Meeting Synopsis:

1. Chair’s Report
   - Introductions
   - Subcommittee Assignments
   - Summary of Last Year’s Annual Report
   - Preview of Issues for this Year

2. Approval of the Minutes of June 11, 2010

3. Adjourn

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 1:32

Reports & Business Items

1. Chair’s Report (John Schaufelberger)

Council Chair Schaufelberger welcomed council members to the 2010-11 year of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and all sitting at the table introduced themselves and signed up for subcommittee assignments. The three subcommittees of the council are Academic Programs (SCAP), chaired by Brad Holt; Admissions and Graduation, chaired by Susanna Cunningham; and Honors, chaired by Gunnar Almgren.

Schaufelberger asked the council to identify and discuss specific topics that could be pursued for this year. The following topics generated discussion.

Impact of Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB) on academics

The council discussed some of the changes that could take place with the implementation of ABB, and the need to assess its effects. Because it will need to be in place for a year in order to make a proper assessment, the investigation may have to take place at a later time. However, a baseline assessment could be conducted now, before the transition.

Holt explained a possible scenario under ABB where a department duplicates academic efforts in order to get more credits. As a hypothetical example, he gave the College of Engineering deciding to teach a lower-level English course for pre-engineering students. Winslow said the curriculum committee would take a look at the course proposal and have the department that was being duplicated review and sign off on it.
Other possible ABB issues raised included departments newly objecting to classes that were approved a while ago, since money would now be flowing where student credit-hours are; students who are not in a particular major not being allowed to take a class in that subject; if certain courses would be dropped because they don’t attract high enough numbers of students; and if extension programs would be offered for Masters degrees only, since it is a more direct infusion of money.

Schaufelberger said that the council can take the proactive steps of establishing policy, framework, or guidelines. Stroup suggested establishing a baseline report on whether students are having trouble getting into classes, and following the issue from there. The council suggested having a person, perhaps Doug Wadden, come to a future meeting to give a primer on ABB, particularly about issues he’s concerned with that would be relevant to the council.

**Classroom presentations by for-profit companies**

Jed Bradley, ASUW Director of Faculty, Administration and Academic Affairs, brought up the issue of off-campus, for-profit companies coming to large lecture classes to take the first few minutes of class to speak to students about employment with their companies, often in the guise of an “internship.” The employment takes the form of an independent contractor position for students, who are then left unprotected by labor laws and often exploited, while supposedly getting academic credits from an online university in Indiana. The primary offenders are Southwestern and to a somewhat lesser extent, College Pro Painters. Bradley said that the presentations waste class time (and thereby student tuition dollars) and attempt to collect personal information from students, all to benefit for-profit companies. He explained that he’d like FCAS to develop a policy regarding this, which would inform professors and lecturers that they don’t have to invite people in to class and can refuse presentations, and set some guidelines on what groups should be allowed to present (to include local, student-run groups that don’t collect data and take no more than three minutes.)

The council related personal experiences with this issue, specifying that the company representatives are often pushy and that faculty who agree to allow presentations believe they are helping students by exposing them to employment and internship opportunities. The council suggested that Bradley continue to develop a resolution for the ASUW Student Senate to pass, which they could help further disseminate to faculty.

**Delay in implementation of new curriculum requirements**

The council raised the issue of delaying the implementation of new curriculum requirements for transfer students. Sahr gave the example of a department changing its admission requirements from coursework in one computer programming language to another. In principle, UW is not supposed to implement such a policy immediately for transfer students. Sahr suggested that the council adopt a policy whereby requirement changes are approved, but with a caveat that community college transfer students be admitted according to the previous requirements for two years.

Kramer asked if majors moving from open to selective would fall under the policy. It was clarified that academic or credit requirement changes are the issue, not grade requirements, because that is not an unusual burden to transfer students. Ballinger said that potential transfer students are pressed to prepare for admission to a major, and develop academic plans in order to get there. Holt said that there is no obligation to grandfather in current UW students to a new requirement, and this policy gives community college students a two year grace period that UW students don’t have.

The council decided that SCAP will consider the matter and develop a policy for the review of the full council.
On a similar topic, it was noted that Chemical Engineering and Bioengineering will be starting their major programs at spring quarter of sophomore year, which breaks the standard two year community college transfer model. While FCAS doesn’t have to do anything about it, it will cause grumbling in the community college world, as students won’t complete their transfer degree in order to come here in time. However, new performance criteria for community colleges doesn’t include degrees granted.

Admission requirements
Ballinger said that the Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board minimum admission requirements relative to science had changed. New requirements are two lab sciences classes; physics, chemistry, or biology, and algebra-based; the two can coincide. Only 50 of the 23,000 resident applicants did not meet this requirement for varying reasons. He said that the university takes different approaches with certain admissions requirements – it is adamant about mathematics, and almost as adamant about international language, but much less so with social sciences and fine arts. They will have to look at how to address this issue.

Ballinger also brought up the issue of international student-athletes that did not meet TOEFL requirements. He said he will raise this with the admissions committee to talk about their policy compared to other Pac-10 institutions. Another issue to bring up with ACIA is the ability of the Athletic Director to ask for appeals on admissions decisions for recruits. If an appeal is made, the matter is looked into by the ACIA. Previously, FCAS approved a statement from the ACIA indicating that the decisions of the committee can’t be appealed, but there is a policy gap in that statement that needs to be addressed. He believes it means that the athletic department cannot appeal an ACIA decision, not that the admissions office cannot. The question is where the ultimate authority to admit a student lies.

This raised a question about who makes the decision on students who are admitted through the Robinson Center for Young Scholars. Ballinger said that with rare exception, when the Robinson Center lets Admissions know who has come through their program, they are admitted, but said it could be a question because of the chain of authority.

Number of credits compared to effort extended
Hold brought up the issue of the number of credits offered in a class compared to the effort extended in a class. Because financial decisions are based on credit-hours, this issue could be ABB-related. The question is with existing classes. There is some self-reported data from student class evaluations that could be analyzed to see if there are any outliers indicative of an issue or problem across certain classes (rather than specific sections of those classes). This data includes total hours spent and perceived useful hours spent. He admitted that the data may be weak, but said it should be looked at.

The council had a brief discussion on the issue, commenting that in the hospital, behavior has changed as economic policies have changed; that students don’t necessarily take the evaluation; and that some classes require more work than the credits offered for them. Sahr said he would obtain the relevant data from the Office of Educational Assessment.

Success of all admitted students
Holt brought up the issue of students that are admitted to the university and end up not graduating. Ballinger said that he doesn’t perceive that there is any issue that stands out, with positive increases continuing across the board in metrics such as academic profiles, diversity, and retention and graduation rates. The council then embarked on a wide-ranging discussion of the matter, balancing two major topics: concern for the fate of admits with lower academic profiles that don’t end up graduating; and specific
outcomes that the university is seeking to achieve via an admissions process that seeks wide representation of the population. The council did not decide on any further action on this issue.

2. Approval of the minutes from the May 28, 2010 meeting

The minutes of the May 28, 2010 meeting were approved with changes.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:54 p.m.
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