University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
November 13th, 2015
1:30pm – 3:00pm
Mary Gates Hall 173R

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from October 30th, 2015
3. SCAP report
4. Chair’s report
5. ABB survey finalization
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1) Call to order

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

2) Approval of minutes from October 30th, 2015

The minutes from October 30th, 2015 were approved as amended.

3) SCAP report

Old Non-Routine Business

#1 - Honors

It was noted this request came to FCAS in a previous meeting this academic year, wherein a member pointed out the negative impact it will have on engineering students and their ability to enroll in honors interdisciplinary courses. After discussion, the request was held to consult with relevant stakeholders, including the Foster School of Business and the College of Engineering.

After discussion, it was noted that the appropriate review body from the College of Engineering did not reply to the FCAS consultation request. The council felt uneasy about going forward with a vote without having approval of the appropriate review body within the College of Engineering. Ratner noted that individuals in the College of Engineering, such as advisors, have found the concerns of FCAS to be legitimate. The council agreed, but noted it was not reviewed by the appropriate body within the College of Engineering. The council noted again that if the Honors request in question is approved, it may alter who is able to participate in Honors interdisciplinary courses. The council discussed the consequences of keeping Engineering students out of interdisciplinary honors courses. They questioned where the Honors designation is assessed after graduation. Miller clarified the designation is present on a student’s transcript and their diploma. Ratner noted the value of the interdisciplinary honors program is that students are able to interact and learn with students from other major areas.
A vote was called; the council abstained from the vote unanimously, and the request was not approved.

A member noted he would vote to approve the request if the appropriate curriculum committee would sign-off on the request.

#2 - Speech and Hearing Sciences

This request is for revised admission and program requirements and new continuation policy requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Speech and Hearing Sciences. Kramer mentioned that the wording in the adjoining 1503 was vague when the request was submitted previously; she explained the language is now clear. She noted SCAP had approved this request.

There was no discussion.

The council voted to approve the request unanimously.

#3 – Aeronautics and Astronautics

The request is for a new minor in Aeronautics and Astronautics. It received no comment during tri-campus review. Kramer noted SCAP approved this request.

The council voted to approve the request unanimously.

#4 – Human Centered Design and Engineering

It was noted the request was held by SCAP.

New Routine Business

#1 – Environmental Health

The request is for revised program requirements for both the Bachelor of Science degree and the minor in Environmental Health. SCAP found the request to be routine.

The council voted to approve the request unanimously.

#2 – Health Services

The request is for revised admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Health Informatics and Health Information Management. Kramer noted the request is routine and clerical in nature. It was noted SCAP approved. There was no discussion.

The council voted to approve the request unanimously.

4) Chair’s report
Kramer noted she is participating in the search for the new university registrar. She explained skype interviews will take place soon, and that there are excellent candidates. She mentioned campus interviews will occur in December.

5) ABB survey finalization

Way noted the Activity-based Budgeting (ABB) Dean survey has been revised to make it much shorter, with less questions. (Questions where answers could be found elsewhere were specially targeted for removal). She noted questions in this survey are now more open-ended. After brief discussion, the word “office” was added to the fourth question of the Dean’s survey to increase clarity.

The council discussed the Advisor’s ABB survey. Way noted an introduction has been added to each survey providing some background and a definition of ABB. She explained ABB has been in place since 2010, but was officially implemented in 2013. The council questioned what information advisors will actually have available, given the survey questions. Wensel explained that though the concern is legitimate and there are varying kinds of advisors, it is useful to ask all responders the same questions, to see responses. Kramer noted the council will benefit from more information, rather than less.

Way explained the Chair’s survey has been altered to include more text boxes. She explained the questions have a curriculum emphasis. Way asked that all FCAS members go to their department chairs and ask them to respond to the survey once it is broadcasted.

It was noted fee-based programs are not included in the surveys, and the surveys are only currently to be broadcasted to the UW Seattle campus.

Way explained the council will be able to see some results from the survey in their next meeting, as the surveys are only open for a short time (less than two weeks).

Way noted this topic is very important to the future of the UW, and Kramer and the council agreed. They thanked Way and the ABB Subcommittee for their work.

6) Good of the order

Discussion of competitive majors

The council held some discussion on competitive majors. Brock noted he does not know how competitive majors choose to admit their students. He explained the requirements for entry into competitive majors are not defined, and there is no stated parameters comprising a basis for denying a student entry into a program, either. Brock explained that before competitive majors, the process for admittance into a program was not nearly as “mysterious” from the student perspective as it is now. Brock clarified his question: how does student admittance into competitive programs actually work?

Kramer agreed and noted some students come to the UW to join specific majors or programs, and they may be denied entry based on grounds that are not transparent to them.

Brock noted the problem deeply affects the students and promotes unfairness. He mentioned time-to-degree and questioned what students do when they are denied entry into competitive majors. Ratner noted some literature on the topic suggests that an entire year is added to student’s time-to-degree if
they are turned down by a program. The council continued discussion and noted that the lack of transparency was a path down a “slippery slope” for the university.

Kramer noted she believes FCAS is the appropriate body to address this concern. DeCosmo agreed and noted that with trends showing heightening enrollments at the UW, the problem is likely to be worsened.

Brock noted one implication of the issue may be the overall quality of future applicants to the UW, as exemplary students may not want to bother with the UW because of its abnormal admission circumstances.

Stroup explained she would like to see what the process is for admission to all UW departments that are competitive. She suggested these departments be reviewed by the council. It was noted FCAS approves the criteria for admission to majors, and Kramer explained FCAS is the body responsible for admissions oversight.

Kramer noted the council is in a good position to address the problem currently, as the administration in place is ideal. She explained she will go to the UW Enrollment Management Committee and tell them of the council’s plan to address issues associated with competitive majors.

Janssen questioned what the criteria is for approving admissions and when the criteria itself was approved. He noted he would like to compare this to actual processes which are taking place. Council members expressed a desire to see a chart showing this information. Wensel added she wonders if all the competitive majors are actually in a “competitive situation,” or if the designation is a remnant of a bygone era. Kramer noted the council will require data to conduct this review and will need support from the administration to accrue it.

DeCosmo mentioned there is no university measurement of how many majors students actually apply to.

Kramer noted this could be an interesting opportunity for a student survey. She noted she will hold discussions outside of FCAS meetings and try to gather some data. Kramer requested that Brock provide a paragraph delineating the problem.

### Summer Quarter online Group-start courses

Wensel introduced a conversation over summer quarter Group-start courses. She noted these courses are administered online, and in the past, students had to pay a substantial fee for enrollment. This fee was reduced from $350 to $120 last summer (2015), and enrollment has now skyrocketed. She noted space is now low in Group-start courses, and this is an issue because many students use these online courses to finish up areas of knowledge for their degrees. Wensel noted she is nervous about the ability of students to take these courses when they need to because of overwhelming demand. She explained that she wonders if the registration process may be changed to remedy this issue. She also clarified that program specific students get low priority when enrolling in Group-start courses, and they do not have the ability to register until the first week of class (PD3). Kramer stated that she did not understand why the requirement for program specific students to be limited to PD3 registration is in place, given that the program in which these students are enrolled was approved with these courses explicitly listed as
permissible. Wensel added it is clear there is a high demand for online courses at UWS, and it is outstripping the supply.

7) Adjourn

Kramer adjourned the meeting at 2:57 p.m.

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

Present: Faculty: Phil Brock, John Deehr, Don Janssen, Patricia Kramer (chair), Dan Ratner, D. Shores, Sarah Stroup, Thaisa Way, Daniel Enquobahrie, Champak Chatterjee
Ex-officio representatives: LeAnne Jones Wiles, Roy Taylor
Guests: Robert Corbett, Tina Miller

Absent: Faculty: Robert Harrison, Peter Hoff
Ex-officio representatives: Aaron Vetter, Robin Chin Roemer
Old Non-Routine Business:

1. Honors - (HONORS-20150922) Revised honors requirements for Interdisciplinary Honors Program.

   Background: The Honors Program is proposing changes they feel will reflect a more even disciplinary balance for Interdisciplinary Honors students, while restricting the use of graduate-level and HONORS 499 credits.

   Action Taken: 10/09/2015 – Approve and forward to FCAS.
   Update: 10/28/2015– Held at FCAS for conversations with non-A&S Colleges and Schools.  Return to FCAS on 10/30/2015.

   Action Taken: 11/6/2015 – Business and Engineering are okay with the Honors proposal. Forward to FCAS without recommendation.

2. Speech and Hearing Sciences - (SPHSC-20150723) Revised admission and program; and new continuation policy requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Speech and Hearing Sciences.

   Background: The Speech and Hearing Sciences department is a competitive admissions program but did not have a continuation policy that is required for competitive majors now (which they plan on phasing in). In the process of drafting their continuation policy they have identified admission and program requirements that need to be revised to reflect current course requirements and admissions best practices. Note that option 2 is the graduate program preparation option and students that do not meet the proposed 3.00 cumulative GPA are able to switch to the option 1 assuming they maintain a 2.00 cum GPA.

   Action Taken: 10/23/2015 – Forward to FCAS without a recommendation if unit responds to SCAP’s questions on continuation policy.
   Action Taken: 11/6/2015 – Approve and forward to FCAS pending clarification of terms in dismissal/drop section of continuation policy.

   Update: 11/10/2015 – Continuation policy has been revised to SCAP’s satisfaction.

3. Aeronautics and Astronautics - (AA-20150515) New minor in Aeronautics and Astronautics

   Background: The department wants to create a minor to serve non-aero STEM majors considering multidisciplinary careers and non-aero STEM students wishing to pursue aero-based graduate work.

   Action Taken: 06/05/2015 – Approve and forward to FCAS.
   Action Taken: 11/06/2015 – Post Tri-Campus Review (no comments). Approve and forward to FCAS.

4. Human Centered Design and Engineering - (HCDE-20150414) Revised admission and continuation requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Human Centered Design and Engineering degree.

   Background: The HCDE department is proposing changing to their admission requirements to update credits amounts, course renumbering, and course frequency. These changes will require updating the continuation policy as it applies to Direct Freshman admits.  (Question – their Continuation Policy requires DFA students to have completed the courses required for regular admission by the start of their junior year or be dropped. These courses are not actually part of the “degree requirements” so are they allowed to do that)
Action Taken: 05/22/2015 – Hold. Research if department has prior FCAS approval for their existing continuation policy (CP). Check with department for approval. Registrar’s office no longer drops students for lack of payment from current quarter – revise CP #5. Recommend they specify which regular admissions requirements are expected to be completed as general education requirements to enforce in the CP. The CP should include a monitoring process during 2nd year to ensure students are making satisfactory progress rather than just dropping them at the end of 2nd year.

Update: The existing continuation policy was approved by FCAS on June 24, 2014. HCDE-20140527. Rick Keil was going to follow up about additional concerns – but I have not heard back yet.

Action Taken: 10/23/2015 – Approve and forward to FCAS pending unit approval of SCAP recommendations.

Update: 11/06/2015 – no response from unit – hold for response.
Action Taken: 11/06/2015 – HOLD

New Routine Business:

1. Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences - (ENVH-20150928) Revised program requirements for both the Bachelor of Science degree and the minor in Environmental Health.

Background: The ENVH department is requesting to update their major as follows: a) how their General Education Requirements are listed to mirror that of the School of Public Health; b) replace HCDE 333 with ENVH 320; c) add BIOST 310 as an approved Statistics course; and d) to move the supporting sciences classes already coded in DARS as major requirements in the catalog copy as major requirements. For their minor they are requesting changes that would make the minor more accessible to non-science majors (they do have sufficient courses without prerequisites for non-science majors).

Action Taken: 11/6/2015 – Approve and forward to FCAS with revisions to General Education requirement statement.

Update: 11/06/2015 – Revisions have been approved by the department.

2. Health Services - (HIHIM-20150605) Revised admission and program requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Health Informatics and Health Information Management.

Background: The Health Services department is revising the catalog copy to make the admissions and program requirements explicit as well as mirror the General Education requirements as approved by the School of Public Health.

Action Taken: 11/6/2015 - Approve and forward (Bachelor of Science degree only; Post-Baccalaureate certificate changes must go to an appropriate Committee for approval) to FCAS with revisions to General Education requirement statement.

Update: 11/06/2015 – Revisions have been approved by the department.