

COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting Minutes: October 6, 2015

3:30 PM, 355 Loew

Members present: Jennifer Turns, Chair (HCDE); Bob Breidenthal (AA); Chris Neils (BioE); Mike Dodd (CEE); Brad Holt (ChemE); Hal Perkins (CSE); Daniel Kirschen (EE); Shan Lin (ISE); Mark Ganter (ME); Colin Butler (Undergraduate Student Representative); Jennifer Tsai (ISE Advisor); Brian Fabien (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs); Scott Winter (Ex Officio, Academic Affairs).

Members absent: Jihui Yang (MSE).

Minutes - The June 2, 2015 and September 29, 2015 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved.

New Course and Course Change Applications

E E 517 Continuous Space Language Processing – Course change application. The course focus is changing in response changes in the Linguistics department. The changes include a revised course description and a new course title. The application included signatures from CSE and Linguistics. The application was unanimously approved.

ME 416 Engineering Innovation in Medicine Design Preparation – New course application. This proposal was tabled at the September 29 meeting to allow for review by the Bioengineering department. Bioengineering had not yet reviewed the proposal, and therefore, it was tabled until the October 20th meeting.

Old Business

Discussion of Direct-to-College Admission Proposal – The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Future Admission Committee's proposal for a Direct-to-College (DTC) admission process. The most significant area of discussion related to the process placing students into engineering departments. Questions and concerns related to placement included:

- What if there is a large imbalance in department requests?
- Will a department be forced to take more students than anticipated?
- A department could be in the awkward position of having fewer students than anticipated.
- If there are more students than space, who decides which students get in and how?
- How does the timing of the placement process align with the timing of the transfer and interest changer processes?
- Why have fixed dates – could the system work with rolling dates?
- How much UW coursework should a student have before being placed? There was a feeling that perhaps students might get placed into departments with so little coursework that no one knows how well they might do.
- Can the placement process involve a letter/statement from students about why they want a major?
- Who will be keeping track of the students and how, particularly in regard to which students are eligible to be placed and which students are not progressing toward placement?

In addition, there was conversation about the following:

- What, in addition to the proposed catalog copy, would be required in the official proposal? The scale and scope of the proposal document was the subject of conversation. There was conversation about bringing an outline to a subsequent CEP meeting.
- There was conversation about how the criteria used to admit incoming freshman to the DTC pool would be identified, and some discussion/curiosity about the challenge/feasibility of differentiating students. There was discussion about the extent to which the intended majors listed by applicants on the freshman application should be used as a part of the DTC selection process.

- Student pathways. Across the conversation, there was talk of different pathways through the DTC process — for example, a student coming in with lots of AP credits, a student who starts to struggle in the first year and perhaps has a 2.5, a student who comes to the university knowing exactly which engineering discipline he/she wants, a student who perhaps doesn't get his/her first choice during a placement process.
- Student quality, ability to succeed, ability to thrive. The conversation seemed to cycle around concerns about student quality (often associated with GPA in general), but also student ability to succeed or even thrive in a department (which had specifically to do with doing well in preliminary courses).

FCAS leadership forwarded a list of questions that should be addressed as a part of a proposal coming out of the College. The list of questions will be forwarded to the CEP members.

It was suggested that prior to the October 20th meeting, additional details on possible placement processes be flushed out including some scenarios for several student pathways. Also, an initial outline for the proposal should be developed.