Chair George Dillon called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Chair’s Report
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Subcommittee Business:
   SCAP—Stephen Keith
   Admissions and Graduation – Don Janssen
4. Old Business:
   Report on University Requirement equivalents—Deborah Wiegand
   MechE: Math 307 change effective now
5. New Business:
   Civil E—expanded list of core choices
6. Adjourned

Guest speaker, Tom Stritikus, Associate Dean of Academic Programs, spoke to FCAS on the proposed BA in Early Childhood and Family Studies. This addition to the agenda changed the order and content as follows: The guest speaker followed the Chair’s Report as item 2, and items 2 and 3 moved to items 3 and 4. Items 4 and 5 (Old and New Business) were tabled until the next FCAS meeting in May 2007.

1. Chair’s Report

Chair Dillon noted the recent news story about the M.I.T. Dean of Admissions who resigned because she had falsely claimed on her resume that she had several degrees. Council members acknowledged the shock of the news in light of the important work she has done to help take the pressure off college admissions.

2. Guest Speaker: Tom Stritikus, College of Education Proposal to offer a BA in Early Childhood and Family Studies

Guest speaker Stritikus thanked the Curriculum Committee and SCAP for their responses, and said that he was there to answer questions. Council members were given a handout of the revised proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Early Childhood and Family Studies. Stritikus stated that he has grown more passionate about the proposal as the work progresses. He suggested that it reflects the best of research and practice for the students going into it, and that he is pleased with the conceptualization of the parts fitting together.
He noted that he hopes the proposal will move to the Tri-Campus Review by the end of the academic year.

Council member Keith reviewed the editing of the proposal by SCAP. He described it as looking more like other Bachelor degree programs and said it was ready to be forwarded. Council member Wiegand inquired about the General Education requirements, noting that if there were additional programs, G.E. requirements are done at the college level and not program by program.

Council member Janssen asked about the General Education requirements, noting that if there were additional programs, G.E. requirements are done at the college level and not program by program.

Council member Janssen asked about the math requirements, suggesting that a required course in statistics was reasonable for the new major. He advised that it should be listed as required and not optional. Stritikus replied that he would take that under advisement and look at the list of approved courses. Janssen asked about the approval of Early Education courses. Council member Winslow noted that they are awaiting their approval from the Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs.

Council member Shields inquired why the ECFS 200 level course was not required. Stritikus replied that the course was a gateway course, not a foundation course, and that some students would not need it. Janssen asked about the timeline for courses with prerequisites and whether students would be able to get them. Stritikus spoke about creating a good timeline that protects the core content and academic rigor of the courses offered, but still allows students some flexibility. A discussion ensued about the ECFS program being transferable with an AA degree.

Shields inquired about the time needed to fit in required upper division courses, and suggested that the language needed to be clearer. Council members discussed how to clarify the requirement, and concluded that it did not need to be more specific. Stritikus explained that it was a launch versus maintenance issue. He said that he was sensitive to the fact that the 300 and 400 level course offerings will have to be intentional through advising.

Janssen suggested that the program should encourage students to get more of their required courses out of the way early, so that they don’t wait until their Junior or Senior year. He said that a statement to that effect would be useful.

Stritikus explained that the major was competitive, and that he expected between 20-25 students the first year, but did not figure it would be a problem filling the program. When asked to explain the rationale for not allowing students to apply for admission until their sophomore or junior year, Stritikus said that it was a question of capacity. He said that they want quality courses that were well-organized and practice-based, so that students would enter with educational experience.

Council member Navin revisited the statistics course issue and suggested that they reconsider the math requirements. She wondered why a higher level course, such as STAT 311, was not suggested or required instead of STAT 220. She noted, for example, that STAT 220 does not have a math prerequisite (whereas STAT 311 has at minimum a
college-level math course) and that students can’t get credit for both STAT 220 and 311, she suggested that perhaps STAT 311 was a better course given that some of the students in this program may want to go on to a graduate program in the future. Stritikus replied that if the program goes out the Tri-Campus review, it could be possible to insert a change in the proposal.

Stritikus asked the council if they felt comfortable forwarding the proposal to the Tri-Campus Review and then bringing it back to FCAS. Janssen commended the proposal and made the motion to forward it to Tri-Campus with the understanding that the discussion of fine-tuning it will take place. Council member Johnson seconded the motion. Council members passed the motion with no further comment. Council members briefly discussed whether the Higher Education Coordinating Board would take notice of the math requirements in the proposal.

3. Approval of the Minutes.

Council members approved the amended FCAS minutes from March 30, 2007. With a few minor corrections, they also approved the April 13, 2007 FCAS minutes.

4. Sub-Committee Business:
   - SCAP – Stephen Keith

SCAP Chair Keith noted that the Early Childhood and Family Studies had just been approved.

New business includes the departments of Computer Engineering and Computer Science and Engineering adding a third “accelerated” admissions option to their degree program. Keith recommended their approval as “routine” and council members endorsed the approval. Keith described as “routine” a request by the department of Mechanical Engineering to drop MATH 307 as an upper division admissions requirement. Keith explained that SCAP had asked the ME department to add an advising note in the catalogue, but neither the department nor the Registrar’s office wanted to add the statement. Council members asked why MATH 307 was no longer required. Council members approved the requested change.

The last three program changes involved creating a new minor within the Aerospace Studies, Military Science, and Naval Science programs. Keith explained that all three programs created the minor in order to recognize the amount of effort that goes into becoming an Officer. He noted that these were non-routine proposals. The Aerospace Studies proposal needed a little clearer description as to why it requires six credits of language in the minor. Wiegand stated that they need to answer the question of how the six credits connect to an academic minor degree in Aerospace, because the minor must be open to anyone. Keith stated that he would like to send forward the three proposals to the Tri-Campus Review. Janssen replied that he would move to approve only the Army and Navy Science proposals. The motion was made to approve the Army and Navy proposals, and Johnson seconded the motion. Council members approved forwarding the two
proposals, and agreed to bring back for review the Aerospace Studies proposal in order to check the wording

**Admissions and Graduation – Don Janssen**

Janssen inquired about the minor in Education, Learning and Society with the recommendation to add a line to the proposal calling for at least 10 credits of upper division coursework. He was told that the line was added, and the proposal has been forwarded to the Tri-Campus Review.

Janssen updated the council on the subcommittee’s review of the Proposed Modifications to Policy on Cross-Campus Enrollment. He described several problems the subcommittee found with the proposal, including that it seeks to allow students to pursue a second major on a different campus simultaneously, as well as allow students to pursue a second major on a campus to which they have not been admitted. The latter problem Janssen described as unacceptable because it would alter campus admission policies. He also noted that the subcommittee did not agree with the proposal to allow students to sign up for cross-campus courses through MyUW. Wiegand remarked that the proposal seems to be allowing students to enroll in courses, not pursue a degree. Janssen replied that the courses are taken in order to get a minor that is not available on the student’s home campus.

Winslow explained why a student pursuing a minor on a second campus should have at least 85 transferable credits, and not the 15 credits recommended in the proposal. Council member Corbett remarked that the 15 credits is a separate issue for UW Bothell because it is a transfer campus for freshman. Council member Ballinger noted that the proposed cross-campus enrollment policy is a request to bolster freshman enrollment and retention possibilities at UW Bothell and Tacoma. Ballinger explained the idea of “institutional bonding” and said that the proposal to allow students to transfer after taking just 15 credits doesn’t allow students to create that kind of relationship with their secondary campus.

Council members discussed various problems in the proposed changes to cross-campus enrollment. It was noted that there are very different admission standards between the campuses. The proposed changes would allow students to take freshman and sophomore courses at UW Bothell, for instance, and then return to UW Seattle or Tacoma for their junior and senior year. Council members agreed that the cross-campus enrollment policy is a strategic issue for UW Bothell which faces difficulties attracting and keeping students because of its location and multidisciplinary programs.

Janssen brought up an issue with the existing policy permitting a student on one campus to complete a minor on another: students caught cheating at UW Seattle, for instance, would get their offense handled at their home campus. It would be best if disciplinary problems were handled on the campus on which they occurred rather than on the campus that the student was enrolled at. He suggested that FCAS discuss this part of the existing agreement at a future meeting.
Ballinger invited the council to consider a collegial response that will communicate how best they can be supportive. Council member Cunningham inquired about having faculty, rather than students, moving across campuses. Several ideas were shared for inviting UW Bothell’s Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Tom Bellamy, to meet with FCAS or the faculty to talk about the motivation behind the proposal, and to brainstorm more ways to develop connections between the campuses. Running out of time, the action taken by the council was to simply continue the discussion at the next FCAS meeting.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.
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