

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on **December 6, 2002** at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of the November 22, 2002 FCAS meeting.
2. Announcements:
 - November 27th meeting with Curriculum Committee to discuss DL courses was rescheduled.
 - Update on academic calendar change.
 - Update on the committee that is continuing the work of the Rose Committee.
3. Discussion of nomenclature for “sub-programs”: Options? Tracks? Concentrations? Should SCAP review and make recommendations?
4. Special guest – Doug Wadden:
 - Tri-campus Program Approval Process.
 - RCEP: Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs. (This is the process that is supposed to be used when a department or program is substantially changed, and it is part of the Faculty Code.)

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of November 22, 2002 were approved as amended.

Announcements

November 27th meeting with Curriculum Committee to discuss DL courses

Plumb said the November 27th meeting with the Curriculum Committee was rescheduled for this coming week. She will report on that meeting at the first Winter Quarter 2003 FCAS meeting.

Update on academic calendar change

The Class “C” academic calendar change was voted down at the Faculty Senate Meeting, but only for this coming academic year. (Too many people had concerns about the coming academic year, including the possible curtailment of TA training in September; and many faculty have their September schedules fixed.) Washburn said the revised academic calendar will be put in place in Autumn Quarter 2004. The revised calendar still needs the approval of both WAC and the Board of Regents.)

Update on the committee that is continuing the work of the Rose Committee

Plumb met with the newly-appointed follow-up committee on faculty council restructuring. Some faculty councils are already preparing to participate in the University Council structure. The Faculty Council on Research is putting together a blueprint for an early pilot program, and Planning and Budgeting also is preparing for the proposed change.

Plumb met with Educational Outreach chair Steve Buck – who is co-chairing the new committee – and Instructional Quality chair Jan Carline. They discussed the proposed University Council on Undergraduate Education, and what form it might take. (FCIQ and FCEO are the two other faculty councils listed under the University Council on Undergraduate Education.) She will update the council on any further discussions.

Discussion of nomenclature for “sub-programs”: Options? Tracks? Concentrations? Should SCAP review and make recommendations?

Plumb said she found many departments who use the term “track.” The term “option” is usually reserved for transcribed programs, Plumb pointed out. (Though Women Studies doesn’t want their programs to be transcribed.) Plumb asked the council for their suggestions.

Kenney said, “Pick a term and stick with it, for non-transcribed options.” Washburn said, “You might want to build a hierarchy: majors, options, tracks, so that tracks are a subset of options.” Woods said, “We have majors, and non-transcribed options; and we have transcribed options.”

Wiegand said, “We only need to regulate transcribed options.” Kenney said, “You could have a word with a specific definition (such as ‘with concentration in -----’).” Washburn said, “Students need to declare options, so we can be apprised of their progress.” Asked by Plumb about her take on this from the standpoint of advising, Wiegand said, “For advising, it would be good to have a defined term. Though, during actual advising sessions with students, several terms will be used in a casual way, unavoidably.”

Janssen commented that another need for clearly defining the term “option” (as a transcribed item) related to potential employers contacting the University to verify that an applicant had indeed completed “X” degree with “Y” option. If the word “option” were used, the University could say yes or no. But if another word other than option were used, the employer could be told to check with the specific department (rather than simply saying, “No, the student did not complete ‘Y’ track”). In some departments with diverse offerings, the students often “concentrate” in a specific area. The students may be inclined to include that concentration on their job application and the student should not be made to look bad because they inadvertently used the wrong word. Clearly defining “option” and passing the information on to departmental advisors would help avoid the “wrong word” problem.

Plumb said, “It would be helpful to have a more complete definition of options (in most cases, transcribed). An option has to be part of an established group of courses.” She said SCAP can come up with a term. She noted that Washburn is on SCAP, and that he could help guide that discussion. Washburn said he will “run this by five or six departments, and see what they say.” Plumb said she could do that. She will definitely run it by PoE, English, and Mechanical Engineering. Labossiere (who is in Mechanical Engineering) said, “We like ‘concentrations’ if they’re *not* transcribed, and ‘options’ if they *are* transcribed.”

Special guest – Doug Wadden on the Tri-campus Program Approval Process.

Wadden began the discussion summarizing previous FCAS discussions years ago when “we had said that these are fully independent campuses, but that’s not the case now. This has been repeatedly described as one university with one Handbook.” He said the Tri-Campus faculty council – on which he and Steven Olswang both serve - has been “brainstorming” on the issue of the tri-campus program approval process.

Wadden said UW Bothell and UW Tacoma keep referring to their own Handbooks, “but the president and the provost both say there is one University Handbook for the University of Washington.”

Wadden said, “Until such a time that the code is changed, FCAS is the designated body for approval of new and revised programs at the University of Washington. The language supporting this role for the council is in Section 23-48 of Volume Two of the University Handbook. The Secretary of the Faculty consigns the decisive decision-making authority in the approval process to the ‘appropriate committee,’ and that committee, or council in this case, is FCAS.”

Wadden said, “It is not about the ‘sharing of information,’ but about this University-wide council being responsible for approval of new and revised programs.” He said, “I want to understand what we’re doing

in this process, and I'm asking you to be aware of your role. After a program is approved by FCAS, it moves through Tim Washburn's office to the president, whose signature is the final authorization."

Wadden said that, though the committee co-chaired by Steve Buck and Ross Heath did not pick FCAS to be one of the "trial" councils in the restructuring experiments, he would like to see FCAS be involved as early as possible. "We'd like to see a moratorium on this discussion *or* a definite five-year plan."

Wadden said Tri-Campus Policy faculty council chair Jacqueline Meszaros is speaking with vice provost Steven Olswang and others, and that work is continuing in the effort to find an early stage SCAP approval process that is acceptable and applicable to all three campuses.

RCEP: Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs

Wadden said, "When proposals came to us [FCAS and SCAP] in the past, we would ask: Is this a fundamental change?, define it as routine or non-routine and proceed from there. But we didn't often refer to the RCEP process. The council must become familiar with RCEP from now on."

Wadden said, "The process of RCEP – Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs – is fixed in the Faculty Code."

If there is a significant change in a program, the RCEP process will be in effect. In one scenario the dean of the program's home department goes to the provost with a request for an RCEP eligible change of program. And that proposal eventually makes its way to SCPB and the Secretary of the Faculty. Or, it may develop from the Provost and be directed to a unit.

Wadden said there are two kinds of RCEP: a full RCEP and a "limited" RCEP. "What constitutes a significant change in the overall curriculum is something that you, as the council approving programs, must look for," he said. Corbett said, "Program eliminations do not come to FCAS, and are not on the 1503 form. Change of titles also do not come to the council." Wadden said, "You might want them to *be* on the 1503 form."

Wadden said, "Options and minors have not been talked of as part of the RCEP process. We're talking of degree offerings or terms of employment, which *do* trigger RCEP's." [He said reference to this appears in Section 26.41 of the Handbook.]

Woods said, "This is due process [RCEP], and I think most faculty are *not* aware of this." Wadden said, "I just want FCAS to know that it's not always an additive process."

Wadden concluded, "We need an approval process that is considerate of all three campuses while emphasizing that FCAS is the authoritative approving body with respect to new and revised programs, and we need to understand the workings of RCEP when determining curriculum change approval."

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, January 10, 2003, at 1:30 p.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor, Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Plumb (Chair), Fan, Janssen, Kenney, Labossiere and Woods;
Ex officio members Adams, Bridges, Liston, Ver Steeg, Wiegand and Washburn;
Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs.

ABSENT: *Professors* Buike, Eastin, Gianola, Newell, Simon and Stygall;
Ex officio members Croft, Gerhart and Morales.