. All (100%) participants enrolled in Bridge Freshmen Interest Groups during Autumn quarter.

Bridge Program collaboration included the following campus units: Admissions Office; Classics; Office of Educational Assessment; Political Science; Office of Minority Affairs; Biology; Educational Outreach; Office of Undergraduate Education; and Office of the Provost.

Classes included “Human Genome” in Biology; “Justice in Ancient Greek Literature,” (on Homer’s “The Iliad” and “The Odyssey,” Euripides’ “Medea” and “Hecuba,” Thucydides’ Pericles’ Funeral Speech, and Plato’s “The Apology,” “The Phaedo,” and “The Republic”) in Classics; and “Money, Politics, and Prisons” in Political Science.

Skills Enhancement Workshops included Mathematics (provision of curriculum specific to each student’s level of proficiency; and use of pre- and post-testing), Writing (emphasis on grammar, sentence strategies, paragraph structures), and Speech (focus on types of communication that affect human relationships).

Follow-up initiatives include: Academic advising and counseling to achieve academic excellence (career counseling, ongoing mentoring); Bridge Freshman Interest Groups (general studies: learning styles assessment), tutoring/mentoring; and Instructional support (for at least three years): achievement workshops, study groups, and review sessions.

Pitre said that Accountability Measures include quarterly reviews of individual academic performance of participants by the Bridge Academic Retention Team, which will make recommendations regarding course sequencing, academic support, and follow-up on those most at-risk academically. The team includes the following: Student Support Services (SSS) Director; EOP Administrative Director of Retention Services and Director of EOP Counseling; Bridge Administrator; EOP Counseling Tier I Coordinator; SSS Counselor; and IC instructor. Other accountability measures include student surveys (assessment of levels of satisfaction), and Bridge focus groups.

Pitre said students become attached to the administrators of the Bridge Program, and sometimes fail to go to their academic advisors when they have questions. Every effort is being made to make students aware of the Instructional Center. Pitre said there are 16 professional instructors with Ph.D. and Masters degrees in the Instructional Center. There is comprehensive support for over 2000 students.

Students who use the Instructional Service do better academically, Pitre stressed. “Students use the Center about twice a week. We sometimes have trouble getting students to serve as student mentors. We think the Instructional Center helps students greatly, especially in their sophomore and junior years, which are the years when these students tend to drop off.”

Future Plans for the Bridge Program include: implementing a Summer Bridge 2003 program at a level comparable to 2002; conducting follow-up assessments quarterly and annually until students are accepted into their major of choice, and after their fifth year of enrollment; and using what was learned from the first year of the program to modify (re-invent) the program for future entering Bridge cohorts.

Pitre was asked how the Bridge Program students are identified. “We take the lowest students from all those who will be admitted. We try to get the best possible diversity mix. We take the lowest SAT scores. The SATs for these Bridge students were very low.” Pitre said a decision was made *not* to include athletes in the Summer Program. (They *are* in the Fall Program.)

Asked about the continuance of the Summer Program, Pitre said the mission now is to seek year-by-year funding. The goal is to get private funding. “We have to find someone interested in supporting this particular student population. We’ll have what we call a ‘Summer Night’ for potential donors. It takes \$325,000 for just one Summer Bridge Program. We’re definitely in need of funding.”

Asked how students can afford the Bridge Program – since the very money they spend on the Bridge Program is money they need for the regular cost of their attending the University – Pitre said, “Those students who *can* afford to pay *do* pay.”

Pitre said, “This student population can do all right if they follow advice and take realistic majors.” Summer Bridge students take longer to get through their academic career, Pitre said. “Yes, it will take them a little longer. The ‘210’ [credits] rule will come into play.”

Asked how FCAS could help, Pitre said, “Your support for the continuance of the program would be greatly appreciated. Some of these students *can* be successful. Those who do better have higher verbal reasoning, we have found. And it is best not to go below a 2.75 GPA. The correlation between a student’s GPA and how well that student will do, how successful that student will be, is significant.”

Washburn said, “It was a little more selective this year than last year. We might see a better performance from this year’s [Bridge Program] students.”

Plumb thanked Pitre for visiting the council, and said, “We’ll ask you to come back next year.”

SCAP: Three “routine” proposals; one “non-routine” proposal (approved by SCAP)

The following three proposals were deemed “routine” by SCAP at its June 6, 2003 meeting.

1. College of Engineering – Computer Science and Engineering (CSE-042303). Revised Major Requirements. “These changes to the undergraduate major in computer engineering were suggested by our departmental review and strategic plan. The changes largely normalize admission requirements between the CS and CE majors, and provide additional flexibility to students in meeting the natural science requirement.”
2. College of Engineering – Computer Science and Engineering (CSEb-042303). New Admission Requirements. “These changes to our computer engineering admissions process were suggested by our departmental review and strategic plan. The changes largely normalize admission requirements between the CS and CE majors, and provide additional flexibility to students in meeting the natural science requirement.”
3. College of Forest Resources – Paper Science and Engineering (PSE-052303). Revised Major Requirements.

“Justification Statement for Changing the PSE Curriculum: During the years of 2000 to 2001, the faculty of Paper Science and Engineering (PSE), within the College of Forest Resources, participated in an intensive review of their academic program prior to an accreditation visit by a national accreditation body. While accreditation was granted to the PSE Program the scrutiny of the existing PSE Program by outside evaluators, and by the PSE faculty themselves, revealed some areas where program improvement could be made. The PSE curriculum subject areas basically cover the manufacturing of paper products and an understanding of the overall paper product characteristics. From the program inception, a significant emphasis has been placed on the ‘processing’ side of the balance between *process* and *product* topic offerings. This has made sense in the past. The Pacific Northwest region of the United States can be classified as a commodity producer. Process efficiency, with a cost reduction emphasis, provided a rationale for stressing subject areas related to ‘processing’. Continuing this emphasis on the processing side, however, may not be justified in the future.

“There currently appears to be a change occurring in the paper industry. More interest is being shown in the area of paper product design. This is partly due to the fact that different raw materials are being used to produce paper. Recycled fibers, currently being used in some products at the rate of nearly 50%, produce paper with different properties than virgin fibers. Manufacturing or design modifications must be made to correct for this effect to maintain product quality. Combining wood fibers with non-wood fibers, such as wheat straw, also changes paper characteristics. Moreover, a greater emphasis is being placed on combining other materials with paper to enhance certain characteristics, such as coating materials (clay mixtures) to improve printing. These changes are enhancing the value of the products. Packaging products are also experiencing similar pressures to innovate and provide similar or better performance

characteristics while maintaining similar, or lower, production costs. These changes imply that students need more exposure to ‘product performance’ related topics. This is the essence of the rationale for the proposed changes we are submitting.

“In our new program, PSE students will be exposed to the ‘how to’ aspects of paper property characterization earlier in the curriculum. The more difficult ‘why’ questions pertaining to paper product performance will be covered in their senior year and will be covered in greater depth in the paper physics course. In his book, *Investigations*, Kauffman distinguishes between *können* (‘know-how’ in German) and *wissen* (‘know that’) while discussing the implications of the role of science on society and culture. Both are needed, he claims; and ‘knowing how’ comes before ‘knowing that.’ ‘Knowing that’, in some areas of life, may in fact never be known! The changes we are proposing for our small, parochial curriculum fits nicely into this motif.

“In the proposed PSE curriculum, the number of required credits is being reduced to free up more credits for student program flexibility. Thus, while 7 credits will be required for PSE 248 and PSE 402, 3 more in the ‘product’ area than the 4 credits currently required, other courses are being dropped to accommodate this increase. In fact, three weeks of PSE 248 will be allocated to fiber characteristics which was formerly covered in PSE 400/401 (6 credits) and PSE 400/401 will no longer be required of PSE students. Three added and six taken away.”

The following proposal was deemed “non-routine” by SCAP at its June 6, 2003 meeting.

4. College of Arts and Sciences – Program on Digital Arts and Experimental Media (DXARTS-060203). New Major/Degree. “Digital and Experimental Arts.”

Undergraduate Program

Digital Arts and Experimental Media (DXARTS) covers a wide range of arts practice and research across multiple disciplines leading to a Bachelors of Fine Arts degree. The BFA program takes advantage of this convergence to create a distinct multidisciplinary community of artists and scholars whose work is best identified collectively as belonging to Digital Arts and Experimental Media. All of the areas depend on the collaboration of artists, engineers, and scientists for their current existence and continued growth in terms of discovery and application.

Examples of Research and Professional Opportunities in DXARTS:

- Digital video art
- Computer music composition
- Web site design and programming
- 3D animation
- motion graphics design
- user interface design
- sound design
- interactive media production
- multimedia art
- electronic stage and set design
- authoring of electronic on-line publications
- special effects design
- virtual environment design
- sound art
- installations art (in galleries, public and virtual spaces)

Bachelor’s of Fine Arts - Admission Requirements

Application and admission to the Digital and Experimental Arts degree program is a highly competitive process that takes place once a year. Application to the program will normally occur during the sophomore year. To begin the application process, students must enroll in DXARTS 200 in the autumn quarter. Based on performance in DXARTS 200 students will be selected to continue into DXARTS 201 in the winter quarter. Students enrolled in DXARTS 201 are eligible to submit an application and supplemental materials to be considered for admission to the program for the spring quarter.

In addition, students must complete the following prior to application:

1. CSE 142 and 143
2. PHYS 114 or 121
3. MUSIC 120 or ART H 203
4. Mathematics proficiency through the pre-calculus level. Proficiency may be demonstrated by completion of MATH 120 or equivalent, a score of 68% or above on a UW Advance Mathematics placement test, a score of 2 or higher on the mathematics AP exam, or completion of a college-level calculus course.

Major Requirements

In addition to the courses required for admission as described above, major requirements include the following:

1. DXARTS 202 (5 credits)
2. Three quarters of DXARTS 400 (2,2,2 credits)
3. DXARTS 412, 430, 450, 460 (16 credits)
4. 300- and 400-level Supporting Electives (50 credits)
A minimum of 25 credits must be taken from DXARTS; the remainder may be additional DXARTS courses or from list of approved electives in other areas.
5. DXARTS 498 – Senior Thesis (15 credits)
The Senior Thesis includes the requirement for completion and exhibition of a BFA Thesis Project that is a significant and original contribution both aesthetically and technically.
5. A minimum GPA of 2.5 in all DXARTS courses.

Plumb said the Digital Arts proposal “sounds exciting.” Corbett said it still must go to the HEC Board. Washburn said, “What if we asked them if students could incorporate the fifth year courses into the fourth-year senior thesis?” Washburn and the rest of the council are concerned about the extra year: the fifth year.

Newell said, “We have enough questions to *not* vote approval now. There are aspects of the proposal that are contrary to FCAS policy.” Plumb said, “I feel the same way.” She added: “They need to clarify how many credits there are in the degree program. Access to the 200 course is an issue. Trying to get the senior thesis to be included in the fourth-year is something, as Tim Washburn says, that we should pursue. We need to learn more about the eligibility of community college transfers. There are questions about the size of the program: Can it be sustained with only 12 students?” Wiegand said, “One good thing is that a lot of their courses do not have many prerequisites.”

The council postponed the discussion of the proposal until Autumn Quarter 2003.

Transfer Admissions

Washburn said he gave a brief report to the Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduations regarding transfer admissions. He said increasing efforts are being made “to graduate students who have more than 210 credits.”

Washburn said, “We’ve reduced the number of freshmen admitted to the University to 4800 from 4900 last year. We’ve also reduced the number of new transfer student admissions. We have such a backlog of transfer students. We just can’t accommodate all the eligible students.”

Washburn emphasized that “we will only admit a certain number of transfer applicants, and will defer 300 others until Winter Quarter 2004, then repeat that pattern in Spring Quarter, and discontinue our direct transfer agreement in Fall 2004.”

Washburn noted that “this is the contentious issue. The transfer admission agreement is what we have to discontinue. We think a comprehensive review for transfer students makes a lot of sense: to move away from a fixed agreement.” He said, “The comprehensive review process will allow us to match incoming students with the resources available at the University.”

Washburn noted that community colleges “want something in return for giving up the [transfer admission] agreement. We could allow up to 105 credits, if the additional 15 credits were applicable, in certain cases, instead of the usual 90.” Wiegand said, “Students who *have* completed an associate degree would have preference. It could help *us*, since those students have completed some of their prerequisite courses.”

Washburn said, “We don’t know where the transfer admission discussion will end up.”

Access to Majors

Plumb will send a letter to David Hodge, Dean of Arts and Sciences, regarding the council’s position on access to majors.

Washburn showed the council the updated version of the “Guidelines for Departmental Admissions Course Prerequisites.” It was agreed that #3 (per the suggestion of Janssen) should be changed to read, “Courses ideally should apply....” The Guidelines are as follows:

Guidelines for Departmental Admissions Course Prerequisites

Academic departments with selective or competitive undergraduate admissions programs often require applicants to complete certain courses before applying for admission. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards reviews departmental admissions policies before University approval, and it offers the following guidance to departments establishing admissions requirements.

1. Courses required for admissions should be offered frequently and with enough seats to provide adequate access to students interested in the major. Access to prerequisite courses should not be used as a way to limit eligible applicants.
2. Courses should be at the 100 or 200 level, with content appropriate for freshmen or sophomores.
3. Courses should ideally apply to general education requirements if the student is not subsequently admitted to the major.
4. Courses should be available at most community colleges so transfer students can complete departmental admissions prerequisites prior to applying to the University.
5. Undergraduate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences should not require more than 20 prerequisite course credits for admission to the major.

Plumb said, “We’ll look at both of these documents in the Fall, and get the best wording.”

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting will take place in October 2003. When the dates of the Autumn Quarter 2003 FCAS meetings are known, and rooms have been found for the meetings, the council will receive the schedule for the quarter.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Fan, Janssen, Labossiere, Newell and Stygall;
Ex officio members Washburn and Wiegand;
Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs;
Guest Emil Pitre, Assistant Vice President, Office of Minority Affairs.

ABSENT: *Professors* Buike, Kenney, Simon and Woods;
Ex officio members Adams, Bridges, Croft, Gerhart, Liston, Morales and Ver Steeg.