Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of minutes from February 3rd, 2017
3. Chair’s report
4. SCAP report
5. Class B legislation on Interdisciplinary Concentration
6. Updating language for Scholastic Regulations Chapter 102
7. Updating language for FCAS Syllabus Guidelines
8. Good of the order
9. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Stroup called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2) Review of minutes from February 3rd, 2017

The minutes from February 3rd, 2017 were approved as amended.

3) Chair’s report

Stroup noted she would like to address Design program admissions process issues (discussed at length in the January 20th, 2017 FCAS meeting). She reminded the council of its findings the last time the item was discussed: in order to be eligible to apply to the Design program, UW freshman must take DESIGN 166 (Design Foundations). All students who receive a 3.7 or above in DESIGN 166 are automatically accepted into the Design major beginning the following autumn quarter. Students who receive less than a 3.7 may participate in the annual UW Design Entrance Workshop held in June. The workshop costs $20 and partially dictates if an applicant is accepted into the program.

Stroup noted she believes this admissions process violates WAC 478-160-055 (Admission to specific major degree programs), as that section states that criteria for acceptance must “apply to all students seeking admission to the degree program at a particular time.” Stroup noted one way to avoid the code violation would be to have all program applicants take the workshop.

Registration to the workshop is hosted by ticketing service Eventbrite, and is listed as an “exam.” It was noted this practice violates the aforementioned WAC as it does not apply to all applicants of the program. The council had questions about how the money from the workshop ($20) was being used by the department. There was also a question of if transfer students are eligible to take the automatic entry course (DESIGN 166).
It was noted a representative from FCAS should talk to the program about the issue.

4) SCAP report

Old non-routine business

#1 – Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

The request is for a Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Engineering. Shores explained the Major was originally proposed as capacity-constrained. After some consultation with SCAP, the department agreed to start the Major under minimum requirements.

The request was approved by majority vote of the council.

New non-routine business

#1 – Nursing

The School of Nursing would like to eliminate a course (NURS 301), as the content of that course is already covered in courses required for admission into the program.

The request was approved by majority vote of the council.

5) Class B legislation on Interdisciplinary Concentration (Exhibit 1)

The council considered Class B legislation altering Scholastic Regulations Chapter 114 Subsection 2.H (Degrees with Minor) to add “Interdisciplinary Concentration” to the section (Exhibit 1). The item was discussed in the last council meeting wherein much of the discussion centered around if “Concentration” was the best and/or most appropriate title. Kramer noted most universities call this type of pathway a “certificate,” but as nothing is actually being certified, “Concentration” is the most suitable term. The legislation was considered (Exhibit 1).

A member noted several units at the university already use the term “concentration” to designate an academic pathway, and questioned if this would be an issue. Kramer explained the fact that the title is “Interdisciplinary Concentration” should avert any confusion.

A member recommended adding “diversity” to two places in the chapter. The change was agreed to and made (Exhibit 1).

Roy’s revisions to the draft legislation were considered. The phrase “disciplinary or” and the word “defined” were added to the section (Exhibit 1).

A motion that the council approve the Class B legislation and forward it on to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) was approved by majority vote.

6) Updating language for Scholastic Regulations Chapter 102 (Exhibit 2)
Stroup noted Class B legislation altering Scholastic Regulations Chapter 102 Section 2.B (Registration Period 1.) was reviewed in the last FCAS meeting and suggested revisions were heard. She explained those revisions have now been made and the council has been asked to consider the legislation (Exhibit 2).

The revisions include removing the reference to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28B.15.624, as that section expires on August 1, 2022, and members felt they did not want the UW policy to also expire at that time. The second revision to the section adds “ROTC students committed to service after graduation” to the UW’s priority registration list (granting this subset of ROTC students the ability to register for courses before other students). The revisions also include adding the phrase “and domestic partners” to the section.

There was some discussion of the term “committed.” After discussion, the term was substituted with “contracted” in order to make the eligibility parameters (granting priority status to ROTC students) more explicit.

The council discussed the rationale for the legislation. Several members explained the legislation is not necessarily based in averting known scheduling issues related to this subset of ROTC students, but based in granting ROTC students (contracted to military service) the same benefit that veterans and national guard members currently receive, as it seems logical to extend that consideration to ROTC students with commitments to service. Johnson explained the number of ROTC students that would be affected by the legislation is approximately 175-200 students (on all three UW campuses) in any given year.

After discussion, the council approved forwarding the Class B legislation to the SEC (Exhibit 2).

7) Updating language for FCAS Syllabus Guidelines (Exhibit 3)

Stroup explained SCAP discussed peer evaluation in a recent meeting. Based on documentation the committee reviews, more and more courses are including some form of peer evaluation in their syllabi, sometimes allowing it to account for as much as 20-30% of a final course grade. Stroup explained SCAP felt that percentage of a final course grade falling to peer evaluation was too high. In response, language was developed to add peer evaluation to the FCAS Syllabus Guidelines (Exhibit 3).

The council reviewed the language. It was noted using the word “discouraged” in the draft language seems to rash, as many disciplines do utilize peer evaluation in ways that are generally non-contentious. Efforts were made to wordsmith the section. There was some discussion of the various meanings the term “peer evaluation” may have. It was noted students literally grading other students’ assignments is not appropriate, however, students evaluating each other is fine in moderation. The section was revised with the goal that the language be flexible but also address appropriate uses of peer evaluation.

The revisions to the Syllabus Guidelines were approved via majority vote (Exhibit 3).

8) Good of the order

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

9) Adjourn
Stroup adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

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

Present:

Faculty: Phil Brock, Mark Johnson, Patricia Kramer, Dan Ratner, D. Shores, Sarah Stroup, Daniel Enquobahrie, Champak Chatterjee, Lynn Dietrich, John Sahr, Ann Huppert
Ex-officio reps: Jayda Greco, Jennifer Payne, Donna Sharpe, Meera Roy
President’s designee: Phil Ballinger
Guests: Helen Garrett, Tina Miller, Emily Leggio

Absent:

Faculty: Matthew Taylor
Ex-officio reps: Conor Casey, Kaitlyn Zhou

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – chapter 114_fcas_winter2017_approved 021717.doc
Exhibit 2 – chapter 102 Class B_approvedbyfcas_021717.doc
Exhibit 3 – Syllabus Guidelines PEER EVAL_approvedbyfcas_021717.doc
H. Degrees with Minor and/or Interdisciplinary Concentration

Departments, schools, and colleges are authorized to provide a course of study leading to an undergraduate academic minor and/or interdisciplinary concentrations. Requirements are within the purview of the department, school, or college.

1) The minor shall consist of not less than 25 credits and that have a disciplinary or topical focus. Interdisciplinary minors are encouraged. Courses taken to fulfill the minor may also apply as appropriate to the general education, writing, diversity, and reasoning requirements. Completion of the minor will appear on the permanent record.

2) An interdisciplinary concentration shall consist of not less than 30 credits that are organized around a set of skills, prerequisites for post-baccalaureate education, or other defined experiences. Courses taken to fulfill the interdisciplinary concentration may also apply as appropriate to the general education, writing, diversity, and reasoning requirements. Completion of the interdisciplinary concentration will appear on the permanent record.

3) Distance-learning minors or interdisciplinary concentrations (whether entirely new, or a distance-learning version of an existing minor) must be approved by the same process as non-distance-learning minors. Modes of content delivery must be described and approved at all levels, including unit, college, and Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
2. Methods of Registration

A. Registration

All students, except those in self-sustaining programs, register using the University's online registration system. Students in self-sustaining programs register through the means established by the administrative unit of the self-sustaining program.

The University has a continuous registration system organized into three distinct priority periods that are referred to as periods 1, 2, and 3. Undergraduates cannot enroll in more than 19 credits prior to the beginning of the quarter so that all students will have a chance to develop basic programs. Credits beyond 19 can be added, subject to college restrictions, after the quarter begins.

B. Registration Period 1

Registration period 1 is designed primarily to accommodate currently registered matriculated students. It occurs during the latter half of the quarter preceding that for which the student is registering excluding Summer Quarter. Registration priority dates are assigned according to the following sequence: disabled students, athletes, eligible veterans and national guard members and their spouses and domestic partners as defined in RCW 28B.15.624, ROTC students committed to service following graduation, students with graduating senior priority status, graduate students, seniors, juniors, sophomores, and freshmen.
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. Also, students depend on the information 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. Consequently, syllabi typically provide the following information.

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

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

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

As the use of learning management systems to convey course information becomes more common, the syllabus may no longer be one document but rather a series of webpages, but the components of a complete syllabus should still be readily available to students.

In addition, two aspects of course assessment are important to consider—participation and extra credit.

Participation: 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). 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/.

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 an extra credit opportunity cannot be feasibly completed by any student in a class, the instructor should offer an alternate but commensurate opportunity to that student.

Peer evaluation: Peer evaluation is discouraged. Should it be used, peer evaluation must be used judiciously and in moderation. Peer evaluation may not replace grading by the instructor assigned the course; while peer evaluation may be included in a grading rubric, students are not to assign grades to other students.
Old Non-Routine Business:

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering- (ENGR-20160412) Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Engineering.

Background: The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering is proposing a new degree in Environmental Engineering designed to comply with ABET accreditation criteria.

Action Taken 04/22/2016: SCAP has no comments at this time.

Action Taken 05/06/2016: SCAP would like to know how this new degree would fit into the larger context of changes taking place in the College of Engineering. Additionally, SCAP mentioned that any new majors need to meet current criteria set forth for new degrees, in particular in reference to the continuation policy, and suggested that the admission criteria for Environmental Engineering be changed to minimum requirement since competitive admission is only being considered as a response to an existing problem, and is thus not applicable for new programs.

Update 06/01/2016: Department has provided a response, see attached (page 026).

Action taken 06/03/2016: Some discussion ensued, no official comments at this time.

Update 10/07/2016: On hold, Heidi Gough Is due to forward additional information shortly.

Update 01/20/2017: Department has changed their admission criteria to minimum requirement, and have attached admission procedure under the Direct to College (DtC) model, as well as a temporary admission process which would be used until DtC comes into effect College-wide. Note: I have added page numbers to the proposal in the lower right hand side of the PDF. You will see transfer student admission (p. 018) and the continuation policy (p. 016) in the main proposal; I will work with Heidi to get these incorporated into the proposed catalog copy, along with any other SCAP recommendations.

Action Taken 01/27/2017: SCAP requested admission on a case-by-case basis for students applying past their freshman year be re-written as this does not comply with a minimum requirement admission process. They also suggested raising the CUM GPA and minimum required grade for a group of courses for admission be raised, in particular if the department is concerned with capacity. SCAP also asked if there were alternative courses to IND E 250 which a students could take to satisfy the economics requirement, the main concern was with how this would affect transfer students. It was also requested that transfer student admissions and the continuation policy be incorporated in the final catalog copy. Other clarifications and inconsistencies in the catalog copy and attached documents were addressed.

Update 02/03/2017: Department has provided an updated 1503, Catalog Copy (p. 029), and an explanation of the changes made (p. 033).

Action Taken 01/27/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.
New-Non Routine

Nursing- (NURS-20160928) Revised program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing.

Background: The School of Nursing is proposing to eliminate NURS 301 as a required course since the content of that course is already covered in courses required for admission into the program.

Action Taken 01/27/2017: Approved and forwarded to FCAS.