Task Force on Academic Progress of UW–Seattle Undergraduates

Implementation Plan

Summary

Recommendation	Status	Suggested Action
Continue to improve enrollment management strategies (improve access to undergraduate courses)	In progress	Continue current efforts.
Reduce repetition of courses	Instituted enforcement of limited repeats	January 2006 - Evaluate effectiveness of new enforcement.
Establish prerequisite grades for courses offered in sequence	Course sequences identified	Analysis to establish criteria for setting prerequisite grades
Ascertain whether non-tenure faculty with term appointments could meet the instructional needs of majors for the near term	2004-05 pilot in Departments of Communication, Political Science, Economics, and Psychology.	Allocate funding to OUE for the biennium. Evaluate access to upper-division courses each year before allocating funds to departments. Define and evaluate outcomes for funded departments.
Enhance academic advising for second-year students, directing pre-majors to fields other than high-demand or highly competitive programs where appropriate.	First year completed using temporary funding. Adequate funding for 2005-06.	Continue funding and establish 1:550 adviser to student ratio. Evaluate after June 2006. Explore additional strategies for second-year students such as exploratory courses in broad disciplinary areas.
Continue the OMA Academic Development Initiative to enhance developmental advising and career planning with emphasis on options to high-demand or highly competitive majors.	First year completed using temporary funding.	Continue current funding for Academic Development Initiative and Comprehensive Mentor Program. Develop web and print publications. Expand assessment effort.
Initiate a discussion with competitive departments to explore multiple criteria for admission. (Improve departmental recruitment and retention of under-represented students)	Planning only	Collect demographic and qualitative data on underrepresented minority students and competitive majors: interest level in majors, admission rates to majors and retention to graduation in majors. Develop strategies for problem areas. Include a representative appointed by OMA as a non-voting member to the admission committees for competitive majors. Professional development for all academic advisers aimed at ensuring a welcoming climate in every adviser's office. Fund that provides resources for departments to initiative efforts to improve the climate for students enrolled in the department's courses and/or major(s).

Recommendation	Status	Suggested Action
Complete a major self-study and external review of undergraduate advising including advising in the Gateway Center, the Office of Minority Affairs, and all departmental advisers.	To be completed June 2005.	Review task force recommendations in light of findings.
Institute electronic processes to monitor student academic progress to degree.	Planning only	Quarterly report to departments: students in major who complete less than 3 credits in major department during quarter.
Institute approval processes for change of major, change of degree, and for enrolling in multiple majors or degrees.	In progress	Faculty Senate actions: Establish guidelines for approval of new majors and multiple majors/degrees. Disallow concurrent degrees for same degree name. Eliminate 45-credit requirement for additional degree. Reduce 45-credit requirement for post-baccalaureate degrees to 30 credits.
Institute mandatory advising for students on academic warning and probation.	2004-05 pilot for freshmen on warning	Expand pilot to include all students who are on warning or probation, whose quarter GPA is below 2.0 for two consecutive quarters, or whose record shows course drops or withdraws for two consecutive quarters.
Establish and require continuing education/training and development for all academic advisers.	Planning only	Establish expectations: undergraduate academic advisers participate in professional development and departments support advisers' professional development activities.
Establish a system that improves the flow of important information to all advisers and regularizes opportunities for cross-campus adviser discussion of issues and consensus building.	Planning only	Add staffing in the Curriculum Office to improve the efficiency of updates to the on-line catalog and institute an annual accuracy review of all university and department websites. Archive information disseminated on the advisers listserv and catalog changes. Hire a consultant to examine information management system and recommend improvements.
Establish a credit bank for selected pre-college credits (AP, IB, CHS)	Planning only	Define a "satisfactory progress credit total" that excludes AP/IB credits.
No more than 30 credits earned in foreign study, undergraduate research, public service internships, and service learning be exempt from academic progress totals, if those types of experiences are not established parts of their program of study.	Planning only	No action requested because UW credits not appropriate for banking.

Task Force on Academic Progress of UW-Seattle Undergraduates

Recommendation #1: Continue to improve enrollment management strategies

Beginning winter quarter 2003, the university, under the signature of the Dean for Undergraduate Education, began sending email messages to students at critical points in their academic progress. Messages go out to students approaching the 105-credit deadline for declaring a major but have not yet declared a major and to students who have completed 105 credits without declaring a major. Messages also go out to students approaching the 210-credit upper limit and to those who are completing 210 credits and have not yet graduated. While it is too early to judge the impact of these messages, between spring quarter 2003, and spring quarter 2004, the number of students at or exceeding 105 without a declared major dropped 0.5% from 7.2% to 6.7%, and the number of seniors at or exceeding 210 credits dropped 1.3% from 11.0% to 9.7%.

Actions of the Enrollment Management Committee:
- Reduced the size of the entering freshman class
- Limited the ability to repeat courses
- Developed an enrollment planning cycle
- Identified bottleneck courses and highly impacted majors
- Provided temporary funds to impacted departments well before the academic year begins to allow for admission of additional graduate students
- Increased commitment from one year to some percentage of original commitment over three years
- Provided funds to departments throughout the year to allow for unforeseen enrollment pressure
- Offered additional TAs to departments offering popular courses meeting in large lecture rooms that have additional space
- Developed tools to predict enrollment demand for specific high-demand bottleneck courses

Recommendation #2: Reduce repetition of courses

In 2003 the Faculty Council on Academic Standards recommended a more rigorous implementation of the University's policy on repeating courses. The University policy, as defined in the University Handbook (Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 15, section 2), permits students to register for a course a second time with departmental approval.

The following process was implemented beginning with courses for Winter Quarter 2005.
At the time of registration, add transactions will search the student's transcript and current class schedule to determine if the student has a grade in the course including an Incomplete ("I"), S/NS, or CR/NC or is currently registered for the course. If the student is attempting to take the course for the 3rd time, the system response will be a message display that the course has been previously repeated and the student is not eligible to register for the course. Courses with an "X", W, or W3-W7 in the grade field are not counted as completed and are not subject to this checking process. Courses listed in the Time Schedule with the following values are NOT subject the repeat rules:

- Courses numbered 500 and above
- Courses listed with a maximum repeat credit limit
- Courses with the repeat-exempt flag set to YES
- ELP courses of ENGL 100 or ENGL 101
- Courses with variable credit
- Courses with duplicate registration allowed in the same quarter
- Independent Study courses coded as IS
- A course designated as Research
- A course taken for Audit

Departmental approval for the first repeat of a course will be automatically set as YES in the curriculum database unless a department notifies the Curriculum Office that one or all of the following options should be NO:

1. Allow repeat registration Period I YES/NO
2. Allow repeat registration Period II YES/NO
3. Allow repeat registration Period III YES/NO.

If a department selects NO option for all three options, students will not be permitted to register for the course a second time. If a department sets the option for Period I as NO and retains the YES for the two remaining registration periods, students will be permitted to register for the course as the first repeat but not until Registration Period II.

In some cases, departments may determine after careful evaluation that it is appropriate to permit a student to register for a course more than 2 times. In these situations, the department staff will use the SRF 104 screen to override the restriction. The override code will be "R". Entry codes will not override this restriction which must be done using this screen. Departments may also override the Period restriction for an individual student by using this same override code.

Recommendation #3: Establish prerequisite grades for courses offered in sequence

Prerequisite grades are currently in place in
   ◆   Mathematics (usually 2.0 in 100-level courses and some at the 300-level)
   ◆   Chemistry (1.7 in 100- and 200-level courses and 3 courses at the 300-level)
   ◆   Biology (1.5 in 180-200-220 sequence)
   ◆   Economics (for ECON 301, 2.0 in ECON 201 and in ECON 300)
   ◆   Psychology (for PSYCH 209, 2.0 in PSYCH 101)

The setting of prerequisite grades is based on either faculty expectations of what constitutes mastery of the basic material in the course or a designation, sometimes supported by data, of an acceptable probability of success in the subsequent course. A statistical analysis comparing student grades in the two courses is warranted to establish criteria for setting prerequisite grades. The following course sequences should be analyzed:
   ◆   MATH 120, 124, 125, 126, 307, 308
   ◆   CHEM 120, 220, 221
   ◆   CHEM 142, 152, 162, 237, 238, 239
   ◆   BIOL 180, 200, 220
   ◆   ECON 200, 201, 300, 301
   ◆   PSYCH 101, 202, 209
   ◆   CSE 142,143
   ◆   MICROM 301 (prerequisite is CHEM 120, 142, or 145, include analysis for Biology prerequisite)
   ◆   PHYS 114, 115, 116
   ◆   PHYS 121, 122, 123

Recommendation #4: Ascertain whether non-tenure faculty with term appointments could meet the instructional needs of majors for the near term

For the 2004-05 academic year funds were allocated to four departments to hire temporary instructors for upper division courses. The departments are Communication, Political Science, Economics, and Psychology. The departments find the funding of one-year appointments crucial in providing access to upper-division courses for their majors. Departments would prefer longer-term funding that would allow them to recruit temporary faculty within specialty areas who have proven teaching ability. However, temporary funding, even for an extended period, is only a stopgap method and should be used only when the backlog in demand for upper-division courses is short-term.

Recommendation #5: Enhance academic advising for second-year students, directing pre-majors to fields other than high-demand programs when appropriate

Four thousand of the five thousand students starting at the University of Washington in 2003 were not in a major at the beginning of their second year. A review of advising services revealed students in their second year receive the lowest level of institutional support. The Individual Second-year Advising Program (ISAP) specifically targeted students starting their second year of study, who were not yet in a major, had 10 or less transfer credits, were not affiliated with EOP, and had no other campus support. The total target population was 3039 students.

The goals of the program are as follows:
- Students will identify academic, extracurricular, and professional areas of interest.
- Students will become more knowledgeable about University resources
- Students will become more knowledgeable about majors available to them.
- Students will experience the intervention as helpful and useful.
- Students will declare majors earlier in their academic careers.

The team of 3.5 (three full time and one part time) ISAP advisers started contacting students in summer 2004, beginning with students in the below 2.5 GPA category and continuing with students with progressively higher GPA's. Outreach efforts are three-pronged, consisting of phone calls, email and postcards. Once phone contact is made 84% students meet with an adviser. Eight months into the project, 750 students have been advised with 300 of the 750 returning for a second appointment. By the end of June 2005 ISAP advisers will have contacted over 1200 of the 3039 students (~40%).

Of the 700 students who completed evaluations:
- 97.7 % report that they learned something new during the appointment.
- 99.1 % report that they found their adviser helpful.
- 97.0 % report that their adviser recommended a specific thing to do as a next step.

Students also report that the ISAP appointment is the first opportunity they have had to talk with an adviser about their interests and their education at UW. Some comments:
- My adviser helped me look at the bigger picture instead of only looking at the short-term.
- My adviser helped me look into classes I wouldn't have considered.
- I think the overall session was exactly what I was looking for-all of it was 100% helpful.
- The adviser let me know about my options for majoring, and helped me prepare.
- I have someone to talk to when I have problems.
- My adviser gave me the reassurance that I could still be successful despite a disastrous freshman year.
- It helped me narrow things down for backup majors and to know what I need to be working on for my intended major.
- It was wonderful to find out about options for research at the UW.

These preliminary results indicate that students appreciate the ISAP intervention. Whether the individualized approach will result in students declaring their majors earlier is not yet known. This goal will be assessed during the 2005-06 academic year, the students' junior year. Assessment of the project will be completed by June 2006 for the first cohort of students (those who entered the University in Autumn 2003). What is apparent at this point is that students who fully utilize advising services make better-informed choices about academic and extracurricular endeavors, which should result in greater satisfaction with their UW experience while improving satisfactory progress toward graduation.

The project is funded on temporary money that will carry it through the 2005-06 academic year. The current funding level of 3.5 advisers translates to an adviser to student ratio of 1:850. In order to contact all the identified students over the course of one year the ratio must be closer to 1:400. Funding two additional full-time advisers would lower the ratio to 1:550 and would guarantee that all students with cumulative grade point averages below 3.5 would be contacted. Although this represents double the number of students for 2004-05, a significant population of students, those with GPAs above 3.5, would not be served. Data collected so far shows that these accomplished students also benefit from the intervention as they make decisions on their education. To contact all targeted students (second-year, premajor, non-EOP or other support) would require funding for 7.5 full-time advisers.

Recommendation #6: Continue the OMA Academic Development Initiative to enhance developmental advising and career planning with emphasis on options to high-demand majors.

Enhanced Advising Initiatives Office of Minority Affairs

In the spring of 2004, the Office of Minority Affairs Counseling Center implemented two key initiatives, the Comprehensive Mentor Program (CMP) and Academic Development Program (ADP), to increase the academic success, personal growth, and leadership development of Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) students. Following is a summary of accomplishments, recommended changes, and expansions for the 2004-2005 year, and a brief description of two new proposed initiatives for the next biennium.

Comprehensive Mentor Program

The OMA/UWAA Mentor Program expanded operations in three different areas: outreach and recruitment, promotional enhancement, and program development. Increased outreach and recruitment led to increased participation. In Autumn 2004 there was a record high number of 368 participants. Winter 2005 saw 132 student mentors/career mentors involved in the Career Mentor Program. Increased participation can also be attributed to promotional enhancements, such as the Mentor Power for Success marketing campaign featuring newly developed materials such as posters, fliers, a website, and handbook.

Online tools were created such as an application form and student mentor/protégé survey. A Catalyst WebQ Online Survey was developed with the Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) to assess the effectiveness of the 2004-2005 Student Mentor Program. Two workshops were developed. The first, "Got Personality…Understanding Personality Types and Your Majors/Careers" (a two-day workshop using the MBTI), was implemented in Autumn 2004. A second, "Growing the Leader Within You" (a one day workshop designed to develop student leadership skills), is currently being developed.

Future recommendations: To continue current activities and expand upon them by offering a Mentor Event at the end of the year; creating such outreach materials as a Mentor brochure and career mentor poster; developing a mentor seminar integrating the two currently offered workshops; and increasing online survey response by offering incentives.

Academic Development Initiative

A developmental approach was used to create several projects aimed at addressing the needs of students. Five of the projects are designed to assist freshmen and sophomores in declaring their major in a timely manner. The sixth project, yet to be developed, is an exit survey for seniors, dropouts, and stop-outs.

Three of the projects are directed toward freshmen. Two use the MBTI as an assessment tool: the Mentor workshops described above and a two-day presentation to freshmen in Engineering 202A, designed in collaboration with the Minority Science and Engineering Program (MSEP). EOP advisers developed a website to provide online access to the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and Strong Interest Inventory (SII), which was also used by the Mentor Program. The third project, a Freshman Expectation survey, will be implemented in Spring 2005.

Of the two projects aimed at sophomores, one continued the collaboration with MSEP by offering the MBTI and SII to sophomores and other students in the Winter quarter Engineering 202A class. Following the workshops, advisers created an "Options to Science Majors" brochure. The Second Year Survey (SYS) Sophomore Advising Program provided intensive academic advising to second year students during individual appointments. The SYS program is designed to make students aware of the full range of university resources and help them choose an academic direction.

Future recommendations: Continue and expand current activities, with the possibility of extending collaborative efforts with Engineering and other departments, such as Psychology, Anthropology, History, Biology, and Chemistry.

Proposed New Initiatives:
1. Hire a Retention Technical Specialist to maintain and update the statistical data collected for the enhanced Comprehensive Mentor Program and the Academic Development Program. Provide web and publication development and maintenance for both programs.
2. Develop an electronic advising system to improve efficiency and intra-program sharing. (Potentially part of the electronic advising file project currently underway)

Recommendation #7: Initiate a discussion with competitive departments to explore multiple criteria for admission.

The University statement on admissions includes the following:

The University's policy is to offer admission to those applicants who are the most able to benefit from and contribute to the University's educational resources. In selecting the freshman class, the University does not make its admission decisions solely on the basis of predicted academic performance. Important academic objectives are furthered by classes composed of students having talents and skills derived from diverse backgrounds.

The University currently admits a student body that is comprised of 11% under-represented minorities (African American, Filipino, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Latino and Native American).

To ensure that students in all majors benefit from the diversity of the student body and that students from all backgrounds have access to all majors, the proportion of under-represented minorities in each major should closely align with their proportion in the student body. For majors with competitive admission processes, an analysis of enrollment in majors and degrees earned by major reveal that some programs meet or exceed this expectation while others fall far short. See Table I. Further analysis is required to determine if the low proportion of under-represented minorities in a program is a result of student interest in the major, admissions procedures, or retention issues. Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) should be asked to study the demographics of applicants, admits, enrollees and graduates. Once the problem area(s) are identified for a major, a qualitative study is necessary to define the problem and identify strategies to remedy the situation.

Historically mathematics and science programs have a low proportion of under-represented minorities. The data for UW majors is summarized in Table II. Analysis of demographic data on student interests at entrance, declaration of mathematics and science majors and retention in these majors will identify the causes of the low enrollment of under-represented groups. A review of University efforts to recruit and prepare students for science and mathematics majors would identify gaps that should be addressed by future initiatives.

While the above review is being conducted the following efforts to improve the climate in departments should be initiated.

- Inclusion of a representative appointed by OMA as a non-voting member to the admission committees of every competitive department. The representative is expected to work with the department in establishing admissions criteria as well as a process for the selection of students.

- Professional development for all academic advisers aimed at ensuring a welcoming climate in every adviser's office.

- A fund that provides resources for departments to initiative efforts to improve the climate for students enrolled in the department's courses and/or major(s).

TABLE I. Degrees Earned (AUT98-SUM04) by and Declared Majors (AUT04) of Under-Represented Minority Students (URM*) in Competitive Majors

MAJOR	DEGREES EARNED			DECLARED MAJOR		
	# URM	TOTAL	%URM	# URM	TOTAL	%URM
College of Architecture						
Architectural Studies	31	290	11%	11	104	11%
Community & Environmental Planning	14	165	8%	1	35	3%
Construction Management	16	287	6%	1	96	1%
Landscape Architecture	2	82	2%	2	43	5%
College of Arts and Sciences						
Art (various majors)	146	1385	11%	35	500	7%
Communication	189	1750	11%	57	551	10%
Computer Sciences	17	479	4%	10	254	4%
International Studies	114	1177	10%	54	524	10%
Law, Societies and Justice	61	401	15%	11	82	13%
Music	18	233	8%	7	171	4%
Neurobiology	10	180	6%	6	62	10%
Psychology	330	2874	11%	62	621	10%
Business School	472	4682	10%	150	2003	7%
College of Engineering						
Aeronautics & Astronautics	15	252	6%	5	106	5%
Bioengineering	0	15	0%	8	95	8%
Chemical Engineering	28	320	9%	10	121	8%
Civil Engineering	45	469	10%	17	219	8%
Computer Engineering	18	310	6%	5	161	3%
Electrical Engineering	71	1088	7%	30	463	6%
Industrial Engineering	21	182	12%	9	90	10%
Materials Science & Engineering	14	66	21%	7	82	9%
Mechanical Engineering	51	676	8%	20	235	9%
Technical Communication	27	171	16%	8	56	14%
Information School (Informatics major)	12	78	15%	14	108	13%
School of Nursing (Nursing major)	63	432	15%	37	233	16%
School of Social Work (Social Welfare)	63	300	21%	19	99	19%

TABLE II. Degrees Earned (AUT98-SUM04) by and Declared Majors (AUT04) of Under-Represented Minority Students (URM*) in Science and Mathematics Majors.

MAJOR	DEGREES EARNED			DECLARED MAJOR		
	# URM	TOTAL	%URM	# URM	TOTAL	%URM
College of Arts and Sciences						
Applied Computational Math Science	18	312	6%	8	109	7%
Biochemistry	46	652	7%	54	600	9%
Biology/Botany/Zoology	153	1614	9%	64	796	8%
Chemistry	30	349	9%	29	323	9%
Earth and Space Sciences/Geology	7	140	5%	11	122	9%
Economics	111	1754	6%	56	719	8%
Mathematics	32	418	8%	21	208	10%
Microbiology	35	310	11%	11	120	9%
Physics	15	329	5%	19	310	6%
College of Forest Resources						
Environmental Science & Resource Management	NA**	NA**	NA**	9	63	14%
Paper Science & Engineering	4	62	6%	5	59	8%

*URM = African American, Filipino, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Latino and Native American.

**Environmental Science & Resource Management major was initiated in 2003.

Recommendation #8: Complete a major self–study and external review of undergraduate advising, including advising in the Gateway Center, the Office of Minority Affairs, and all departmental advisers.

Timeline for self-study and external review:

March 31, 2005	Initial report to advisory group and external reviewers
April 7-8, 2005	External Review visit, complete report during visit
	James Anderson, Vice President and Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment and Diversity, Texas A&M
	Jerry Hogle, Vice Provost for Instruction, University of Arizona
	Esrold Nurse, Assistant Dean, Student Academic Affairs, College of Literature, Sciences and the Arts, University of Michigan
May 2005	UW visits to other campuses
June 15, 2005	Summary report and recommendations from advisory group to provost

Components of the advising self-study

Method	Group	Type of Information

Surveys	• Advisers
	  o Department
	  o OMA
	  o Gateway
	  o SAAS
	  o Tacoma & Bothell
		• About the advisers and their work, training and professional development, communication and connections, factors that help and hinder work, suggestions for improvement

	• Students	• Level of use, factors that hinder use, who they go to for advising, issues discussed, consistency of information, how well advising needs being met, suggestions for improvement
Interviews (group and/or individual)	• Departmental advisers • OMA advisers • Gateway advisers • SAAS advisers • Current and former staff	Effectiveness of current advising structure – for advisers and students, self advising, consistency of information, evaluation, communication and connections, diversity
Phone census	• Departments	Information on organizational structure of advising services in the departments
Review of existing material		Background on advising at UW
Review of academic advising literature		Background on advising (development, themes and issues)
Peer review		Information on how advising conducted at peer institutions

Recommendation #9: Institute electronic processes to monitor student academic progress to degree.

The intent of this recommendation is to ensure that students are making progress toward satisfying degree requirements by taking courses that meet those requirements. Some departments, most notably competitive admission departments such as engineering, currently have continuation policies for students enrolled in the department's major. These policies tend to include some or all of the following:

1. Maintaining full-time status with at least 12 credits earned per quarter.
2. Maintaining a certain quarterly overall GPA.
3. Maintaining a certain overall GPA in courses within the major.
4. Maintaining enrollment without excessive course repeats, drops or withdrawals.

For non-competitive majors, a student should be expected to complete courses within his/her major in order to make satisfactory progress toward a degree. To facilitate monitoring of enrollment in courses within a declared major, the registrar's office should be asked to provide a quarterly report that lists the students with a particular declared major who have completed less than 3 credits in the department that offers the major during the previous quarter. Departments are expected to advise students who are not making satisfactory progress. The greatest increase in advising load will be in departments that do not currently monitor academic progress, particularly departments with large numbers of majors. These departments are primarily located in the College of Arts and Sciences. (***Need numbers to assess impact)

Recommendation #10: Institute approval processes for change of major, change of degree, and for enrolling in multiple majors or degrees.

When an undergraduate enters a major he/she must complete a change-of-major form that requires the signatures of the adviser in the department they are entering and the adviser in the department they are leaving. The addition of a second major also requires the change-of-major form with signatures from both departmental advisers. Currently there are no guidelines for adviser approval of changing majors or adding majors.

UW policy states that undergraduates must complete their degree(s) within 30 credits beyond what is required for graduation. For most degrees, 180 credits are required and graduation is expected by 210 credits. Current implementation of this policy involves requiring students who have earned 210 credits and have not applied for graduation to complete a graduation plan that includes graduation within two quarters (approximately 240 credits).

Changing from one major or degree to another
Establish the following guidelines for departmental approval of change from one major or degree to another.
  * The student must articulate an acceptable rationale for how the new major relates to his/her educational plan and personal goals.
  * The student's academic plan must include completion of the new major within a reasonable number of credits, not to exceed 210 credits. Change of major will ideally occur before the student has completed 135 credits.
A student whose plan falls outside the guidelines may request a review for approval from the dean of the college of the new major or degree or his/her designee(s). Attention must be paid to the efficiency of this approval process.

Adding a major
Establish the following guidelines for departmental approval of multiple majors..
  * The student must be enrolled in one major before adding any other majors.
  * Enrollment in the additional major must occur before the student has completed 135 credits.
  * The student must articulate an acceptable rationale for how all majors relate to his/her educational plan and personal goals.
  * The student must be able to show the commitment and ability to complete all majors within a reasonable number of credits, not to exceed 210 credits. For any major that is a coherent program through which students move as a cohort, the student must show how the proposed academic plan allows full participation in the cohort.
A student whose plan falls outside the guidelines may request review for approval from the dean of the college that offers the majors or his/her designee(s). Attention must be paid to the efficiency of this approval process

Adding a degree
Formalize structured dual degree options, such as BA/BM in Music, to be entered as one code. Admission and graduation requirements for dual degrees are determined by the departments and are subject to approval by the colleges that offer the degrees and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, but are not subject to the guidelines below.

Establish the following guidelines for departmental approval of individualized concurrent degrees..
  * The student must be admitted to one major before applying for the addition of an additional degree.
  * Enrollment in an additional degree program must occur before the student has completed 135 credits.
  * The student must have sophomore standing and completed at least 30 credits at UW with at least a 3.0 GPA.
  * The student must articulate an acceptable rationale for how all degrees relate to his/her educational plan and personal goals.
  * The student must be able to show the commitment and ability to complete all degrees within a reasonable number of credits, not to exceed 210 credits. For a degree program that is a coherent program through which students move as a cohort, the student must show how the proposed academic plan allows full participation in the cohort.
The student whose academic plan falls outside the guidelines may request a review for approval from the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation). Attention must be paid to the efficiency of this approval process

Disallow awarding concurrent degrees in the same college when the programs lead to the same degree. Such students should pursue concurrent majors.

Faculty Senate
The Faculty Council on Academic Standards has agreed to pursue legislation to
  * Eliminate the university's 45-credit requirement for concurrent degrees. Encourage colleges to adopt an individualized-concurrent-degree policy in the context of the above guidelines.
  * Reduce the 45-credit requirement for post-baccalaureate degrees to 30 credits. A post-baccalaureate student must complete the residency requirement (45 credits out of last 60) only if he/she has not already done so.

Recommendation #11: Institute mandatory advising for students on academic warning and probation.

Identify students who meet one of the following criteria:
- On warning
- On probation
- Quarter GPA below 2.0 for two consecutive quarters
- Excessive drops, incompletes or 'X' grades in two consecutive quarters

Goal is for every student in the above categories to meet with an adviser before registering for the following quarter. Discussion with adviser will include the following:
- Explanation of low scholarship status and the grades required to move off of warning and probation.
- Analysis of student's situation that led to low scholarship status.
- Discussion of resources to address academic difficulty and personal issues.
- Discussion of student's academic direction, which, where appropriate, includes options that may be more appropriate for student's goals and talents.
- Schedule next appointment for beginning of subsequent quarter and give student list of actions to complete before that appointment.

Students will meet with an EOP, departmental, or Gateway adviser. EOP advisers will continue their current practice of contacting EOP students on warning and probation. A department may decide either to contact the students in the department's majors or to refer the students to EOP and Gateway advisers. Gateway advisers will contact pre-major students who are not affiliated with EOP. Approximate number of students in these categories is 600 per quarter based on data from 2000-2004.

Recommendation #12: Establish and require continuing education/training and development for all academic advisers.

The intent of this recommendation is to ensure a consistent level of expertise and professionalism among advisers across campus. The responsibility rests with the departments who employ advisers and the administrator who oversees advising for the Seattle campus (currently assistant dean in Office of Undergraduate Education).

To ensure consistency in advising services advisers are expected to participate in professional developments activities. Departments are expected to support these activities. This support includes

- An adviser and his/her supervisor working together to decide what activities are appropriate for the adviser's responsibilities and experience level.
- Accommodation for time away from the office for the adviser to participate in professional development activities.

The Assistant Dean is expected to support professional development activities by providing

- Consulting services to assist advisers and supervisors in developing professional development plans.
- Professional development activities related to the University's policies and procedures.
- Coordination of workshops and other professional development activities.
- A resource list and calendar of professional development events including a mechanism for individual advisers to share information on specific activities.
- Leadership for the Adviser Education Program.

Financial support for the professional development activities will be provided by the Provost's Office. Included are funds for conference travel costs, workshop fees and other costs associated with professional development activities. Annually the assistant dean will report to the provost on how funds were spent.

Professional development activities include training, workshops, mentoring, conference attendance/presentations, exchanges, and coursework. The following activities are either current activities that should be expanded or new activities that should be developed.

- Undergraduate Advisers Council initiates policy discussions:
    - When a new policy is implemented or a significant change occurs in a current policy, information on the policy will be sent to undergraduate advisers by their UA Council representative and meetings will be scheduled for discussion of the policy.
    - "Is it still working?" sessions to discuss current policies for which the UA Council determines either the policy or the advisers need an update.
- Quarterly core workshops on topics and skills identified as central to the work or UW advisers.
- Campus-wide collaborative and committee work. (University Committees such as Career Week, PSO Board, Undergraduate Advisers Council, and other activities, such as conducting workshops for other advisers and participating in reading groups.
- An adviser exchange program formalizes a short-term (one-half to two-day) experience in a different environment. Examples are shadowing advisers in other UW offices or at other institutions, observing the operation of a UW program (McNair Program, Interdisciplinary Writing Program, etc.), and visiting the work site of a graduate of the adviser's program. An adviser-trainer would coordinate the exchanges and maintain a list of exchanges completed by advisers.
- Voluntary mentoring program facilitates interaction between an experienced adviser and an adviser new to advising at UW. An adviser-trainer coordinates the mentoring program.
- Format of spring All Advisers Meeting is revised to include an outside speaker. At a later date the meeting may be reformatted to include a conference style approach with presentations by campus advisers.

Establish a training requirement for all undergraduate and graduate students working as peer advisers.

- Within the first six months of hiring, peer advisers must participate in an 40-hour training program. The training period may be concentrated or spread over an extended period of time not to exceed one quarter. Peer advisers are paid during their training activities.
- During their employment peer advisers must attend quarterly update meetings.

Oversight of the continuing education program resides with the Office of Undergraduate Education assistant dean responsible for undergraduate advising.

Recommendation #13: Establish a system that improves the flow of important information to all advisers and regularizes opportunities for cross campus adviser discussion of issues and consensus building.

Flow of information:

Advising expertise involves the management of an increasing amount of information. The flow of information occurs in three ways: within departments, from administrative offices to departments, and across departments. The efficiency of the first is handled within departments. The second, from administrative offices to advisers, is now facilitated by the Undergraduate Advisers Council, which has improved the timeliness of the dissemination of information on new policies and procedures.

The third, information flow across departments, is more difficult to manage mainly because of the volume of detailed information generated by each department. Some strategies that may improve this process:

- Improve the efficiency of updates to the on-line catalog (Curriculum Office)
- Institute an annual accuracy review of all university and department websites (Curriculum Office).
- Develop an electronic archive of information disseminated on the advisers listserv and catalog changes. Departments could also submit items for the newsletter directly.
- Hire a consultant to examine our information management system and recommend improvements.

Discussion of issues and consensus building:

- Undergraduate Advisers Council initiates policy discussions:
  - When a new policy is implemented or a significant change occurs in a current policy, information on the policy will be sent to undergraduate advisers by their UA Council representative and meetings will be scheduled for discussion of the policy.
  - "Is it still working?" sessions to discuss current policies for which the UA Council determines either the policy or the advisers need an update.
- Undergraduate Advisers Council groups meet at least once per year with Assistant Dean to raise issues and build consensus on solutions.

Recommendation #14: Establish a credit bank for selected pre-college credits (AP, IB, CHS).

Instead of a credit bank define a "satisfactory progress credit total" that is used exclusively for the 210-credit policy. Excluded from this total would be Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB). College in the High School credits are not included because they are likely to be state-supported in the future. For freshmen entering in Autumn 2004, 1621 brought in 23,000 AP credits for an average of 14.5 credits per student. No data available for IB credits.

Recommendation #15: No more than 30 credits earned in foreign study, undergraduate research, public service internships, and service learning be exempt from academic progress totals, if those types of experiences are not established parts of their program of study.

A credit bank for university credits is not recommended because all UW credits should be counted toward graduation and, thus, towards satisfactory progress.