Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from May 25th, 2018
3. Chair’s report
4. Div. Dean Mike Shapiro on Language Instruction
5. SCAP Report
6. Pre-Health “Track” Options
7. Update on Syllabus Best Practices
8. Good of the order
9. Adjourn

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

2) Review of the minutes from May 25th, 2018

The minutes from May 25th, 2018 were approved as written.

3) Chair’s report

Stroup revisited the UW student course evaluations discussion from the last meeting, noting that several other Faculty Councils have now expressed interest in the topic, including the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, and Faculty Council on Teaching & Learning. It was clarified that UW schools, colleges, and departments are able to customize their student evaluation forms in order to collect more useful data, and that bolstering awareness of this fact will be a goal going forward.

It was noted the Areas of Knowledge FCAS project, which involves creating descriptions for each Area of Knowledge category, is ongoing. Curriculum body leads on the UW Tacoma and UW Bothell campuses will be asked to vet the descriptions.

There was some discussion of the potential for strike of academic student employees (ASE). Though a worker’s strike was ultimately averted, members made note of various ways the university did not sufficiently plan for a strike, including a lack of provided mechanisms for cancelling and rescheduling exams, and for grading in the absence of graduate student teaching assistants.

Stroup explained Integrated Social Sciences (ISS) – a fee-based online bachelor’s degree completion program in the College of Arts and Sciences – submitted a truncated summary of its third-year self-
assessment as requested (full report formerly submitted to FCAS March 9, 2018) (Exhibit 1). After brief discussion, a motion was made for FCAS to accept the report. The motion was approved by majority vote.

4) Div. Dean Mike Shapiro on Language Instruction

Mike Shapiro (Divisional Dean of the Humanities, College of Arts and Sciences) was present to discuss a change in general education requirements for the College of Education to drop the graduation requirement of a foreign language through the 3rd quarter for each of the College’s undergraduate programs.

Discussion

Shapiro noted he would like to weigh in on the discussion of foreign language study at the UW. Having been faculty at the UW for five decades, as well as former chair of Asian Languages and Literature, he noted he has been deeply involved in language studies during his career.

It was clarified the UW’s foreign language admission requirement is two high school years or two college quarters. In relation to credit equivalencies, one year of foreign language instruction at the high school level generally translates to one quarter at the UW. Shapiro noted there are four skills generally emphasized in foreign language instruction: reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension. The College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Social Work, and the College of Education require foreign language instruction beyond what is necessary for admission to the university.

Several benefits relating to foreign language acquisition were emphasized, notably an increase in cultural competency and sensitivity. It was noted foreign language study in higher education has shown signs of deteriorating both domestically and internationally in recent years. Online language instruction has become increasingly popular/attractive, though data shows regular day-to-day (in-person) interaction is a more effective method for learning foreign language. A member noted related data shows that students who want to take foreign language courses often experience difficulty scheduling those courses because of the high frequency of regular weekly sessions. A member expressed that the diminution of language study requirements at the college-level also impacts K-12 language programs.

Ballinger (president’s designee) reminded the council that in the recent past there was an explicit request that a formal description of the statement of purpose for having UW students study international languages be developed. This statement of purpose was never taken on as an FCAS initiative, and notably still does not exist at the university.

Conclusion

Shapiro asked that foreign language instruction be deliberated in FCAS in the future. A member commented that the diminution of foreign language requirements at the UW represents a weakening of academic standards. Stroup reiterated that FCAS would deliberate after more time had been provided to members to consider the important issue.

Shapiro was thanked for presenting, and he left the meeting.

5) SCAP Report
**Routine Business**

#1 – Nursing
#2 – Nursing

The requests are for revised admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degrees (traditional BSN and Accelerated BSN) in Nursing. Following the change, the accelerated program (ABSN) will require 79 credits, while the traditional program’s credit requirement is not changed (91 credits).

The requests were approved by majority vote.

**Non-routine Business**

#1 – Education

The request is for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Early Care and Education, the Bachelor of Arts degree in Early Childhood and Family Studies, and Bachelor of Arts degree in Education, Communities, and Organizations. The College is proposing to drop the graduation requirement of a foreign language through the 3rd quarter for each of its undergraduate programs. It was noted the request dovetails with the formerly deliberated agenda item on foreign language instruction.

A member made a motion to table the request. The request was tabled via majority vote.

#2 – Asian Languages and Literature

The request is for a new minor in Indonesian Language and Culture.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#3 – Biology

The request is for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Biology.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#4 – Nutritional Sciences

The request is for a new undergraduate major in in Food Systems, Nutrition, and Health.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#5 – Public Health

The request is for a new option in Global Health within the Bachelor of Arts degree in Public health.

The request was approved by majority vote.
#6 – Public health

The request is to change the name of the program from Public Health to “Public Health-Global Health.”

The request was approved by majority vote.

#7 – Real Estate

The request is for a new minor in Real Estate.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#8 – Asian Languages and Literature

The request is for revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Korean.

It was noted SCAP forwarded the proposal to FCAS with the recommendation that the Department consider offering graded courses instead of independent study as alternative for the study-abroad requirement. There was some discussion and members agreed graded courses should be offered in lieu of independent study.

A member made a motion to reject the proposal. The request was rejected by majority vote.

#9 – Computational Finance and Risk Management

The request is for a new minor in Computational Finance.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#10 – Neurobiology

The request is for change of name from Neurobiology to “Neuroscience.” The Department received sign-off from the Department of Psychology and the Department of Biology.

The request was approved by majority vote.

#11 – Social Work

The request is for revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Social Welfare.

The department is proposing revised admission requirements, terminating its early admission pathways, and proposing to remove Economics and Human Biology from program prerequisites.

The request was approved by majority vote.

6) Pre-Health “Track” Options
It was noted there has been attempts to capture a “pre-health track” at the UW by several different avenues in the recent past. A draft minor was developed, but the credit load came out to 78 credits and ultimately was deemed too large per the FCAS Policy Pertaining to Minors (25-35 credits). An option was also considered, but both ideas ran up against constraints and were subsequently dropped.

Stroup noted there is an idea for recommended “pre-health courses” to exist in a published UW document. Miller commented that a pre-health degree audit could be developed via the DARS program, in response.

It was noted there has been attempts to capture a “pre-health track” at the UW by several different avenues in the recent past

7) Update on Syllabus Best Practices

A draft of the FCAS Syllabus Best Practices was presented (Exhibit 1). Members were asked to review the document and recommend addition of any content they feel should be included. Janice DeCosmo was noted as the contact for the project.

8) Good of the order

Navid Azodi (ASUW) was thanked for being a productive student partner in the council’s work.

9) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Sarah Stroup (Arts & Sciences) (chair), Dan Ratner (Engineering), Phil Brock (Arts & Sciences), Lynn Dietrich (Education), Mike Lockwood (Naval ROTC), John Sahr (Engineering), Radhika Govindrajan (Arts & Sciences)
Ex-officio reps: Robin Neal, Meera Roy, Jennifer Payne, Navid Azodi, Louie Tan Vital
President’s designee: Philip Ballinger
Guests: Emily Leggio, Tina Miller, Robert Corbett, Janice DeCosmo, Helen Garrett

Absent: Faculty: Ann Huppert (Built Environments), Daniel Enquobahrie (Public Health), Champak Chatterjee (Arts & Sciences), D. Shores (Business), Zhi Lin (Arts & Sciences)
Ex-officio reps: Conor Casey, Robin Neal

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – FCAS Syllabus Best Practices_draft.pdf
DRAFT

June 8, 2018

FCAS Syllabus Guidelines

A syllabus is required as part of the documentation submitted for review of all new course applications and of proposals to substantively change existing courses. In addition to forming an important aspect of the review of course proposals, the syllabus is kept by the Office of the University Registrar to aid in documenting the course content for students. Besides its administrative purpose, students depend on the information on a syllabus to understand what is expected of them in the course. While disciplines will vary in the format and specific content of the syllabus, certain components are important for most courses. Note that since Canvas and other learning management systems for presenting course information have become more common, the syllabus may no longer be one document but rather a series of electronic documents, the components of a complete syllabus should still be readily available to students.

Syllabi typically provide the following information:

1. Course description
   a. Logistics to obtain necessary materials and assistance
   b. Learning/intellectual content
   c. Learning objectives
   d. Characteristics of class meeting (online, lecture-based, seminar, etc.)

2. Course assessment/expectations
   a. Explicit description of types of assessments, including method (points, percentages, etc. for each type of assignment) and general criteria (participation, improvement, content correctness, etc.)
   b. List of assignments with estimated due dates and scope

3. Course policies
   a. Accommodation
   b. Academic integrity
   c. Inclusivity
   d. Technology Protocol
   e. Strategies for success

Policies Related to Syllabus Development

Accommodation

Instructors are obligated to provide reasonable accommodations for students who have disabilities. The university’s Disability Resources Office is the campus partner that provides services for students “with either temporary or permanent physical, health, learning, sensory or psychological disabilities.”

The following is an example of a syllabus statement to include:
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“Access and Accommodations: Your experience in this class is important to me. If you have already established accommodations with Disability Resources for Students (DRS), please communicate your approved accommodations to me at your earliest convenience so we can discuss your needs in this course.

“If you have not yet established services through DRS, but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodations (conditions include but not limited to; mental health, attention-related, learning, vision, hearing, physical or health impacts), you are welcome to contact DRS at 206-543-8924 or uwdrss@uw.edu or disability.wl.edu. DRS offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities and/or temporary health conditions. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between you, your instructor(s) and DRS. It is the policy and practice of the University of Washington to create inclusive and accessible learning environments consistent with federal and state law.”

Academic Integrity

The university’s policy on plagiarism and academic misconduct is a part of the Student Conduct Code, itself based on policy defined in WAC 478-121. The university has prepared a set of policies, entitled Student Conduct Policy for Academic Misconduct and Behavioral, Chapter 209 in the Policy Directory. Since what specifically constitutes academic misconduct varies by discipline, individual departments, schools and colleges may have descriptions and language for syllabus development. As an example, here is a statement developed by faculty at UW Tacoma:

“A major part of your experience at UW Tacoma will be reading, synthesizing, and using the knowledge and ideas of others. To plagiarize is to use the ideas—or unique phrasing of those ideas—without acknowledging that they originate from someone or someplace other than you.Attributing where you get your information builds your own authority to speak on that topic and provides valuable backing to the arguments you make. Attribution also distinguishes your ideas and words from those of others who came before you. At the University of Washington, plagiarism is a violation of the student conduct code, and the consequences can be serious. Though citing, quoting, and paraphrasing can be confusing at first, it is essential for your success at UWT that you familiarize yourself with the important conventions of academic writing. Additionally, plagiarism can be understood differently in various disciplines. For instance, the ways in which one summarizes others’ ideas in texts, or attributes information from texts in one’s own paper, are not the same in the sciences as they are in the humanities, or the social sciences. This means it is vital that you understand the specific expectations and guidelines for writing that will help you avoid plagiarizing in this class. If you have questions about what amounts to plagiarism, you are strongly encouraged to seek guidance from faculty and the Teaching and Learning Center as soon as possible.”

Another resource for explaining plagiarism and, as importantly, preventing is hosted by the University Libraries on their page on plagiarism prevention. This page explains how to use Vericite to check plagiarized text.

Inclusivity
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One of the core values of the university is inclusivity and diversity, regardless of race, gender, income, ability, beliefs, and other ways that people distinguish themselves and others. As the Diversity at the UW website first page states:

“At the University of Washington, diversity is integral to excellence. We value and honor diverse experiences and perspectives, strive to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, and promote access, opportunity and justice for all.”

The Diversity page is a portal to various aspects of how this value is threaded through the university’s work. Inclusivity has a more basic meaning when applied to a course. Assignments and activities should be accessible to all students, such as class trips or activities in the field. Alternative assignments should be available to those who may not be able to complete them as the instructor envisions them.

Electronics in the Classroom

There is no general policy on the use of technology (phones, tablets, laptops, etc.) at the university but instructors can set expectations about how these devices are used. The UW Tacoma provides this statement for inclusion in a syllabus:

“Electronic devices (including, but not limited to, cell phones, tablets and laptops) may only be used in the classroom with the permission of the instructor. Activities that are not relevant to the course, such as checking/ sending email, playing games and surfing the web, are considered disruptive activities when class is in session. Check with your school/program about their electronic devices policy, or to see if it’s at the discretion of the instructor.”

As with any expectation of a class, if an instructor has a policy in mind, it should be included in the syllabus. Please note that grades may not be based on students’ use of discouraged or prohibited technology in the classroom.

Grading

Participation: Instructors may not grade students solely based on attendance, though students’ performance on in-class assignments obviously suffers if they are not in class. Instructors may base a portion of a student’s grade on participation. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) has provided this statement on the use of participation in grading:

“While most instructors understand the need for explicit guidelines regarding how assignments, such as term papers, will be graded, the rubric for participation can be overlooked. Generally, students cannot be assessed for their behavior and attendance is considered a behavior (See Faculty Resource of Grading at [https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/grading.html](https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/grading.html)). Students may be assessed on their participation in the classroom as long as the rubric used to assess the quality of that participation is explicit (i.e., described in detail in the syllabus) and not based solely on attendance. In courses where the pedagogy requires that more than 15% of the course grade be based on in-class participation, the assessment rubric is critical so that students understand what is expected of them. Best-practice examples and other information can be found at the Center for Teaching and Learning website: [http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/](http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/).”
Grading on Behavior: A student cannot be graded solely on behavior; generally, a student's grade should reflect their mastery of the course content. For example, a paper should not marked down simply because it is late, particularly if there is no policy on completing assignments on time in the syllabus. However, if the same lateness affects the student's performance on linked assignments or activities (such as group discussion or revision), then penalizing that lateness may be appropriate, if stated on the syllabus. The Faculty Resource on Grading (FROG) discusses the distinction between grading an assignment solely on behavior compared to grading based on performance https://depts.washington.edu/grading/conduct/grading.html

Extra credit: Extra credit is discouraged. Should it be used, extra credit opportunities must be offered judiciously and not as a replacement for primary course material. Such opportunities are to be: fair; that is, available to all students equally; not dependent upon a specific time outside the regularly scheduled class period (e.g., attending a specific talk or performance); not dependent upon the ability to travel to or from specific locations (e.g., attending a specific talk or performance); not dependent upon the expression of political or social interest (e.g., caucusing, voting, watching a debate, volunteering); and made explicit in the syllabus. In no event should extra credit be offered to only a subset of students. If any student in a class cannot feasibly complete an extra credit opportunity, the instructor should offer an alternate but commensurate opportunity to that student.

Peer evaluation: Peer evaluation must be used judiciously and in moderation. Peer evaluation may not replace grading by the instructor; while peer evaluation may be included in a grading rubric, students are not to assign grades to other students.

Policy on Incompletes: An incomplete grade (I) is only given if a student is doing satisfactory work up until the last two weeks of the quarter and has furnished proof that the work cannot be completed because of illness or other circumstances beyond the student's control. The instructor must file a written statement with the head of the department or the dean of the college listing the work that a student will need to do to remove it. For further information on incompletes, see how the Registrar treats them and the university policy on their use.

Students' Right to Due Process: The syllabus is the contract with the class and individual students. Therefore, it is important to make explicit expectations on assessment, conduct, and other aspects of the class. According to the FROG,

"Due process involves providing students with a clear description of course expectations, including grading requirements, as well as behavioral guidelines. Most important, it provides students with the opportunity to appeal conduct-related decisions to a higher University authority. Since an important element of due process is the giving of notice of expected behavior, classroom expectations/criteria should be placed in the syllabus and on your faculty web page and announced during class. This notice is an important prerequisite for establishing fair rules of behavior."

Thus, for academic standards, the course itself is part of due process. Fairness plays a role in assignments and expectations, but it is grading where it becomes most visible to the student. There is never not a subjective element to teaching and assessment but clearly explaining expectations of timeliness, participating civilly, or other aspects of the course in a syllabus can help prevent misunderstanding in the class. The FROG is a resource for this issue and those above.

Medical Notes: Forthcoming
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Best Practices and Other Guidance

Disability Resources for Students: Disability Resources for Students is housed in Mary Gates and provides a host of resources for students. Addition The Access Technology Center, providing access to university technology, is also located in Mary Gates.

Faculty Resource on Grading: The FROG is a site developed by the Office of Educational Assessment with input from FCAS and the Office on Student Conduct. It provides explanations of the UW grading system, providing access to students with disabilities, academic conduct, and other topics.

Additional Syllabus Development Guidance: The UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly has a webpage that provides statements for inclusion in syllabi on topics addressed above and others such as classroom civility. The UW Bothell Campus Council on Academic Standards & Curriculum (CCASC) has a list of FAQs for developing a syllabus for a course requiring curriculum review.

Syllabus Design: The Center for Teaching and Learning is a campus resource for all aspects of teaching. They provide advice on course design and syllabus development, beginning with http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/preparing-to-teach/designing-your-course-and-syllabus/.

The Student Conduct Code: The code as written in Chapter 478-121 of the Washington Administrative Code is the set of official policy developed to implement the Revised Code of Washington, which was passed as a statute by the Legislature. The Student Governance Policy, Chapter 209, based on these, provides the entire university its policy on academic misconduct. The code describes instances of misconduct as well as rights to privacy and due process that students have.

UW Libraries Resource on Plagiarism Prevention: This useful guide for students is found at: http://www.lib.washington.edu/teaching/plagiarism

Sample Syllabi forthcoming