The Faculty Council on Academic Standards met on Friday, October 3, 2003 at 1:30 p.m. Chair Carolyn Plumb presided.

**Synopsis**
1. Welcome and Introductions.
2. Approval of the minutes of the June 13, 2003 FCAS meeting.
3. Summary and discussion of College of Forest Resources proposal.
4. Recruit members for subcommittees: SCAP, Honors, Admissions.
6. Academic Progress.

**Welcome and Introductions**
FCAS Chair Carolyn Plumb welcomed new and returning members to the 2003-2004 academic year. Council members introduced themselves and identified their departments or units and their positions.

**Approval of the minutes**
The minutes of June 13, 2003 were approved as amended.

**Summary and discussion of College of Forest Resources proposal: Digital Arts BFA proposal**
Plumb said the College of Forest Resources proposal involves six previous majors and would retain the Bachelor of Science degree in Forest Resources with a new major in Environmental Science and Resource Management. She noted that curricular changes in CFR have been discussed in the college and the council for several years. (Certainly, SCAP has had extensive discussion of this and other CFR proposals in recent years.)

Plumb said the current proposal would pare down the program to two majors. She informed new council members that FCAS spoke with CFR representatives last year. Dean Bruce Bare, Linda Brubaker, Robert Edmonds and Michelle Trudeau visited the council on May 30, 2003.

Plumb told the visitors at that meeting: “Your proposal is going through the RCEP process [Restructuring, Consolidation, or Elimination of Programs] because it eliminates five majors, though it does not eliminate a degree.” And Susan Woods, 2002-2003 SCAP chair, told them that SCAP had concerns about the proposal having minors instead of options or concentrations within majors. Trudeau informed the council that CFR “has not touched the six minors we have in the program.” Dean Bare added, “We’re not recommending changes in minors. And there are no options in the new majors.”

After lengthy discussion about minors versus options, Plumb told the visitors at the May 30th meeting, “You could have CFR minors for non-majors. Minors and options are transcripted. Concentrations might work better for your majors: concentrations are more fluid and are not transcripted. You could see how this goes in a couple years, and maybe go with options at that time. The bigger picture involves consolidation, efficiency, and cross discipline interaction between faculty and students.”

Today, Plumb reiterated that the CFR proposal’s goal is to produce a “more fluid curriculum: less specialization,” and that CFR “should consider concentrations rather than minors for their own majors.” SCAP and FCAS both recommended concentrations.
Plumb said CFR became aware that they would have to go through the RCEP Process. This process was approved by the Faculty Senate in the mid 1990’s, but is only now being seriously put into practice. Plumb said the CFR RCEP process “is still going on. The council thought it best to wait till RCEP is further along, and letters from related departments (with programs concerned with environmental resources and management) have been received.

One issue, said Plumb, is the title: “Environmental Science and Resource Management”. “Is this the best title?” she asked. “Is it too broad a title? Would students clearly understand the nature of the program by the use of this title?”

Plumb also said she has received several E-mails from people who have issues with the proposal. Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden (after greeting the council and thanking them for serving on FCAS) asked Plumb where the concerns about the scope of the curriculum in the proposal are coming from. Plumb said one important unit with concerns is PoE (Program on the Environment). PoE wrote a letter to CFR Dean Bare suggesting that the title might be more confusing than clarifying. PoE believes that the title suggests a breadth of curriculum that is not present in the proposed program. The director of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences has said that his program has concerns and will be responding.

Plumb said Arts and Sciences Dean David Hodge supports the proposal, as does Earth and Space Sciences, Architecture and Urban Planning, and Dean Denice Denton and the College of Engineering. Wadden said, “Normally, the College Curriculum Committee would reconcile this kind of dispute.” Kenney said, “It would be easy enough to modify this title to suggest the content of the program and satisfy those who are uneasy with the title.”

Wadden said, “It’s important for you to know that this discussion has nothing to do with the RCEP process. That [process] has no bearing on FCAS decisions. We just need separate FCAS input.” Wadden also noted that “we’re trying to have a forum to discuss University degree proposals [i.e., degree proposals for the entire tri-campus University]. One of our questions is whether or not FCAS is the place to do this.”

Wadden noted that the tri-campus legislation [on defining “campus” and proposing changes in Section 23 of the Faculty Code] was removed from the Agenda for the October 6th Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting. Also, Wadden said the discussion of the possible program review process for the other campuses is suggesting a process that would not go directly through FCAS, but would inform FCAS and others of new programs being proposed, or of proposed changes to existing programs.

Wadden’s question is: “How might a program at UW, Bothell or UW, Tacoma affect a UW, Seattle program? Does Tacoma know that Arts and Sciences is repositioning a particular program? What about accreditation? What would be the most effective use of the Code? Should Bothell and Tacoma have a separate Code?”

Plumb said, “This is a big issue, and it won’t be resolved until we get a new President. We had a mechanism that FCTCP worked out last year.” Wadden said, “That procedure wasn’t codified.” Plumb said, “Some faculty feel they haven’t had a chance to be heard [on the CFR proposal issues].” Washburn said that one thing that is certain University-wide is that there is one transcript for all three campuses: one accreditation for the entire University.

Bridges said, “I agree to sending a degree proposal that comes to my desk to FCAS for input: faculty needs to be part of that process. The question is: What would work best?” Kenney said, “We would still need feedback from affected departments, as to the effect they feel the proposal would have on their programs. We need relevant information, and we need the correct departments to sign off on program Faculty Council on Academic Standards
proposals.” Bridges said, “I think I’d send it to the relevant dean, and ask the dean if there are problems with the proposal. The dean in turn would send it to the appropriate departments and units.”

Kenney said there is still another step in the approval process: the approval of the academic content. Washburn said, “All the courses go through the curriculum committee process: If questions arise there, queries go out to departments. And they are referred, finally, to the Provost’s Office for resolution.” Washburn suggested that SCAP could have a member from each campus. Plumb said Tacoma and Bothell did not want their programs to go through SCAP or George Bridge’s office [Undergraduate Education]. Wadden pointed out that “the SCAP process has worked well in the past, and could continue to do so.”

Plumb stressed that one complication with the CFR proposal was that it was turned in late. “We can’t have departments submitting new proposals to SCAP in April and May if they want their programs to begin in Fall Quarter.” Wadden said, “It’s important to identify what the issues are, and when they would be resolved.” Stygall said, “Have we ever set out as a principle anything about overlap of students? Are programs competing for the same set of students? In the case of the CFR proposal, are these different programs competing for the same students? Perhaps some general principles could be crafted so that everyone is talking on the same ground.”

Plumb said, “Regarding the CFR proposal, how do we proceed? I’ve talked with Dean Bare, and with the School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences. They could come to the FCAS meeting on October 17th.” Wiegand said, “We need to know whether they have responded to our recommendation that they offer concentrations rather than minors to students in the major.” Bridges said, “I think it’s good for FCAS to talk to the concerned departments.”

Plumb said, “Aquatic and Fishery Sciences and others still feel their concerns have not been heard.” Bridges said, “You and Gail [Stygall] have hit it. Aquatic and Fishery Sciences feel they haven’t been heard. And departments and programs need to be heard [in this process].” Plumb suggested the council could invite the Program on the Environment (PoE) to address the council first, to be followed by the College of Forest Resources. Washburn demurred: “I think direct connection between them would be productive.” Plumb pointed out that the council “should vote on this by October 31st. We need to hear from both groups; then see what we think we should suggest; and then see what they say in response.”

Plumb said the council could set aside 20 or so minutes each for PoE and Aquatic and Fishery Sciences at the October 17th FCAS meeting. “We’ve heard from CFR; we could send them a summary of where we are, and get their response.” Washburn again urged that it would be better “to get them together.” He said it would be hard to “do this [process] second-hand.” Plumb said she would call the affected programs and tell them the council wants to hear from them, perhaps in the same room.

It was decided that the October 17th FCAS meeting would best be held in the Regent’s Room. The Regent’s Room is on the third floor (301) of Gerberding Hall.

**Recruit members for subcommittees: SCAP, Honors, Admissions**

SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs)  
SCAP assesses and approves – or rejects – new degree programs and new admission requirements, and programs revising their major or minor requirements. SCAP does not assess individual courses.

New regular voting member Steve Keith, from Naval Science, volunteered to become the third faculty member on SCAP. The other SCAP members are: Nancy Kenney (chair) and Susan Woods, the other faculty members; and Robert Corbett, Tim Washburn and Debbie Wiegand. Scott Winter, of the Undergraduate Advising Center, who works at times with Debbie Wiegand and Robert Corbett on
proposals submitted to SCAP, will once again be a regular guest contributor to the subcommittee’s discussions. Carolyn Plumb will receive copies of new proposals for her own review.

ADMISSIONS
Gail Stygall will chair the Admissions subcommittee. Also serving on this subcommittee are Debbie Wiegand and Tim Washburn. Don Janssen and Emile Pitre volunteered to join the Admissions Subcommittee. This is an important subcommittee, as Tim Washburn and Enrollment Services are in the process of revising University of Washington admissions policies. Last year’s Admissions Subcommittee was part of this process.

HONORS
Laura Newell will chair the Honors Subcommittee in Winter and Spring quarters of 2004. Erkang Fan has volunteered to serve as chair for Autumn Quarter 2003. Tim Washburn and Steve Buck are also on this year’s subcommittee. (After the meeting, Buck agreed to be on the Honors Subcommittee.) Honors legislation was passed in the Faculty Senate on May 15, 2003, stipulating that UW, Bothell will award a President’s Medal (the student awarded the Medal was the first transfer student to be so honored). The President’s Medal is separate from the Chancellor’s Medal, which is also awarded to a student of academic distinction, but to a student who has also “negotiated tremendous odds” in achieving excellence at the university level. In Autumn and Winter quarters the freshman, sophomore and junior Honors candidates will be chosen and assessed. The winners will be selected in Spring Quarter 2004.

Summary and discussion of the Digital Arts BFA proposal
Plumb informed new FCAS members that SCAP and the council looked at the Digital Arts BFA proposal in Spring Quarter 2003. After expressing concerns – such as whether or not students could incorporate the fifth year courses into the fourth-year senior thesis, and other concerns over aspects of the proposal that are “contrary to FCAS policy” – SCAP received a revised proposal, which is what is now before the council.

Plumb said, “All the issues of this proposal need to be discussed. They would like to see students admitted by Spring 2004.” She pointed out that only 12 students would be admitted to the program each year, and that the program would have upwards of 30 students in all at any one time.

Academic Progress – George Bridges
Bridges told the council that the Provost has created a task force to monitor and assess the academic progress of undergraduate students at the University of Washington. “Much has come out of this assessment,” Bridges said. “It was found that students repeat courses much more often than might be supposed.” He informed the council that there is a piece of legislation in Olympia directing the University to submit a report by January 2004 on academic progress. He said this is “an opportunity to look at two key issues: 105 credits to declare a major; and 210 credits to graduate.” He also said he would like FCAS to look at the issues highlighted by the task force. Plumb said she serves on the task force, and will lead the council in a discussion of its issues at a future meeting.

Next meeting
The next FCAS meeting is set for Friday, October 17, 2003, at 1:30 p.m., in the Regents’ Room, 301 Gerberding Hall. - Brian Taylor, Recorder

PRESENT:  
Professors Plumb (Chair), Janssen, Keith, Kenney and Stygall;  
Ex officio members Bridges, Pitre, Richards, Washburn and Wiegand;  
Regular guest Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs.  
Guest Doug Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate
ABSENT:  Professors Buck, Fan, Gianola, Labossiere, Newell, Reusch, Simon and Woods; Ex officio members Morales and Navin.