

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on **October 18, 2002** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the October 18, 2002 FCAS meeting.
2. Discussion of proposed academic calendar revision.
3. Continued discussion of the Rose Report.
4. Initial discussion of the "Match Day" proposal.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of October 18, 2002 were approved as amended.

Discussion of proposed academic calendar revision

Plumb said that, according to the suggested revised calendar distributed by Washburn at the October 11 meeting, there would be, on the average, 6.2 days between September 15 and the first day of school, as opposed to 6.7 days in the current calendar. There would thus be approximately a half-day difference in the two calendars. The first day of instruction in Autumn Quarter 2003, under the revised calendar, would be September 24, as opposed to September 29 in the current calendar.

In the revised calendar, the Final Exam week in Autumn Quarter 2002 would finish on December 13, nearly a full week earlier than in the current calendar. "The period between the last day of Finals Week and Christmas would be longer by several days," Washburn noted. Janssen said, "Some TA's have to work beyond December 15, if there is still work to do, so arrangements for pay beyond the standard September 16 – December 15 quarter will still need to be made."

Washburn said, "Our main question is: What's the cost?" He said the proposed revised academic calendar should be more cost-effective than the current one.

Plumb reminded the council of Stygall's concern about the proposed academic calendar revision: that the TA orientation lasts two full weeks, and that, if TA's come in before September 16th, they will have to be compensated. Kenney said, "It's not just independent teaching TA's that have long orientations, so perhaps *all* TA's should be considered."

Newell said, "Aren't we being asked to evaluate this proposal on principle? It concerns a *reduction* of TA training time." Plumb said, "I couldn't vote to approve the change of calendar unless I knew it would not affect TA orientation." Washburn said, "It is not known yet if it will go through the Faculty Senate."

Janssen said, "This proposal puts another Thursday and Friday in the calendar, which would be helpful. At present, we lose a Thursday and Friday in Autumn Quarter because of Thanksgiving."

Plumb said, "We can wait until the 1st of November to vote as a council on the proposal. If TA orientation could be kept intact, I think I could approve the proposal."

Washburn said, "We could add another day to the calendar for grades being due (and make that day Tuesday, and not Monday)." Morales said, "Monday and Tuesday would be good for students too. It would allow students time to contact their advisors, if necessary, and to make other adjustments they would otherwise not be able to make." ASUW representative Cammie Croft said, "Yes it *would* be good

for students [for those very reasons].” Morales said, “Students could be proactive trouble-shooters with that extended date.”

Plumb said, “We’ll come back to this issue at the November 1st FCAS meeting, and see if we need to vote on the proposal at that time.” She said whether FCAS voted on it or not would depend on what occurs in the meantime in the Senate Executive Committee.

Continued discussion of the Rose Report

Plumb said, “It is important that we get our thoughts out today, so I can report to the Senate Executive Committee on Monday, October 21st.”

Plumb said there is a notion among many people who have studied and discussed the Rose Report that some “University Council” combinations would be good, and that other combinations would not be. Washburn said, “It depends on what you combine the councils with.” Do you lose something if you have to put several issues in one council?” Kenney said, “When you look at all the things under Current Administrative Committees, you’d want to ask: Would we be doing all that?” Newell pointed out that “the vast majority of these committees are administration-related, more than faculty-related.”

Janssen said, “This [Report] addresses the wrong issue. Should the faculty councils be reorganized to better address their issues? The answer is probably: Yes. But it should also be asked: Has the administration come up with new committees for issues that should have been directed to faculty councils?” Plumb said this goes back to Hazard Adams’s comments about “spirit” vs. “matter.” Kenney said, “Faculty councils have a *small* voice in these restructured councils. I like, though, reassessing the faculty councils.” Janssen said, “We need to have a faculty voice *through* the Faculty Senate.”

Woods said, “Regarding a graduate council, such a council would be totally new in the Faculty Senate. Yet, the Graduate School evaluates and reviews undergraduate programs, based on departments, and does not report to the Faculty Senate. This doesn’t make sense” Plumb said, “Yes, it doesn’t make sense.” She added that the Senate “wants to do something with this.” Janssen said, “This *used* to be an institution that focused on undergraduate education.” He added, “You’d want to be sure to see how much FCAS would be affected by the proposed changes.”

Washburn said, “On many of these University Councils, you’d have to have enough faculty members to serve on all the subcommittees” Janssen said, “Apparently, some of the subcommittees would have outside members; that is, faculty who are not on the University Councils themselves.”

Woods asked, “do all of these become tri-campus councils?” And Plumb asked, “What about the notion of having co-chairs? One chair from the faculty and the other from the administration.” Janssen said, “For us, it should not be a problem; for a budget committee, it could be disastrous.” Plumb said, “To me, it seems less efficient to have two chairs. It seems more cumbersome.” Kenney said, “To some degree, it depends on who it is.” Adams said, “It could become a problem of power, when the issue is critical. Then the possibility is that the administration will ‘speak softly, but carry a big stick.’” Plumb said, “Since the administration has told Faculty Senate chair Sandra Silberstein that it is interested in working together with the faculty, it would be a good time to bring up the issue of ‘parallel committees.’ Some councils could be combined, but others not. Faculty Affairs would have to be Faculty Affairs.”

Plumb said it is important to keep in mind that “these tables are not a blueprint. They are just an example.” Kenney said, “Accountability is an issue that, in the past, reported to us: to FCAS. The student learning side was a domain of FCAS. Combining FCIQ – the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality – and FCAS would be logical.” Newell said, “But to entitle this ‘Undergraduate Education’ – as the tables suggest – would be limiting. We deal with Nursing and other professional programs, and with

all sorts of other things, including SCAP. Under the new council, we wouldn't see professional programs.”

Plumb said, “I'll summarize these concerns and E-mail them to you, so that I may get your suggestions in time to include them in my presentation to the Senate Executive Committee on Monday [October 21st].”

[Note: What follows is Plumb's summary, sent to council members on October 19th.]

The following was prepared by Carolyn Plumb for the October 21st special session of the Senate Executive Committee, specifically scheduled to discuss the Rose Report.

**Rose Report: Feedback for the Senate Executive Committee
From the 10/18 Meeting of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards**

Prepared by FCAS Chair, Carolyn Plumb

On 10/18/02, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) held a special meeting to discuss three important proposals, one of which was the Rose Report. The Rose Report proposes replacing current Faculty Senate Councils and the Senate Planning and Budgeting Committee with University Councils that would be populated by both the faculty and the administration.

FCAS members initially expressed the following possible positive outcomes from the proposed reorganization:

- Less duplication of working committees.
- Better cooperation and communication between administration and faculty.
- Clearer responsibility and accountability for problem solving and policy development.
- Fewer committees and councils, and thus more faculty involvement (e.g., the question was raised: “Is it difficult to recruit faculty for Faculty Senate councils because many are already involved in other special committees and task forces?”)
- A more logical structure for and set of responsibilities for the Graduate Council, which currently reviews undergraduate programs and is not linked in any way to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

Members expressed the following concerns and questions regarding the proposed reorganization:

- There could be a dilution of what some see as an already small faculty voice in the governance of the university.
- On critical issues, faculty could be outvoted.
- Councils could become polarized.
- Currently, faculty have a voice both in Faculty Senate Councils and also in the committees and task forces created by administration.
- The co-chair model can be awkward and inefficient.
- In the case of FCAS specifically, naming the council “Undergraduate Education” does not account for the fact that the council currently reviews and approves graduate-level professional programs.
- The reorganization may be addressing the wrong issues: why not focus on reorganizing the Faculty Senate councils, re-specifying the mission of each council, and lobbying the administration to delegate work to the councils?
- The proposed councils would need enough members to populate the numerous subcommittees. Would the councils be unwieldy?
- Would all councils include representation from all campuses?

FCAS members think it would be helpful to have a response from the administration in regard to the Rose Report. Answers to the following questions would be instructive:

- Which of the administration committees and task forces named in the Rose Report are active?
- How many of the active administration committees could and would be eliminated if the Rose Report recommendations were implemented?
- Could there be less proliferation of committees and more work accomplished through the Faculty Senate without the restructuring?

FCAS will continue discussion of the Rose Report at our meetings 11/1 and 11/8.

Initial discussion of the “Match Day” proposal

Plumb said Debra Friedman has been taking the “Match Day” proposal to many different groups, both faculty and other. She said Michael Halleran, Divisional Dean for Arts and Sciences, called her and asked what FCAS thinks of the proposal. There is “no great positive response” thus far to the proposal.

Woods asked, “What’s our capacity for majors?” Washburn said, “No one knows. But when you design something like this, positives usually do result. Even without ‘Match Day,’ in this case. In order to do ‘Match Day,’ you’d have to have a common date for application submissions. And, creating a campus Website that allowed all students to have access to a common application date – a common online site that all students could go to, including all transfer students – could actually be done without ‘Match Day.’”

Janssen said, “Engineering has already implemented much of this kind of process. But is it not better to work with this on a college by college basis? Different colleges would best use different features in their own process. They would have different dates for notifying students of acceptance.” Kenney asked, “What’s the ‘Match Day’ part of this? It would be different if these weren’t medical students, who are homogeneous.”

Adams said, “Departments, particularly in the Arts and Sciences, are getting smaller, and can accept fewer students. This is an important factor.” Kenney said, “Yes, how many majors *can* the UW absorb?” Janssen said, “We could have a broad, generic major (General Studies).” Kenney suggested, “We could have, for instance, a general Humanities major.”

Washburn said, “We have to understand students’ needs.” Adams said, “I’m not sure that a specific major is necessarily a better thing.” Kenney asked, “Does Debra Friedman’s proposal get to the heart of the matter?”

Plumb said, “There are people looking for a major, with low grades, but Undergraduate Advising does a good job of redirecting these students to a major they are more likely to succeed in.” Kenney said, “There are so many reasons why a student could *not* have a major by 105 credits.” Plumb said that, in her department – Technical Communications – “we only give one extension; then a student has to go. I don’t think a lot of pre-major extensions are a good thing.” Kenney said, “It would be good to see statistics on this.” Woods said, “Some of our students – in Nursing – who get extensions, *do* get in eventually.”

Newell asked “if the non-major is a problem?” “Yes,” said Washburn. “And FCAS has struggled for a long time to help students find a major.” Newell said, “Debra Friedman’s proposal won’t solve this problem.” Washburn said, “I think Debra Friedman *wants* to find a way to help students who are lost and need a major.” Janssen suggested that students “could be put in General Studies by default, if they don’t declare a major.” Plumb said that “at some point a student has to be responsible.” Washburn emphasized, “We want to tell students to consider having choices of possible majors that are somewhat

related.” He noted that, all too often, students’ first and second choices for possible majors have little if anything in common.

Plumb said, “We could have students say, before registering, what their choices for majors would be.” Janssen said, “Some students *do* know early: Engineering students, for instance.” It was agreed that this is the case in certain disciplines: specific examples are Engineering and Computer Science and Engineering.

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, November 1, 2002, at 1:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Fan, Janssen, Kenney, Newell and Woods;
Ex officio members Adams, Croft, Liston, Morales and Washburn;
Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs.

ABSENT: *Professors* Buike, Eastin, Gianola, Labossiere, Stygall and Woods;
Ex officio member Adams, Gerhart, Liston, Morales and Washburn.