Minutes
Special Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, April 20, 2020, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom


Absent: Shailendra Jain, Marian Harris, Kelty Pierce, Giuliana Conti

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:39 P.M.

The agenda was approved.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Joseph Janes. [Exhibit A]

Janes began by welcoming Alexandra Portillo, the newly hired Council Analyst.

Janes commented on the importance of the recently approved Class A legislation on the realignment of faculty ranks.

Janes noted that because of the Governor’s Proclamation on Open Meetings, several Class A proposals might not be dealt with this year because they do not meet the restrictions (necessary and routine) or COVID-related. These include a proposal from the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs regarding a diversity-statement requirement for applicants for certain faculty positions and a proposal from the Faculty Council on Women in Academia regarding the requirement to publish unit-level promotion and tenure guidelines.

Janes said the remaining meetings this year will deal with a number of Class B resolutions related to COVID, a Class C resolution related to efforts of the dispute-resolution task force, and personnel issues such as faculty-council membership.

Janes noted that he has been involved in numerous COVID-related meetings over the last few weeks, too many to described in any detail, but he said that people have pulled together to work for the benefit of students, staff, faculty, and the community at large.


   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]

   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]

   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]

There were no questions.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

President Cauce thanked all members of the community for stepping up to the challenges presented by the COVID pandemic. In the present and immediate future, these challenges include everything ranging from campus maintenance and safety to academic issues involving grading, graduation, and continuing with the online presence. Looking forward, the University is looking at various guidelines and scenarios for getting people back to work and for running a fall quarter.

President Cauce emphasized that the University will face serious financial issues. The State tax structure is dependent on consumption, which has been severely affected by the virus. The University may be asked by the State to absorb a general budget cut. Moreover, the University faces strains on internal
funding sources such as tuition, philanthropy, investment returns, parking, athletics, food and housing, and the provision of medical services. The University has pledged to keep all employees whole until May 4, but layoffs and furloughs may be necessary after that time. Cauce noted that the University of Arizona has announced that all their employees face furloughs and pay cuts. She said other schools have talked about foregoing raises. She closed by saying that things will be clearer in three or four weeks.

There were no questions for the President.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the February 10, 2020, SEC minutes.
   b. Approve the February 27, 2020, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, as the 2020-20201 Faculty Legislative Representative and JoAnn Taricani, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences, as the 2020-2021 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative.

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

   a. Class B Legislation – Standardized tests. [Exhibit E]
      Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the legislation for submission to the Senate.

Ann Huppert, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and Marjorie Olmstead, Chair of the Council’s Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material contained in the Exhibit and a letter provided by Phil Ballinger, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment and Undergraduate Admissions, herein attached as Addendum I. They noted that the legislation codifies temporary COVID policies making them formally applicable now as well as going forward. The legislation allows the three campuses to pursue their own policies. Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, added that President Cauce has emphasized the legislation’s importance in current recruitment efforts.

In response to questions, Olmstead said that no decision has been made about the Seattle campus going test blind as opposed to test optional. Further study on that issue will be done over the summer.

There was no further discussion.

The motion passed.

   b. Class B Legislation – Hardship withdrawal and annual drop. [Exhibit F]
      Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the legislation for submission to the Senate.

Ann Huppert, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material contained in the Exhibit.

During discussion, it was agreed that this is an important issue for students, especially in the COVID climate.

There was no further discussion.

The motion passed.
c. Class B Legislation – Distance learning. [Exhibit G]  
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning.  
Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.  
A motion was made and seconded to approve the legislation for submission to the Senate.

Tom Halverson, Chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, and Lynn Dietrich, member of the Council, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material contained in the Exhibit. They added that the changes make it possible for fee-based students to take campus on-line electives. They also emphasized the legislation’s importance in the COVID climate.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed.

d. Approval of the April 30, 2020, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit H]  
Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.  
A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda for distribution to the Senate.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed.

8. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 3:48 P.M.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend  
Approved by: Joseph Janes, Chair  
Mike Townsend  
Secretary of the Faculty  
Faculty Senate
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Joseph Janes Associate Professor, Information School

We last met 9 weeks ago, on February 10. Looking at my calendar over those last several weeks tells a story that will be familiar to everyone. Those next few weeks were busy yet ordinary: we had a full and successful Senate meeting, our faculty councils continued their hard work, so much so that we scheduled an additional Senate meeting to handle the volume of legislation. I also went to Olympia to testify on behalf of the faculty regent bill, had meetings with the usual variety of folks from students to the president, heard the provost lay out his thoughts at his annual town hall, went to a men’s basketball game with friends.

And then the world changed. These last several weeks are mostly a blur, as they have been for us all, grappling with questions and decisions none of us could have imagined facing, one after another, each more extraordinary than the last.

So much has happened that a report like this seems futile, or at least inadequate to the times. I could try to lay out all the discussions, meetings first in person then by Zoom (where would we be without Zoom?), emails, phone calls that we’ve been involved in, but instead I will just tell you that we, the leadership of the faculty, have been there, have been part of these discussions, appropriately consulted and involved, fulfilling our vital and necessary role in shared governance of the university.

We meet, without meeting, in a Spring Quarter like no other, thinking about our university and our campuses without students, classrooms without classes, labs and studios and libraries silent as they almost never are.

And yet, our work goes on. We meet to carry on the work of the faculty, to consider important legislation that will help our students present and future by clarifying and updating a number of existing policies and that could ease the pathway to our university for students who might never otherwise come our way.

I thank you all, not only for your service here, but for everything that you and all our colleagues around the university are doing to further the educational, scholarly and clinical work that motivates us all.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. **Vice Chair Update**: Principal Lecturer Chris Laws, Astronomy Seattle, has been elected to be the 2020-2021 Vice-Chair.

2. **Senate Elections**: Senate elections are currently ongoing.

3. **Committee on Committees**: The Committee on Committees is seeking candidates for membership on various Faculty Councils and Committees for 2020-2021. Contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) for further information.

4. **Annual Faculty Lecture**: The Nominating Committee has finished deliberations and forwarded its recommendation to the President.

5. **Council Analyst**: We are pleased to announce the hiring of Alexandra Portillo as Council Analyst with a starting date of March 30. Ms. Portillo has a BA (Global Studies and Law, Economics and Public Policy) and MA (Public Policy) from the University of Washington. Her recent professional experience includes work with College Spark and the Human Rights Defense Center. Please join us in welcoming her to our community.

6. **COVID-19**: We will make every effort to support the continued operation of the faculty side of shared governance, but, as with the rest of the University, the Secretary’s office has gone virtual, with only sporadic in-person availability. The easiest way to contact us is via email.
April 20, 2020, SEC Minutes

Exhibit C

Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
George Sandison, Professor, School of Medicine

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget meets weekly with the Provost, the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budget, and the head of the Board of Deans. SCPB is charged with consulting on all matters relating to the University budget and on a wide range of program and policy decisions.

SCPB meetings have been taking place as remote connection Zoom meetings since February. This action is part of UW and state efforts to minimize large in-person gatherings whenever possible in an effort to prevent spread of the Covid19 virus. At the time of writing SCPB has met five times since the previous report to the Senate Executive Committee held 02/10/20. In these five meetings the committee has acted and advised as follows.

- An update was received on progress of the ABB phase III task force. This report is in its final editing stage and is anticipated to be finalized and presented to Provost Richards April, 2020.
- A student financial aid update was provided by Kay Lewis, Assistant Vice-Provost. State funding of the Washington College Grant (WCG) resulted in a 20% increase in 19-20 and an additional 870 students funded. A further increase for 20-21 is expected to be in the range $15-20 million for a total about $110 million but it is difficult to predict with great accuracy. The update included a review of aid statistics stratified by campus, need, family income. Graduating undergraduate degree loan debt has been relatively constant each of the past 5 years at an average about $22,000. Graduating student average debt for professional degrees was much higher. This debt exceeded $240,000 for a doctorate of dental surgery degree.
- A legislative session update was presented by Randy Hodgins, VP for External Affairs. The legislature adjourned March 12th after passing the 2019-21 supplemental budget. OPB’s brief on the 2020 compromise budgets is available at the following link, https://www.washington.edu/opb/opb-briefs/. Undergraduate resident tuition will increase by about 2% according to the legislated formula but about $2.5 million per year will be redirected to support the state office of financial management (OFM) One Washington financial transformation instead of the University's academic mission. Objections and efforts to change this legislation are being pursued by the University.
- School of Nursing Associate Dean Anne Hirsch presented. Advice was provided on the limited RCEP request. This was a straight-forward request eliminating courses and programs that are no longer in use and have no student or faculty impact. However concern was expressed regarding the long program pause that had taken place before bringing this RCEP request forward for consideration at SCPB.
- A qualitative holistic review of unit submitted FY 21 finances and operations to OPB took place. These submissions are also reviewed by the unit’s relevant Elected Faculty Councils in addition to SCPB. These annual reviews are an opportunity to highlight and evaluate near term projected financial concerns or opportunities for the growth of the unit with input from the Provost’s office.
- An update on the UW Financial Transformation (UWFT) was provided by Brian McCartan, VP for Finance and Ed Lotus, Assistant VP for UWFT. Planning for FT began in January 2018. The 2-year Readiness and Design phases ending calendar year 2019 came in under budget at $24.52 million. We are now in a 7 month Architect phase (i.e. process design and integration, workshops, pain points and process knowledge transfer) as we head toward go-live in 2022. Our Board of Regents approved a FT project completion budget December 12th, 2019. Total cost for project completion is $269.25 million. Financial processes will lie at one of three levels; UW-wide, organization-wide (academy or medicine) or Hub. The definition of the Hubs are still in flux but the attempt is to combine like processes for groups of units. A guiding principle will be to establish shared services for process standardization.
- Unit fee-based degree fee change requests for summer quarter were circulated to members for comment if the request was 4.75% or more. Members provided feedback on the justifications for these unusually large increases with special address on the potential financial impact on students in terms of absolute dollar increase.
• Provost Richards provided an update on the work of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Task Force. The task force charge is to review approaches used to evaluate faculty performance across the Seattle campus to bring a greater uniformity of evaluation that also recognizes community engaged scholarship, public scholarship, and diversity scholarship as well as diverse forms of leadership for the campus/University. Ultimately the work is to help UW reach consistently high standards for faculty achievement and provide an efficient mechanism for feedback on faculty performance. The task force has formed a sub-group of members to make specific recommendations relating to a small number of evaluation form options that best suit the vast majority of units across the campus. Present intentions are inclined toward separating annual merit evaluation from faculty performance evaluation frequency under the faculty code for the difference categories and levels of faculty appointments.

• Dr. Shwetak Patel, Interim Director of the Global Innovation Exchange (GIX), and Ms. Margaret Shepherd, Chief of Staff, provided an update on the plans, 2020 objectives, and intended organizational restructuring of GIX. Based on feedback from various internal and external sources and the Boston Consulting Group, GIX is advocating a major change in governance, people, programming, partnerships, and operations in a timeline of 18 months.

SCPB will continue to monitor the fiscal health of the various academic, research and business units especially those units in debt or in a weak fiscal condition. Future meetings will include next year’s FY budget, student life investments, and faculty/staff compensation and benefits.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor, Music History

Update for the April 20, 2020 SEC meeting:

The bill I reported as passed by the Legislature and waiting for the Governor’s signature (HB 2514/SB 6412) was ultimately vetoed by the Governor. This bill would have created the requirement for all public universities to use the Common Application in addition to other applications, and carried a cost to all public universities. Because the Governor vetoed the funding for this bill, he also vetoed the bill itself.

Although the Governor did not cut the core budget of the university, he did veto spending that had been inserted into the budget as provisos, for specific projects at the UW: funding for the Burke Museum ($100,000), the UW Center for Human Rights ($205,000), a study on the Death with Dignity Act ($232,000), and more special projects. For a full list of vetoed amounts, see https://www.washington.edu/opb/opb-briefs/2020_state_supplemental_budgets/

It is expected that the Legislature will meet in a special session, sometime after the June 2020 revenue forecast has been issued. The forecast had been steadily climbing over the past several years, but the current economic shutdown will of course have a significant impact on the projections for state revenue. We will learn more in late June.

The Office of Financial Management will be asking state agencies to start looking for savings in their operations; this is part of the planning that will occur over the next few months as agencies prepare their requests for the 2021-23 state budget; requests are due in Autumn 2020, for consideration in the 2021 legislative session (a budget-writing session).

Report of March 30, 2020

Now that the session has ended, immediately before the restrictions of congregating started, we know what will be enacted and what has not advanced. Some bills are still waiting for the Governor’s signature:

Passed by the Legislature: HB 2327, requesting annual reports that would provide more detailed information on investigations where there has been a finding of sexual misconduct; HB 2514 (also SB 6412), creating a new Washington common application, or requiring all four-year institutions to use a current type of common application, such as the national Common App (the UW currently uses the Coalition Application); HB 1755, allowing the regional universities to offer doctoral degrees in the field of education; SB 6492 (already signed into law by the Governor), which will change the tax collection sources for the new financial aid program for undergraduates, the Washington College Grant.

Not passed: HB 1079, creating a faculty regent at the UW and WSU, passed the full House (as it does each year), and proceeded to the final step in the Senate before final passage – but did not get advanced for its final vote. ESSB 5504, calling for a study of allowing access to online peer-reviewed journals to all state employees and students; HB 1084, regarding the rights of use of name and image for student athletes, and possible payment to athletes; HB 2283, asking for details of admissions information after each cycle, and the use of special admission criteria; 2523, requiring that more detailed financial aid information be provided to undergraduate students at the point of admission; SB 6542, calling for a study of automatic admission to the four-year universities.

I am still sorting through the final compromise supplemental budget (The UW had some requests in this non-budget-writing year), and will have a fuller report on that before the full Faculty Senate meeting.
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 101 (Admission)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards recommends removing Scholastic Regulations Chapter 101.2.B.1.c and making related housekeeping changes in Chapter 101: Admissions.

Undergraduate admissions holistic review at the University of Washington has been carefully crafted and revised over the past 15 years through a close partnership among the faculty, academic advisors, and the University’s Undergraduate Admissions Offices. UW holistic review seeks to enroll an undergraduate class rich in the intellectual abilities, academic commitments, diversity of perspectives, backgrounds, and talents that create a stimulating educational environment and promote desired learning outcomes.

Scholastic Regulations Chapter 101.2.B.1.c currently lists submission of standardized test scores (SAT/ACT) as a minimum requirement for admission to UW for students with fewer than 40 transfer credits. Chapter 101.2.C allows this requirement to be waived “when the applicant's high school and/or college scholastic records indicate a high probability of academic success.” By eliminating mention of test score submission as a minimum requirement, we will better align scholastic regulations with best practices in undergraduate holistic admissions and encourage each UW campus to evaluate and choose among test-required, test-optional, or test-blind admissions policies.

The relevance of standardized test scores (STS) as one component in a multifaceted review of domestic freshman applicants has decreased as UW has gained experience with holistic review, and it is time to consider whether or not the benefits of STS outweigh their costs. At the Seattle campus, standardized test scores are currently required only of freshman applicants from the United States, but not for either international freshmen or transfer students with more than 40 credits. Thus, only about 2/3 of new undergraduates arriving on campus in 2018-19 had STS considered during their admission. All three student groups thrive at UW Seattle at comparable rates (see Table). A recent national study, Defining Access: How Test-Optional Works by Syverson, Franks and Hiss, found that colleges which recently converted to test-optional generally report an increase in applications from traditionally underrepresented groups upon changing to test-optional admissions, and no significant difference between graduation rates of students who do or do not submit scores.

The validity of using STS to evaluate college applicants has come into question on both a local and national level. Nationally, there is a high correlation between test scores and socioeconomic status (e.g., family income, parental education level); predicted first year college grades for specific STS vary widely among different demographic groups. Use of STS in admissions has the potential to perpetuate privilege if these factors are not taken into account.

Locally, when considered in combination with a contextualized high school record, STS add minimally to our ability to predict success at UW Seattle. An internal study of UWS students who enrolled as first-time-first-year students from 2008 to 2016 found weak to no correlation of STS with retention and graduation rates when other factors were also included (indeed, the STS correlation with four-year graduation rates was weakly negative). When considering first year grades, validity studies performed by the College Board found that while SAT scores added significant predictive value to high school GPA for students arriving at UWS in 2006 and 2012, they did not do so for the 2017 cohort, especially for Washington residents (see Figure). The difference between 2012 and 2017 was attributed to two significant changes: (i) the SAT was modified in 2016 to more closely reflect a standard high school curriculum, and (ii) UW has successfully exploited its growing history of holistic admissions to contextualize the high school record for most applicants.

At the level of the student, standardized tests place an academic, financial and psychological burden on many potential applicants to the University of Washington. Academically, participating in either free or commercial test preparation activities that can increase student’s scores takes time and effort from other activities that are more relevant to a student’s success at college. This includes not only their general
high school curriculum and extra-curricular activities, but also preparing for advanced placement or international baccalaureate exams that can earn them college credit. Not all qualifying students are aware of or comfortable accessing fee waivers or disability accommodation for taking standardized tests, which places an undue financial and/or performance burden on these students. Even with a fee waiver and free online preparation materials, low income students may feel compelled to choose between taking time to prepare for a standardized test and time to earn money. Access to test sites can also be difficult for some students, requiring extra costs for lodging and transportation. This year, with the COVID situation, many test dates have been cancelled. High-stakes testing also can place a student under psychological stress, leading both to a poor exam performance that does not reflect their knowledge and abilities, and to reducing their resilience to other stresses. Finally, having test scores that are below reported UW averages can lead to some students choosing not to apply, even if the rest of their record is strong.

Standardized test scores do have some benefits and uses. For example, STS help renormalize a high school record when there is not a track record of students from that school; low scores can help identify students who are likely to need help to thrive in large introductory classes that include high-stress exams, enabling us to connect them with resources; STS are required for students to participate in NCAA athletics; STS play a role in national reporting for grants and academic rankings.

Enacting this change to the Scholastic Regulations will allow each UW campus to consider eliminating requiring standardized test scores for admission and enable such a change, should it be proposed and adopted. After weighing the local costs and benefits of STS in admissions, each campus could choose (a) to make submission of STS optional, (b) to eliminate their use entirely, or (c) to maintain the requirement of STS submission. Implementation of any changes would be determined separately on each campus after broad consultation with stakeholders. Due to the COVID situation, the STS requirement was suspended for 2021 admissions based on the last sentence of 101.2.C, which allows the Office of Admissions to waive the STS requirement for individual students. This legislation enables and endorses a longer-term decision on standardized test use.

The main actions of this legislation are to remove section 101.2.B.1.c, making standardized tests no longer a minimum requirement for admission to UW, and to remove the last sentences of 101.1.1.C.1 and 101.2.C, and the words “when required” from 101.12.A, which refer to 101.2.B.1.c. There are additional housekeeping amendments to this chapter, as well. Direct reference to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards is changed to refer to a designated faculty body, allowing for structural differences among the three campuses. Also, the Board of Regents admissions policy acquired a new number when it was amended in July 2019, and gender-neutral language is inserted in 101.1.C.1.
Graph and Table

Table 1: Cohort Retention and Graduation Rates. Seattle Campus. Only WA State and Domestic Non-Residents (NR) FTFY and transfer students with fewer than 40 credits submit SAT/ACT for admission. Values for FTFY entering in Autumn 2013, and transfer students entering in Autumn 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency/Academic Origin</th>
<th>1 yr retention</th>
<th>2017 grad</th>
<th>2018 grad</th>
<th>2019 grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMEN start AUT 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int'l Student Visa (978)</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic NR (1061)</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA State (4187)</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER start AUT 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int'l Student Visa (200)</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic NR (106 [26]†)</td>
<td>78.3% [100%]</td>
<td>38.7% [52.8%]</td>
<td>66.0% [92.3%]</td>
<td>71.7% [96.2%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA State (1105)</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 2-year college (1198)</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†The bracket denotes out-of-state students who attended WA community colleges before transferring to UWS.
Data from UW Profiles

Figure 1: SAT Validity Study for First Year GPA. Predictive validity (on scale of 0 to 1, corrected for small range) for first year GPA for SAT alone (red), high school GPA alone (blue) and both together (purple). The difference between including both SAT and HSGPA and only including HSGPA is plotted at the right in gray on an expanded scale. For Washington residents, the difference is one sixth that in 2012; for non-residents, there is less information about high school contextualization, but the additional value of the SAT is still about half what it was for all students in 2012.
Chapter 101: Admission [relevant sections only]

1. Preliminary Statements and Definitions

A. General Policy

It shall be the general policy of the University to admit students whose educational backgrounds indicate their reasonable probability of success in a University program. A designated faculty body on each campus, The Faculty Council on Academic Standards, is responsible for the interpretation of this chapter and for the development of undergraduate admission policies that will achieve the goals outlined in Board of Regents Governance, Regent Policy No. 32.4, "Policy on Admission." The Council provides guidance to the Office of Admissions in the development of operating policies and procedures.

C. Undergraduate Application Process

1) A freshman or transfer applicant for admission shall be required to submit an application that includes an official transcript of his or her record in high school and each college or university attended. (Test score requirements are explained in Subsections 2.B.1.c and 2.C.)

2. Admission to Undergraduate Standing

A. Holistic Review

Undergraduate programs offered by the University lead to a bachelor's degree. Admission is competitive. In making admissions judgment, the University uses a holistic review process. This process considers such factors as high school grade-point average, courses taken, grade-point average in transferable college level course work, institution(s) attended, level of entry, scores on an acceptable admissions test when required, areas of academic interest, and personal factors such as school and community service, leadership, overcoming adversity, and family educational and socioeconomic background. The relative consideration of these factors may differ between freshman and transfer applicants and among Washington State residents, non-Washington State domestic residents, and international applicants. The designated faculty body, The Faculty Council on Academic Standards, shall periodically review and approve the holistic review process for its campus.

B. Distribution of Enrollment

1) Freshman or Transfer Admission

The University shall consider for admission any applicant who meets the following minimum standards:

a) Completion of a college preparatory course of study to include the following high school credits:

- 4 high school credits of English;
- 2 high school credits of a single foreign language;
- 3 high school credits of mathematics: algebra, geometry, and preferably trigonometry (a fourth high school credit of mathematical analysis or calculus is recommended for students preparing for majors in the sciences or engineering);
- 2 high school credits of science including one laboratory science course in biology, chemistry or physics;
3 high school credits of social science;
1/2 high school credit of the fine or performing arts; and
1/2 high school credit of electives taken from the above areas.

Total 15 high school credits of college preparatory course work.

*One high school credit represents a standard full year of high school course work.

b) A scholastic and personal record that indicates the applicant is adequately prepared to
complete a degree at the University of Washington.

c) Submission of scores on an acceptable admission test such as the SAT or the ACT, unless
the applicant has earned at least 40 reasonably distributed transferable quarter credits after
high school graduation.

[...] C. Additional Considerations

The University in its discretion may consider applicants for admission who do not meet the above
requirements, but are able to submit additional evidence supportive of sufficient promise of
benefiting from or contributing to the University's undergraduate programs. Admission test scores
may be waived by the Office of Admissions when the applicant's high school and/or college
scholastic records indicate a high probability of academic success.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
Class B Legislation  
Student Governance and Policies  
Scholastic Regulations  
Chapter 113, Section 3 (Dropping a Course)

### Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 113.3.A (Dropping a Course) based on the following findings:

A working group formed in May 2019, led by the interim director of the Resilience Lab, and sponsored by the Office of the University Registrar, and working in concert with faculty, staff, and student representatives, has prepared recommendations for changes to the Hardship Withdrawal and Annual Drop process. Their proposed revisions are designed to create a system that is compliant, timely, user-friendly and trauma-informed for students in crisis, and that provides for self-determination while still being a managed process (e.g., checklists/warnings, required advising).

The proposed changes have now become even more urgent due to the effects of COVID-19 related policies on students. In particular:

- Current Chapter 113 limits reviewing and approving Hardship Withdrawal Petitions (HWPs) to circumstances that have arisen after the 14th day of the quarter. Having this language in place when we review Spring 2020 HWP’s will prevent us from considering issues related to the COVID-19 outbreak and moving classes to 100% Remote Delivery - as both occurred before the 14th day of Spring Quarter (April 12th).

- Current Chapter 113 language prevents us from approving HWPs for circumstances for which students already received a Hardship Withdrawal. Without this amendment, if a student received a HWP for winter due to the COVID-19 outbreak or change in course delivery, we will not be able to approve a HWP again for the same reason.

If recommendations are approved, the proposed Former Quarter Drop Review Board can be instituted for Spring 2020, allowing for a more robust review and appeal processes for Spring Quarter 2020 petitions. Implementation of the Current Quarter Drop will go through technical implementation beginning in the summer of 2020.


---

3. Dropping a Course

A. Officially Dropping a Course

A drop from a course is voluntary severance by the student of their connection with the course. To be official it must be made under the following conditions:

1) Before the 14th Calendar Day

Courses may be dropped for any reason through the 14th calendar day after the start of the quarter. In some cases, departmental approval will be required. There will be no transcript entry for courses dropped by the 14th calendar day of the quarter.

2) One Course Per Year, After 14th Calendar Day

A student may drop a maximum of one course each academic year (defined as September through August) after the 14th calendar day of the quarter. This drop is available through the seventh week of the quarter. A grade of W followed by a number indicating the week in which the drop occurred will be recorded for the dropped course. Unused drops do not accumulate from year to year.

2) Current Quarter Drop
Students may drop courses weeks three through seven during the current quarter through the Current Quarter Drop process. An annotation of RD (Registrar Drop) will appear on the student academic record.

3) Hardship Withdrawal
After the 14th calendar day, a student may petition the Registrar’s Office in writing to drop a course. The Registrar will grant such a petition if in his or her judgment the student is unable to complete the course in question because of physical and/or mental debilitation or unusual and extenuating circumstances, beyond the student's control, which have arisen after the 14th calendar day of the quarter. Petitions must be filed with the Registrar’s office promptly after the occurrence of the event that gave rise to the need for dropping. Approved drops will be entered on the transcript with a grade of HW.

3). Former Quarter Drop
Students may petition to drop courses for a former quarter using the Former Quarter Drop process. The Registrar will grant such a petition if in their judgement the student was unable to complete the course in question. Approved drops will be entered on the transcript with an annotation of RD (Registrar Drop).

4) Withdrawal Through Last Day of Class
A student may drop all courses through the last day of classes by withdrawing from the University for that quarter.

B. Unofficially Dropped Courses
Drops from a course not officially transacted with the Registrar's Office are not official, and result in a grade of 0.0 (E) for the course.

C. Summer Quarter
Proportional drop schedules will be publicized in the Time Schedule for Summer Quarter a and b terms.

D. DL-Courses Off-Calendar Courses
For DL courses that do not follow the quarter schedule, the drop deadline is the 14th day after the official start of the course. A DL course may be used for the once-yearly drop described in Subsection 3.A, but not within two weeks of the end of the maximum term for completion of the course, as specified at the time of registration. All other provisions of Subsections 3.A—3.D apply.

For DL courses and other courses that do not follow the quarter schedule, the drop deadline is two weeks prior to the end of the maximum term for completion of the course, as specified at the time of registration. All other provisions of Subsections 3.A – 3.C apply.
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 115, Section 1 (Course-Numbering System) and Chapter 114, Section 1 (Depth Requirements) and Section 2 (Requirements for the Bachelor’s Degree)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, with the support of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending several regulations related to distance learning: Scholastic Regulations Chapter 115 (Courses), Chapter 114 (Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement) and Chapter 107 (Academic Probation and Dismissal for Low Scholarship) based on the following findings:

Chapter 115:

- DL courses are required to undergo an extensive review in the third year by the University Curriculum Committee, a process that is not required for courses taught on campus and puts an undue administrative burden on units offering online courses. This statute was developed at a time when the university was just beginning to explore distance learning. We now offer over 900 online courses and the additional effort does not reflect what we now know about the risks and challenges of this mode of instruction, nor does it align with the levels of review and evaluation we require of courses taught on campus.
- DL courses offered by the University of Washington should be recognized as residence credits.
- Home units may develop their own systems and processes of monitoring online courses, as they do for courses taught on campus, but an additional review at the university level is expensive, labor-intensive, discriminatory, and unnecessary.

Chapter 114:

- If DL courses are recognized as residence credits, it will no longer be necessary for a distance-learning degree program to petition for a waiver of the 45-credit resident requirement. Eliminating the need for this waiver will significantly diminish the Registrar’s administrative burden of adjudicating these waiver requests.

Chapter 107:

- If DL courses are recognized as residence credits, it will no longer be necessary to call them out specifically to calculate the cumulative grade-point average.

Chapter 115

Courses

1. Course-Numbering System

1) DL Courses

8) In addition to the initial review, DL courses must be reviewed in the third year by the appropriate curriculum review committees of the school or college. It is the responsibility of the home school or college to determine the necessity of and procedure for additional review of DL courses after the courses have been approved at the university level.

10) DL courses offered by the student’s home campus are considered residence credits at that campus.
Chapter 114
Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement

1. Depth Requirements

B. Residence Requirement

To be recommended for a first or subsequent Bachelor’s degree, a student must complete 45 of his or her final 60 credits as a matriculated student in residence at the University of Washington campus where the degree is to be earned. Exceptions to this rule are as follows:

1) Of the 45 resident credits required for a UW undergraduate degree, no more than 10 credits may be waived by the dean of the college or school awarding the degree and only on a case-by-case basis.

2) A unit desiring to develop a provisional undergraduate distance-learning degree may petition the college or school and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards appropriate campus undergraduate program governance body for a waiver of the 45-credit resident requirement and/or the 90-credit course limit. Such petitions should identify the reasons why the offering needs to waive the requirement, based on audience, access, or unit academic mission, describe the relationship of the new program to existing degrees, justify the methods of content delivery, and describe the goals and oversight needed to meet institutional standards. If the petition is approved, the degree may be implemented with a repetition of the above mentioned review required in the sixth year for continuance.


Chapter 107
Academic Probation and Dismissal for Low Scholarship

1. Cumulative Grade-Point Average

Cumulative grade-point average includes only credits granted for courses taken in residence at the University of Washington and DL courses. This specifically excludes transfer and extension credits, and credits earned by examination.

S-B 95, December 10, 1964; S-B 173, April 6, 2007: both with Presidential approval.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
Agenda
Special Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 30, 2020, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom
Phone:
Dial: +1.408.638.0968 (US Toll) or +1.646.558.8656 (US Toll)
You will be prompted to enter the meeting ID: 560 829 4138

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Associate Professor Joseph Janes.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   a. Approval of the February 10, 2020 Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of February 27, 2020, Faculty Senate minutes.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Confirm Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, as 2020-2021 Faculty Legislative Representative and JoAnn Taricani, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences, as 2020-2021 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative.

   a. Class B Legislation – Standardized tests.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   b. Class B Legislation – Hardship withdrawal and annual drop.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   c. Class B Legislation – Distance learning.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

9. Good of the Order.

10. Adjournment.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
    Approved by: Joseph Janes, Chair
    Mike Townsend
    Secretary of the Faculty
    Joseph Janes, Chair
    Faculty Senate
To: Professor Joseph Janes (Faculty Senate) and Professor Ann Huppert (FCAS Chair)

From: Philip Ballinger, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Management

Re: UW’s Standardized Test Admission Requirement in View of New Data and Changing Environment

Date: February 11, 2020

Dear Professors Janes and Huppert,

The University of Washington’s undergraduate student application review and admission policies support two mission objectives: broad enrollment access and strong educational outcomes. Access without outcomes is illusory, and outcomes that do not benefit society in all its demographic dimensions are but an echo of the mission intent. The University of Washington’s mission intends that academic success, degree attainment, rich student experiences, and excellent opportunities to learn and contribute to society apply to persons from all backgrounds. The University’s mission to create, disseminate, and preserve knowledge is not elitist, but broadly applicable and intended to be widely impactful.

Seeking to attain both better access to and outcomes for its student body, the University of Washington introduced holistic review of applications for undergraduate admissions in 2005, abandoning a purely quantitative system based solely on standardized test scores (SAT or ACT) and grade point averages (GPA). Since that change in policy, the diversity of the student body has significantly increased and its educational outcomes have dramatically improved. While the University’s current holistic review policy incorporates GPA and standardized test results, it does so within a rich contextual matrix of school, neighborhood, and family information. Additionally, applicants have a voice in the process through their written statements about what is of value to them, what they are committed to in effort and time, what challenges they experienced and overcame in attaining their education, and how they envision contributing to the learning environment of the University.

Since the University’s shift to holistic review, standardized tests as required elements for admission to universities have come under increased review, criticism and even condemnation. Nearly a thousand primarily regional public universities and smaller private colleges became ‘test optional’ or ‘test flexible’ during this period. Most recently, two AAU institutions -- the University of Chicago and Indiana University -- have become test-optional. Currently, the University of California’s faculty and regents are debating the possibility of no longer requiring standardized tests for admissions purposes. In any case, in their recently released study, the UC faculty recommend a reduced use of standardized tests in the UC’s holistic review and admissions processes.

University of Washington faculty and enrollment officials have periodically reviewed the role, usefulness, and validity of the SAT within the holistic review process. Until recently, external and internal validity studies of the SAT supported its use as an outcomes-focused predictive tool within the matrix of holistic review. In fact, some of the validity studies conducted between 2006 and 2015 indicated that SAT scores were at least as predictive as GPA, and that using SAT and GPA together within holistic review significantly increased the predictive strength of academic assessments. However, this trend has changed. Internal and external studies concluded over the past few months indicate that in
recent years, the high school GPA has become significantly more predictive than the SAT, and that the added predictive value of the SAT has significantly diminished for students enrolling at the University of Washington.

Much of the general criticism of the use of standardized tests in college admission processes finds root in the concern that they amplify social privilege and thereby further marginalize educationally disadvantaged populations. Examples of expensive and intensive test preparation, private tutoring and counseling, and perceptions about rankings-driven emphases on standardized test scores by selective colleges and universities give ground to such criticism. In any case, the enmeshment of the SAT within societal and educational structures of socio-economic inequity and segregated privilege has eroded support for the use of the test in college admissions. While our institution-specific data and general research findings demonstrate that the SAT is a useful additive tool for predictive and support purposes, the test clearly exists and is used within a miasma of privilege-driven structures and practices. This harms socially and educationally segregated low-income and under-represented student populations and communities. Increasingly, the distinction between the SAT and the environmental miasma in which it lives is lost. The question, therefore, is not whether the SAT is innately sound, but whether it can operate soundly and with good social purpose within the inequitable environment in which it exists. In the balance of student, institutional, and social goods, does the use of the SAT as an admissions-associated test continue to outweigh the negative effects of its contextual misuse and accompanying perceptions?

I believe that the University of Washington must now reconsider its requirement and use of standardized test scores in its application review and admissions processes. The added predictive value of the SAT may no longer exceed its current social cost.

The February 8, 2020 issue of the Economist outlines the questions before us:

Even if the question of predictive power were resolved, another question arises about how good the tests would have to be at predicting college outcomes to justify their use. If they significantly decreased the number of successful applicants from already disadvantaged groups, such a sacrifice would presumably not be justified by a minor gain in predictive power. How institutions judge this trade-off depends on their mission, circumstances and the cohort they want to attract.

The added predictive value of the SAT has diminished for the University of Washington. The social cost of the continued required use of the SAT has arguably increased. Does the diminished usefulness of the SAT for the University still outweigh the social, perceptual and possible enrollment costs?

I wish you and your colleagues well and offer my support as you consider this important and impactful policy challenge.

Respectfully,

Philip Ballinger