Chair John Schaufelberger called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Chair's Report
   Subcommittee Assignments
   Plan for developing Class B Legislation
2. Approval of Minutes of October 9, 2009
3. SCAP Report (Brad Holt)
4. Informational item on next JAOG meeting (John Sahr)
5. E-Portfolios and Kuali Student (Debbie Weigand and Tom Lewis)
6. Adjourn

1. Chair's Report

Chair Schaufelberger welcomed members to the meeting. He announced FCAS’s subcommittee rosters have been finalized and distributed a handout that lists the subcommittees and their membership.

Chair Schaufelberger announced on behalf of Cunningham that the next meeting of her Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation will be on Wednesday, November 18 from 12:30 to 2 pm in 209 Schmitz Hall. The Subcommittee on Honors will probably not meet until December.

Chair Schaufelberger provided background on FCAS’s plan for developing Class B Legislation and the timing of when the Class B Legislation will be presented to the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. The tentative plan is to finalize the Class B Legislation by December and present it to the Senate at its late January meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 9, 2009

The minutes were approved as submitted.
3. SCAP Report (Brad Holt)

Holt explained that his SCAP report usually has two parts, starting with routine items. He briefly introduced three programs--Spanish and Portuguese Studies, Sociology, and Bioethics and the Humanities—and asked that all of these be approved as a part of the consent agenda. The three items were unanimously approved by FCAS.

Holt reported on one non-routine item, the School of Medicine request to SCAP for approval of a 1 credit ethics course. He first provided some background on the source and scope of FCAS’s authority over academic programs. He noted that historically FCAS has reviewed undergraduate programs, while graduate programs have been reviewed by the Graduate School. It has been unclear, however, how the professional programs fit into this. Holt stated that SCAP, after much discussion, decided to review and recommend for approval a very specific request, the request to add a 1 credit ethics class. Chair Schaufelberger and Holt explained further that SOM’s 1503 was sent back to be modified and edited. SCAP requested that it be made very clear on the 1503 that the request be limited to only the 1 credit ethics course and not include general changes to their curriculum.

FCAS members discussed whether approving this request would set a precedent. Holt commented that he felt reviewing a request like this is a faculty responsibility. FCAS discussed the concern that the Council may not be qualified to evaluate future professional program requests. Council members also discussed which unit or body has oversight over the University’s professional programs.

The request to add a 1 credit ethics course was approved unanimously by FCAS.

4. Informational item on mathematics requirements at the community colleges (Sahr)

Sahr updated the Council on his ongoing work with Phil Ballinger and the Joint Access Oversight Group (JAOG) on the complex set of issues involving mathematics requirements at the community colleges and the UW’s mathematics admissions requirement. Chair Schaufelberger asked Sahr to invite a JAOG member to an upcoming FCAS meeting.

FCAS members engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of the Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA), the difference between the DTA and the MRPs (Major Related Programs, sometimes referred to as Major Ready Programs or Pathways), JAOG expectations, and how departments admit transfer students.
5. E-Portfolios and Kuali Student (Debbie Weigand and Tom Lewis)

Weigand provided an introduction to the new student administrative system Kuali Student. She referred to a handout (later emailed to the FCAS distribution list) titled “Wanted: a next generation student system.” She explained that her purpose in attending the meeting was to share information and draw FCAS’s attention to a couple of specific issues.

Weigand provided an overview of the University’s decision to replace our current student administrative system and to become a founding partner of the Kuali Student project. She explained that KS is a community-source development and that the member institutions are working to produce one product, which the University of Washington will then be able to modify for our own needs. She mentioned that KS is being completed in stages. The first stage is Curriculum Management. This will be ready by next summer. The timeline for the entire project is to have it completed by 2013-2014.

Weigand discussed the University’s current curriculum management process and course approval process, which are both based on paper forms. She suggested that KS will be a lot more flexible and efficient than our old system. She announced that aspects of KS’s development will be brought to FCAS for input, discussion, and decisions.

She provided insight into how KS will function as a “next generation” student system. For example, she has found that UW undergraduates are interested in Learning Plans—in KS’s ability to support students’ goals in both their academic and personal lives. Another topic of interest to FCAS is Learning Objectives. Weigand thought that this would be a good opportunity for the faculty to provide input on defining learning objectives and thinking about how learning objectives could be used. She will be discussing this issue with this Council and FCIQ.

Pengra commented that he wasn’t sure how KS’s Learning Objectives fit into our current system of students meeting with advisors to plan their academic schedule. Weigand discussed how KS can be an “e-Advisor” for students who do not meet with an advisor in person. KS can provide a lot of information online to help students choose between courses and majors. KS could also mine information useful to administrators and advisors, such as the background of students taking a class or the popularity of a course.

Tom Lewis provided insight into the history of e-Portfolio development and use at the UW. He referred to the handout “A Catalyst Without a Mandate: Building an e-Portfolio Culture at the University of Washington.” In 2001-2002 Catalyst built an e-Portfolio system for the UW, partly as a tool to assist in the tracking of learning outcomes. After some years, the result is that many programs use the software, especially in Bothell and
Tacoma, some programs use it in innovative and successful ways, and there are many programs that do not use the software. The software seems to be used most often as a place for students to upload their documents, as an “accountability matrix” or storage space, and as a developmental reflective tool.

Lewis noted that in some ways the 2001-2002 software is outdated, since students now have a rich online life on Facebook, MySpace, etc. The Catalyst e-Portfolios will be retired in June. Lewis asked FCAS for input on whether it is important for the UW to have this kind of system.

Holt responded that he didn’t think FCAS is the right place to ask this question. He suggested that Lewis contact the individual college and schools’ Councils on Educational Policy or their equivalents. Regarding learning outcomes and objectives, Holt commented that in his college, the College of Engineering, for example, learning outcomes are thought of in terms of accreditation.

Haag Day provided insight into how colleges and schools think about learning outcomes and accreditation and wondered whether those details interest students. FCAS engaged in a general discussion of how e-Portfolios and demonstrated learning outcomes can be related to the student experience.

Padvorac commented that the key to this kind of tool’s effectiveness in the classroom is whether or not the instructor is actively engaged and enthusiastic.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.
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