

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

June 1st, 2017
10:30am – 12:00pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from May 4th, 2017
 3. Working Group Updates
 4. Good of the Order
 5. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. Halverson served as proxy chair while Turner was briefly absent.

2) Review of the Minutes from May 4th, 2017

The minutes from May 4th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Working Group Updates

Best Practices in Online/Hybrid Teaching and Learning Environments

Zontine noted the subcommittee held a discussion of its goals for the 2017-2018 academic year and set a strong foundation for the next year.

Cataloging Assessment and Improvement of Teaching & Learning Across Colleges

Jones-Wiles (president's designee) explained the subcommittee plans to hold an event during fall of 2017 centered on excellence in student learning. She noted tips and tools will be presented on enhancing student learning, and three to four presenters are planned to give talks on effective teaching. Jones-Wiles explained if the event proves successful, it might be something the FCTL chooses to hold on an annual basis.

There was some discussion of the newly-created Guide to Evaluating Teaching in Tenure & Promotion Cases (developed by the Center for Teaching and Learning in consultation with various Faculty Councils), and specifically the effectiveness of its dissemination. Several members explained they never received the completed Guide, though the document was supposedly sent by all deans to their faculty. Other members confirmed they did receive it.

Additional discussion focused on the recent change to administer student course evaluations online, and several members reported a reduced student response rate. Tom Lewis (Director, Academic Experience Design & Delivery) explained there are policies the university could implement to bolster online response rates, such as granting early viewing access of student grades to those who complete evaluations, but implementation of such a measure would require sign off from FCTL and others including the Provost.

Teaching and Learning Effectiveness for Part-time Lecturers

Tihanyi showed a report document as well as part-time lecturer survey results, which were generated by the subcommittee as a conclusion to the year's work (Exhibit 1) (Exhibit 2). The report includes a list of recommendations to improve pedagogical and professional conditions for part-time lecturers. Tihanyi explained of the surveyed part-time lecturers, over half (51%) have been affiliated with UW for more than five years, and 48% for one to five years. It was noted the third recommendation in the report would be addressed further during the summer.

The council thanked the subcommittee for its extensive effort surrounding the topic.

Teaching Effectiveness

McGough explained the subcommittee has finished development of the map of teaching resources. There was some discussion of methods for dissemination for the resource, including through the personalized academic resource portal, MyUW. The subcommittee was thanked for its development of the resource.

Diversity- and Equity-Informed Pedagogies

Hornby noted she would like to make "equity in pedagogy" a regular agenda item of FCTL in the next year (to be regularly readdressed in meetings). She emphasized it's importance to pedagogy at the UW.

Zachry gave some information on a program sponsored by the UW Simpson Center for the Humanities, which held two events to discuss "accommodations of difference in writing instruction." The program is expected to extend into academic year 2017-2018.

Howells mentioned the Nursing School might be a good resource relating to diversity in pedagogy, as the School has effectively integrated the topic into their program offerings.

Opinions on subcommittees

Halverson asked if members felt their subcommittees' work was finished, or if the bodies should continue during 2017-2018. Members felt their subcommittee work was ongoing. A member encouraged that items within FCTL's 2016-17 charge letter be readdressed in academic year 2017-18.

4) Good of the Order

Use of student data

Lewis explained he would like to hold a follow-up discussion from the last meeting on the use of learning analytics at the UW. He presented a document showing draft objectives and principles for learning analytics, which had been revised based on feedback from the FCTL (in its previous meeting) and other stakeholders (Exhibit 3).

Lewis provided an overview of changes in the document. The main change relates to the “Governance” section, revised to state that “the Faculty Council for Teaching & Learning will exercise oversight over the goals for the use of learning analytics,” while the Provost’s Office will oversee access to the data. Specifically, the FCTL is to preserve the goals of learning analytics, be consulted on who uses the data and for what purpose. It was further clarified that new goals and uses for learning analytics will likely arise on their own, and the council will be asked its position on permitting or rejecting those proposals. It was noted the primary goal of learning analytics at the UW has already been defined as “improving student success.” Lewis noted the FCTL will be asked to provide oversight as soon as is reasonable, however, no decisions need be made until fall, 2017. Lewis explained a new data governance structure for the UW is being developed by the Provost’s Office and other administrative experts, and faculty input is being sought out for this process.

A member explained a report developed by a campus agency showed that students who leave the UW most commonly do so for reasons of depression or emotional distress. She encouraged using analytics to develop policies that relate to improving student retention and time-to-degree.

There was a question concerning which office at the UW would hold responsibility over data security and privacy. Lewis explained his team within UW-IT would be partly responsible for these elements.

A member encouraged that the document be shared with the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) in order to inform widely and gain other-campus perspectives. Other members agreed and noted at the very least, FCTL should have representation from the other campuses during 2017-2018. Another member asked if students will have access to analytics reports, leading to extended discussion of potential use-cases. There was discussion of using micro-level data to aid students with various aspects of their education (e.g. degree completion). There was some discussion of “happy paths” – pathways of least resistance to degree completion. It was noted the last sentence of the first paragraph seems to presume there will be micro-level data used at the UW (Exhibit 3).

A member encouraged consideration of how academic advisors might use learning analytics data, as well as consideration of what is shared with students concerning their own data. “Transparency” is unaddressed in the document, a member commented.

A member suggested the topic might be the focus of a subcommittee in the fall of 2017. Alternatively, another member recommended no subcommittee be formed, and the topic be discussed by the full council at every juncture.

A motion was made, stating: “the FCTL takes responsibility for managing the process of moving forward with governance-related elements of learning analytics.” The motion was approved by a majority of voting members.

Lewis explained the document has been disseminated to the other UW campuses. Howells, Bookstein, Peterson, Zachry, Walls, and Gillis-Bridges volunteered to be on a small group to be consulted over the summer concerning learning analytics policy and associated governance structures.

Discussion was halted due to time constraints.

5) Adjourn

Halverson adjourned the meeting at noon.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Ellen McGough, Jennifer Taggart, Dan Turner (chair), Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges, Timea Tihanyi, Kathleen Peterson, Fred Bookstein, Amy Howells, Mark Zachry, Thomas Halverson
Ex-officio reps: Amanda Hornby, Alexandra Walls, Maria Zontine
President's designee: LeAnne Jones Wiles
Guests: Tom Lewis, Christine Sugatan

Absent: **Faculty:** David Masuda
Ex-officio reps: Meixi Ng

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – PTL_Teaching_effectiveness_Subcommittee_final_report_May_2017.pdf

Exhibit 2 – Statistics for FCTL Part Time Lecturer Survey.pdf

Exhibit 3 – Analytics_principles5.doc

Supporting Teaching and Learning Effectiveness for Part-Time Lecturers

Committee Report 2016-17

Members: Timea Tihanyi, Senior Lecturer, School of Art + Art History + Design (Chair); Christine Sugatan, Program Administrator, Center for Teaching and Learning; Jennifer Taggart, Principal Lecturer, Mathematics; Mark Zachry, Professor, Human Centered Design & Engineering.

The Subcommittee's Charge for 2016-17

- Explore the landscape of existing support and resources available to Part-Time Lecturers (PTLs).
- Identify a list of resources available/most useful specifically to PTLs to aid in their own development and meet their level of readiness given their more limited investment of time at the UW.
- Identify the need for additional teaching and learning support and/or a more efficient distribution of information related to existing resources.
- Produce a concise set of recommendations to use in onboarding, teaching and learning effectiveness, professional development and sustainability for PTLs.

Survey Method and Process

The Subcommittee on Part-Time Lecturers designed and conducted an online survey using Catalyst WebQ and distributed it to a list of 1000 PTLs who were on payroll for the 2015-16 academic year (information provided by Academic HR). This survey did not include instructors with contracts through Professional and Continuing Education.

We received a large volume of responses with a total of 194 participants (nearly a 20% participation rate). Our survey participant pool included a 10% response rate from instructors who did not get rehired in 2016-17.

In the spring of 2017, we provided preliminary reports to the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL). As we reported at the FCTL meetings then, the subcommittee's approach was to ask and analyze questions that explore the landscape of existing support and resources available, most used by, and

found as most useful by PTLs. We explored patterns of use of the above resources both at the campus level and at unit levels. Further, we identified specific areas where existing support meets the actual and perceived needs of PTLs. Finally, we identified specific areas where there is need for additional support or where use patterns would indicate considerations for alternative solutions (for distribution, efficiency, or implementation).

Our survey complements some of the findings in the 2014 “LECTURERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON: SEATTLE CAMPUS CONSOLIDATED REPORT,” which is available at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/06/uws_lecturer.pdf .

In addition, we consulted the 2011-12 Survey of UW Tacoma Lecturers, which is available at https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/Lecturer_Affairs_Report_Dawson_5-31-16.pdf, and the “2016 UW LECTURER SURVEY REPORT” conducted by UW Faculty Forward, available here: <http://www.uwfacultyforward.org/library>.

Our working group has received valuable information and feedback from the Academic Experience Design & Delivery division of the UW Information Technology (UW-IT) team, the FCTL Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning Effectiveness, and Vice Provost Philip J. Reid (Academic & Student Affairs).

Issues specific to PTLs

UW PTLs are non-promotable instructional titles that are identified by Academic HR using the following two job codes:

1) Title: Lecturer, Part-time

Job Class Code: 0185

<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/job-class-codes/lecturer-part-time/>

Length of Appointment: May be on an annual part-time basis, or quarter-by-quarter up to 100%.

2) Title: Lecturer, Part-time, competitive recruitment

Job Class Code: 0140

<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/job-class-codes/lecturer-part-time-competitive-recruitment/>

Service Period: 3, 6, 9 or 12 months (1 or 2 months for summer quarter only)

Length of Appointment: May be on an annual or multiple year (1-5 years) part-time basis (minimum 50% FTE), or quarter-by-quarter up to 100%.

There is a large variation among units and within units in the length and frequency of each appointment, as well as in types of teaching assignments and course loads.

Survey Findings

Survey Population

Over 30% of survey respondents were from the College of Arts & Sciences, 14% from the Foster School of Business, 11% from the College of Engineering, and 10% from Law. Over half (51%) have been affiliated with UW for more than 5 years and 48% for one to five years. In terms of the number of courses taught per year, 48% teach 1-2 courses per year and 41% teach three or more. Most PT Lecturers (70%) were the principal instructor of a self-designed course in a specific content area; 28% were the principal instructor of a course also taught by other instructors; and 11% co-taught their courses. A large portion of instruction by responders (67%) was in active learning spaces such as seminars, discussion sections, labs, studios, or other project-based learning environments; 40% of instruction was in small lectures; and 19% in large lectures.

Landscape of Existing Support and Perceived Need for Support

Participants were asked to rate the level of support they received as a new instructor. The level of support available from the unit was generally described as at least “adequate” with regard to hiring (e.g., teaching responsibilities, evaluation of teaching), and working (e.g., building policies, lab use, equipment, safety, FERPA), with the exception of communication about promotion, rehiring, and raises. Regularly used campuswide teaching resources included the following: Canvas LMS at 75% (which is not surprising as it is one of the most promoted services at the UW and one that is most universally used across various teaching institutions) and MyUW (69%). On the other hand, two thirds (66%) of the respondents also noted consulting their own resources (e.g., previous syllabi and course website) in preparation for teaching a course.

Participants were asked to rate the level of availability of teaching resources. Most participants rated as “not available” or “somewhat difficult to access” each of the following: procedures, and policies related to teaching, existing pool of departmental teaching resources (such as course syllabi and best practices), advice from senior colleagues within the unit, and connections with fellow instructors outside of the home unit.

Campus-wide resources, such as workshops and learning communities offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and teaching with technology/LMS workshops offered by UW-IT were also noted as not readily accessible due to general unawareness to the existence of these or being underutilized due to inconvenient timing. Participants noted that “outside of the unit, it is unclear where to go and whom to ask for help.”

Additional challenges listed were:

- Changes in student demographics, teaching/learning habits, and technologies.
- “Navigating communication gap” within department cultures.
- Having no designated go-to person in the instructional unit.

It is also notable that, in preparation for teaching at the UW, 90% of participants rated their own previous experience as the most critical, while 67% would request advice from colleagues, and 34% would welcome access to departmental resources (e.g., syllabi) if they were available.

Related to UW online resources, many respondents noted that efficiency in accessing information matters. Some information is technically available but is located in obscure places or requires excessive clicking to navigate to.

Many participants expressed a need for “human contact on top of web resources” such as a point person in the unit, and for maintaining access to library services and to one’s own prior course content in Canvas LMS when off of payroll, especially if they are rehired regularly.

Recommendations

After assessing the responses to our survey, we developed four actionable recommendations. The first two of these focus on the unit, while the last two and, in some extent, #2, would require consideration and action at the University level.

1. Peer-mentor system at the unit/program level

Our findings suggest that units/departments/programs would benefit from establishing paths of contact and extending an invitation to PTLs to connect with their hiring unit on a regular basis. Many PTLs requested an opportunity to “meet face to face with department heads, program heads, and other faculty in a setting in which the role of part time faculty is clearly explained as part of the overall plan for teaching students.” PTLs should feel welcome to use teaching resources available to full-time faculty. Units may consider ways to allow and encourage peer-mentoring (for example as a service component for FT faculty) and peer-feedback (collegial evaluation, review and consultation opportunities).

2. Toolkit

The purpose of the toolkit is to supply consistent teaching and learning information in an efficient manner across units and colleges but to keep it easily accessible to the individual user and easily customizable for the department or unit with unit-specific resources.

A key to this efficiency is easy navigation, relevance to tasks on hand that need to be done at a certain time in the quarter, and one-click access from a designated main site, such as MyUW or departmental intranet.

Two examples that the committee have discussed for the delivery of such a toolkit are a customizable web-based template and a departmental welcome package. A customizable web-based template could be a set of building blocks that UW-IT may develop and distribute to the departments/units. It is up to each unit to populate the template with current and unit-specific content. This content could appear as part of the MyUW Teaching page to the individual user.

Similarly, a welcome package may be developed by each unit, containing current procedural and teaching related information for new/returning faculty. Such welcome package would be automatically sent to the the instructor when the appointment is entered into payroll.

A toolkit would contain

- a map of teaching/learning resources (such as the one developed by FCTL Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning Effectiveness);
- clear procedural information for teaching-related issues (e.g., classroom reservations, TA oversight, textbook selection and ordering, content creation) and working (e.g., student course evaluations and collegial evaluation, new course proposals, re-hiring, merit and raise);
- FAQ's to address best practices for teaching and situations specific to PTLs (e.g., whom to contact outside of the department's traditional working hours).

3. Extended Affiliation and Access to Services

Our subcommittee found it essential that PTLs be provided clear procedural information and a workable timeline at hiring. In addition to addressing those needs, we recommend further consideration of extended access to UW systems (library, Canvas LMS, MyUW, and general computing services) outside the period of the contract, especially in cases of instructors who are regularly and repeatedly hired.

4. New and expanded development opportunities

While a significant amount of teaching support for PT Lecturers may come from within the units/departments/programs, the CTL (in consultation with lecturers) can be positioned to create new and to expand current professional development opportunities to PT faculty. Since scheduling during regular office hours is the biggest obstacle for most PTLs, we see much potential in participatory webinars, online workshops, and Learning Communities designed for PTLs.

The CTL may also consider partnering with units and working as a facilitator of peer-to-peer workshops or unit-specific teaching questions. The timing of such workshops is critical to success; for example, extending affiliation for PTLs could make such workshops accessible to faculty several weeks prior to the start of the quarter.

Additional Perspectives from Part Time Lecturers

We found the survey respondents to be thoughtful and generous in sharing their perspectives about their experiences at UW. Much of this feedback is not directly aligned with our top-level recommendations above, but nevertheless deserves consideration. We provide selected comments from the participants below.

Professional Development

“As a part-time lecturer, I have two additional jobs that enable me to survive, so time for additional professional development is hard to carve out of my life. However, I copied a list of

the resources you cited in this survey, and I will follow up to see what is currently available. Thank you - this was helpful.”

“I would love to have an ‘open-door’ that I could utilize to bounce off ideas, gain a fresh perspective, get feedback and insight.”

“This past fall, [my unit] began providing an orientation program to part-time lecturers. This helped me learn some of the personnel basics, and gave me the opportunity to meet other part-timers, which made me feel like less of an outcast. As a part-timer at [this unit], I feel there is zero opportunity for professional development, and zero opportunity for career advancement, so even a modicum of structure or guidance in those areas would be helpful.”

“I would love to have more interaction with the program I teach in including pre-course, during course, and after course. I want to be able to have a planning time with the other instructors and the program to ensure we are all meeting the same objectives. I would like to have a post-course review, esp. of evaluations to develop a constructive plan to improve the course for the next time I teach it. Overall I often feel very much on my own teaching without much of a support system. Most of what I know has just come from my years of teaching the class and trial/error.”

Awareness

“It would have been particularly helpful to know about any type of workshops or orientations for new lecturers. But beyond knowing, it would have been helpful for [my unit] to have made an effort to actively bring these resources to our attention and perhaps even design some sessions for the adjunct lecturers in the program.”

Access

“You may offer things to help, but I have a job and so things that happen at 2:00 on a Thursday or whatever, those may as well not exist. Online things would be best.”

Resources

“Probably I could find information on them if I were to seek it out, however a UW onboarding for part time instructors that provides an overview of the available resources would be helpful.”

“On-boarding information clearly listing the available resources, and someone to talk to from the outset to give general advice, and answer any specific questions.”

“Revised library policies that allow me to check out books/materials if I have an appt in the calendar year.”

Employment Arrangements

“Stable schedule so I know ahead of time what I am teaching so I can prepare. The PCE gives me a schedule/contracts 1 year ahead of time. It would be great if other departments did the same for Part time lecturers.”

“What would really help is to feel some sense of being welcome at the school. I've taught at [UW] for over 6 years and have never been welcomed by anyone other than one or two support staff. Aside from large group email blasts to all faculty about general topics of interest to the school and, perhaps, faculty, there is very little feeling of connectedness to the school. What would help is to meet face to face with department heads, program heads, and other faculty in a setting in which the role of part time faculty is clearly explained as part of the overall plan for teaching students. Resources should be clearly identified, and part-time faculty should be made to feel like they're truly welcome to use those resources.”

Communication

“Periodic check-in's with school administrators to see how things are going with the class and to remind instructors about existing resources.”

“Communication is inadequate. Last year I never received notice of reappointment. I had to email a bunch of people to find out if I had been reappointed. This year, it has been over two months since submitting reappointment materials with no word as to the outcomes of the process.”

“More clear communication of what the expectations of the students are in each type of course, and a better explanation of the curriculum and how the courses I was assigned fit into them.”

Appendix

The following supporting documents are attached with this report:

- Statistics for FCTL Part Time Lecturer Survey
- PTL survey questions #14 and #15 filtered for participants from College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business, and School of Law

Statistics for FCTL Part Time Lecturer Survey

Total submissions: 194

* Calculated using numeric values

Multiple choice - multiple answers (check)				Response statistics*	
Question					
What is your primary college, school, or division? Choose as many as apply.				Mean	8.98
				Median	20.00
				Mode	7
				Min/Max	1/20
				Standard deviation	5.69
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage		
1	Professional & Continuing Education	8	4.12%		
2	Arts & Sciences -- Arts	14	7.22%		
3	Arts & Sciences -- Humanities	20	10.31%		
4	Arts & Sciences -- Natural Sciences	23	11.86%		
5	Arts & Sciences -- Social Sciences	18	9.28%		
6	Built Environments	15	7.73%		
7	Business	28	14.43%		
8	Dentistry	1	0.52%		
9	Education	4	2.06%		
10	Engineering	21	10.82%		
11	Environment	6	3.09%		
12	Information	8	4.12%		
13	Law	19	9.79%		
14	Medicine	6	3.09%		
15	Nursing	7	3.61%		
16	Pharmacy	3	1.55%		
17	Public Affairs	3	1.55%		
18	Public Health	1	0.52%		
19	Social Work	11	5.67%		
20	Other (please describe):	18	9.28%		

Multiple choice - one answer (button)				Response statistics*	
Question					
How many classes are you teaching in the 2016-17 academic year?				Mean	2.30
				Median	2.00
				Mode	2
				Min/Max	1/3
				Standard deviation	0.66
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage		
1	0	21	10.82%		
2	1-2	93	47.94%		
3	3 or more	80	41.24%		

Multiple choice - one answer (button)				Response statistics*	
Question					
How long have you been working at UW?				Mean	2.50
				Median	3.00
				Mode	3
				Min/Max	1/3
				Standard deviation	0.52
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage		
1	Less than a year	2	1.03%		
2	1-5 years	93	47.94%		
3	5 years or longer	99	51.03%		

Multiple choice - one answer (button) Question				Response statistics*	
Do you work with TAs?				<i>Mean</i>	1.57
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Median</i>	1.00
Numeric value Answer Frequency Percentage				<i>Mode</i>	1
1	Never	113	58.25%	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/3
2	Sometimes	51	26.29%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	0.75
3	Always	30	15.46%		

Multiple choice - multiple answers (check) Question				Response statistics*	
What is/was your role in instruction of the course you are currently teaching/most recently taught? If more than one, choose one particular course.				<i>Mean</i>	1.57
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Median</i>	1.00
Numeric value Answer Frequency Percentage				<i>Mode</i>	1
1	Principal instructor of a self-designed course in a specific content area	135	69.59%	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/5
2	Principal instructor for a course also taught by other instructors	55	28.35%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	0.86
3	Co-instructor (co-teaching)	21	10.82%		
4	Instructor for section/lab (there is another instructor, different from you, in charge of the lecture)	7	3.61%		
5	Other (please describe):	2	1.03%		

Multiple choice - multiple answers (check) Question				Response statistics*	
How would you describe the type of course? Select all that apply.				<i>Mean</i>	3.97
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Median</i>	3.00
Numeric value Answer Frequency Percentage				<i>Mode</i>	3
1	Seminar/Small discussion-based class	63	32.47%	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/10
2	Large discussion-based class/Evidence-based learning class	24	12.37%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	2.67
3	Small lecture	77	39.69%		
4	Large lecture	37	19.07%		
5	Completely online	5	2.58%		
6	Hybrid (meets in person and online)	14	7.22%		
7	Studio/Project	22	11.34%		
8	Lab	21	10.82%		
9	Professional & Continuing Education course	9	4.64%		
10	Other (please describe):	13	6.70%		

Multiple choice - one answer (button)				Response statistics*	
Question					
Approximately how many students are/were enrolled in this course?				Mean	2.64
				Median	3.00
				Mode	2
				Min/Max	1/6
				Standard deviation	0.97
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage		
1	Under 10	15	7.73%		
2	10-25	79	40.72%		
3	26-50	72	37.11%		
4	51-100	18	9.28%		
5	101-300	8	4.12%		
6	Over 300	2	1.03%		

Multiple choice - multiple answers (check)				Response statistics*	
Question					
Which of the following did you do to prepare yourself to teach the course for the first time? Please select all that apply.				Mean	2.29
				Median	2.00
				Mode	3
				Min/Max	1/4
				Standard deviation	1.02
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage		
1	Talked to instructors who have taught the course before	123	63.40%		
2	Reviewed course materials from my department	119	61.34%		
3	Reviewed course materials from sources outside of my department	132	68.04%		
4	Other (please specify):	59	30.41%		

Matrix - one answer per row (button)				Response statistics*		
Question						
How challenging were each of the following when you first taught at UW? (Not challenging 1 - Somewhat challenging 3 - Very challenging 5 -N/A)				Row1	Mean	3.13
					Median	3.00
					Mode	3
					Min/Max	1/6
					Standard deviation	1.48
Row 1						
On-boarding and orientation to the department/program				Row2	Mean	3.28
					Median	3.00
					Mode	3
					Min/Max	1/6
					Standard deviation	1.39
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0						
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage			
1	1	33	17.01%			
2	2	34	17.53%			
3	3	52	26.80%			
4	4	40	20.62%			
5	5	19	9.79%			
6	N/A	16	8.25%			
Row 2						
On-boarding and orientation to teaching at the UW (grading policies, course management timeline and logistics)				Row3	Mean	2.85
					Median	3.00
					Mode	1
					Min/Max	1/6
					Standard deviation	1.47
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0						
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage	Row4		

1	1	20	10.31%	Mean	2.66
2	2	41	21.13%	Median	2.00
3	3	49	25.26%	Mode	1
4	4	45	23.20%	Min/Max	1/6
5	5	26	13.40%	Standard deviation	1.48
6	N/A	13	6.70%		
Row 3				Row5	
Finding existing teaching resources related to your class				Mean	3.58
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				Median	4.00
Numeric value Answer Frequency Percentage				Mode	3, 4
1	1	46	23.71%	Min/Max	1/6
2	2	42	21.65%	Standard deviation	1.65
3	3	42	21.65%	Row6	
4	4	31	15.98%	Mean	3.24
5	5	26	13.40%	Median	3.00
6	N/A	7	3.61%	Mode	3
Row 4				Min/Max	1/6
Connecting with other instructors within your unit for advice				Standard deviation	1.37
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				Row7	
Numeric value Answer Frequency Percentage				Mean	2.19
1	1	54	27.84%	Median	2.00
2	2	47	24.23%	Mode	2
3	3	39	20.10%	Min/Max	1/5
4	4	27	13.92%	Standard deviation	1.11
5	5	18	9.28%	Row8	
6	N/A	9	4.64%	Mean	2.23
Row 5				Median	2.00
Connecting with other instructors outside of your unit for best practices in teaching				Mode	1
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				Min/Max	1/6
Numeric value Answer Frequency Percentage				Standard deviation	1.31
1	1	25	12.89%		
2	2	34	17.53%		
3	3	36	18.56%		
4	4	36	18.56%		
5	5	29	14.95%		
6	N/A	34	17.53%		
Row 6					
Learning a new teaching technology (Canvas, lecture capture, etc.)					
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
Numeric value Answer Frequency Percentage					
1	1	21	10.82%		
2	2	38	19.59%		
3	3	58	29.90%		
4	4	39	20.10%		
5	5	26	13.40%		
6	N/A	12	6.19%		
Row 7					
Engaging students in course material					

Total responses (N): 194		Did not respond: 0	
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	62	31.96%
2	2	67	34.54%
3	3	38	19.59%
4	4	20	10.31%
5	5	7	3.61%
6	N/A	0	0.00%

Row 8
Resolving issues involving classroom conduct/communicating with students

Total responses (N): 194		Did not respond: 0	
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	70	36.08%
2	2	57	29.38%
3	3	43	22.16%
4	4	9	4.64%
5	5	7	3.61%
6	N/A	8	4.12%

Short response Question	
Any additional challenges you would like to add?	
Total responses (N): 81 Did not respond: 113	

Statistics are not calculated for this question type.

Matrix - one answer per row (button) Question			
Rate the level of support/resources that you received when on-boarding as an instructor.			
Row 1 Policies with regard to hiring and working at the UW			
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0			
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	Insufficient	61	31.44%
2	Adequate	122	62.89%
3	Superlative	11	5.67%
Row 2 Evaluation of teaching (e.g.: student course evaluations, collegial evaluation/peer review)			
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0			
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	Insufficient	48	24.74%
2	Adequate	130	67.01%
3	Superlative	16	8.25%
Row 3 Promotion/Rehiring/Raise			
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0			
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage

Response statistics*	
Row1	
Mean	1.74
Median	2.00
Mode	2
Min/Max	1/3
Standard deviation	0.55
Row2	
Mean	1.84
Median	2.00
Mode	2
Min/Max	1/3
Standard deviation	0.55
Row3	
Mean	1.53
Median	1.00
Mode	1
Min/Max	1/3
Standard deviation	0.59
Row4	
Mean	1.75
Median	2.00
Mode	2
Min/Max	1/3
Standard deviation	0.59

<i>value</i>			
1	Insufficient	101	52.06%
2	Adequate	83	42.78%
3	Superlative	10	5.15%

Row 4

Other information (building policies, lab use, equipment, safety, FERPA, etc.)

Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0

<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	Insufficient	63	32.47%
2	Adequate	116	59.79%
3	Superlative	15	7.73%

Multiple choice - multiple answers (check)				<i>Response statistics*</i>	
<i>Question</i>					
When teaching, what UW teaching resources do you use regularly? Select all that apply.					
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Mean</i>	5.30
1	MyUW Dashboard	133	68.56%	<i>Median</i>	3.00
2	Previous course syllabi, previous course website	128	65.98%	<i>Mode</i>	3
3	Canvas Learning Management System	146	75.26%	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/13
4	Classroom resources, including classroom scheduling and Classroom Technology & Events services: classrooms layout and technology support	80	41.24%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	3.65
5	Disability Resources for Students (DRS)	64	32.99%		
6	Grading resources (FROG: Faculty Resources on Grading)	30	15.46%		
7	UW Libraries such as course reserves, subject librarians, etc.	93	47.94%		
8	Auxiliary support for students, such as UW Writing Centers, CLUE, Departmental Study Centers, etc.	40	20.62%		
9	Teaching with Technology resources, including UW-IT: Teaching and Learning tools and Learning Technologies ("how-to" guides and workshops)	33	17.01%		
10	Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL): Pedagogy resources, workshops and services	27	13.92%		
11	Office of Educational Assessment: Course evaluations	69	35.57%		
12	Department, School, College website	58	29.90%		
13	Other (please specify):	17	8.76%		

Short response <i>Question</i>	Statistics are not calculated for this question type.
What would allow you to more efficiently access the teaching resources you need at UW?	
Total responses (N): 102 Did not respond: 92	

<i>Matrix - one answer per row (button)</i> <i>Question</i>				<i>Response statistics*</i>	
How important are the following teaching resources to you? Least important 1 - Somewhat important 3 - Most important 5 - N/A				<i>Row1</i>	
<i>Row 1</i>				<i>Mean</i>	3.94
Advice from colleagues				<i>Median</i>	4.00
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Mode</i>	5
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/6
1	1	10	5.15%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	1.20
2	2	16	8.25%	<i>Row2</i>	
3	3	31	15.98%	<i>Mean</i>	4.52
4	4	61	31.44%	<i>Median</i>	5.00
5	5	70	36.08%	<i>Mode</i>	5
6	N/A	6	3.09%	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/6
<i>Row 2</i>				<i>Standard deviation</i>	0.89
My own experience (trial-and-error)				<i>Row3</i>	
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Mean</i>	3.67
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Median</i>	4.00
1	1	6	3.09%	<i>Mode</i>	4
2	2	2	1.03%	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/6
3	3	10	5.15%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	1.07
4	4	45	23.20%	<i>Row4</i>	
5	5	130	67.01%	<i>Mean</i>	3.09
6	N/A	1	0.52%	<i>Median</i>	3.00
<i>Row 3</i>				<i>Mode</i>	3
Internet resources				<i>Min/Max</i>	1/6
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Standard deviation</i>	1.21
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Row5</i>	
1	1	3	1.55%	<i>Mean</i>	3.13
2	2	26	13.40%	<i>Median</i>	3.00
3	3	54	27.84%	<i>Mode</i>	1
4	4	64	32.99%	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/6
5	5	43	22.16%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	1.78
6	N/A	4	2.06%	<i>Row6</i>	
<i>Row 4</i>				<i>Mean</i>	3.09
Departmental resources				<i>Median</i>	3.00
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Mode</i>	1
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/6
1	1	21	10.82%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	1.74
2	2	39	20.10%	<i>Row7</i>	
<i>Row 4</i>				<i>Mean</i>	4.92
Departmental resources				<i>Median</i>	6.00
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Mode</i>	6
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Min/Max</i>	1/6
1	1	21	10.82%	<i>Standard deviation</i>	1.76
2	2	39	20.10%		

3	3	64	32.99%
4	4	46	23.71%
5	5	20	10.31%
6	N/A	4	2.06%

Row 5

Workshops and/or learning communities offered by Center for Teaching and Learning

Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0

Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	47	24.23%
2	2	37	19.07%
3	3	37	19.07%
4	4	21	10.82%
5	5	20	10.31%
6	N/A	32	16.49%

Row 6

UW-IT Learning/Technologies workshops

Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0

Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	46	23.71%
2	2	36	18.56%
3	3	45	23.20%
4	4	18	9.28%
5	5	19	9.79%
6	N/A	30	15.46%

Row 7

Other

Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0

Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	22	11.34%
2	2	4	2.06%
3	3	20	10.31%
4	4	5	2.58%
5	5	14	7.22%
6	N/A	129	66.49%

Matrix - one answer per row (button)			
<i>Question</i>			
Rate the availability of the following resources for your teaching. Abundant 1 - Somewhat difficult to access 2 - Not available 3 - N/A			
<i>Row 1</i>			
Advice from colleagues			
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0			
Numeric value	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1	1-Abundant	73	37.63%
2	2-Somewhat difficult to access	95	48.97%
3	3-Not available	20	10.31%
4	N/A	6	3.09%

<i>Response statistics*</i>	
<i>Row1</i>	
Mean	1.79
Median	2.00
Mode	2
Min/Max	1/4
Standard deviation	0.75
<i>Row2</i>	
Mean	1.14
Median	1.00
Mode	1
Min/Max	1/4
Standard deviation	0.53
<i>Row3</i>	

<i>Row 2</i>				<i>Mean</i> 1.46	
My own experience (trial-and-error)				<i>Median</i> 1.00	
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Mode</i> 1	
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Min/Max</i> 1/4	
1	1-Abundant	177	91.24%	<i>Standard deviation</i> 0.72	
2	2-Somewhat difficult to access	10	5.15%	<i>Row4</i>	
3	3-Not available	3	1.55%	<i>Mean</i> 2.02	
4	N/A	4	2.06%	<i>Median</i> 2.00	
<i>Row 3</i>				<i>Mode</i> 2	
Internet resources				<i>Min/Max</i> 1/4	
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Standard deviation</i> 0.72	
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Row5</i>	
1	1-Abundant	124	63.92%	<i>Mean</i> 2.48	
2	2-Somewhat difficult to access	58	29.90%	<i>Median</i> 2.00	
3	3-Not available	5	2.58%	<i>Mode</i> 2	
4	N/A	7	3.61%	<i>Min/Max</i> 1/4	
<i>Row 4</i>				<i>Standard deviation</i> 0.98	
Departmental resources				<i>Row6</i>	
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Mean</i> 2.37	
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Median</i> 2.00	
1	1-Abundant	39	20.10%	<i>Mode</i> 2	
2	2-Somewhat difficult to access	121	62.37%	<i>Min/Max</i> 1/4	
3	3-Not available	25	12.89%	<i>Standard deviation</i> 1.03	
4	N/A	9	4.64%	<i>Row7</i>	
<i>Row 5</i>				<i>Mean</i> 3.53	
Workshops and/or learning communities offered by Center for Teaching and Learning				<i>Median</i> 4.00	
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0				<i>Mode</i> 4	
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Min/Max</i> 1/4	
1	1-Abundant	27	13.92%	<i>Standard deviation</i> 0.92	
2	2-Somewhat difficult to access	88	45.36%		
3	3-Not available	38	19.59%		
4	N/A	41	21.13%		
<i>Row 6</i>					
UW-IT learning/Technologies workshops					
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					
<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>		
1	1-Abundant	38	19.59%		
2	2-Somewhat difficult to access	88	45.36%		
3	3-Not available	27	13.92%		
4	N/A	41	21.13%		
<i>Row 7</i>					
Other					
Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0					

<i>Numeric value</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	1-Abundant	10	5.15%
2	2-Somewhat difficult to access	27	13.92%
3	3-Not available	8	4.12%
4	N/A	149	76.80%

Short response
Question

What other forms of help, if any, would help you meet your instructional goals (including professional development and teaching/learning practices)?

Total responses (N): 194 Did not respond: 0

Statistics are not calculated for this question type.

Questions or comments?
[Contact us](#) or email catalysthelp@uw.edu

Goals and Principles for Learning Analytics at the University of Washington

Learning analytics at the UW

Learning analytics refers to the collection, analysis, and use of student data. Learning analytics may be used to identify populations of students based entirely on existing data, for instance first-generation or transfer students. They may also employ statistical modeling or machine learning techniques to make predictions about students' future behavior, for example student success or students who are at risk of failing a course or dropping out of the university.

As UW begins employing learning analytics to improve student success, it is important to establish clear goals and principles that will help guide UW faculty, administrators, and staff in the appropriate use of learning analytics. The purpose of this document is to state UW's goals for the use of learning analytics, outline UW's principles on the appropriate use of learning analytics, and describe which student data is in and out of scope. These goals and principles are aspirational and intended to serve as a foundation for UW in the rapidly emerging field of learning analytics.

Goals for the UW's use of learning analytics

- Help students achieve their learning goals
- Improve persistence and retention
- Reduce the time it takes to finish a degree

Principles for the use of learning analytics

Responsibility

- Following core UW values, the University has a responsibility to improve student persistence, help students achieve their learning goals, and support their journey toward a degree. This can be accomplished, in part, by extracting meaning from student data via learning analytics.

Communication

- UW will clearly communicate to the university community the student data are used, how they will be used, and plans for future use. Similarly, UW's goals for current and planned applications of learning analytics will be communicated in a timely manner.

Validity and efficacy

- Assessment and refinement of modeling, analysis and practices will be an ongoing process. The accuracy of the models will be closely scrutinized on a quarter-by-quarter basis to ensure they

- are meeting a predetermined level of accuracy.
- Algorithms and other analytical processes performed on student data will be available for review both within and outside the university so long as review does not expose student data.
- Modelling and analysis of student data will be free from bias.
- Errors in the data will be corrected through source data systems.

Governance

- The Faculty Council for Teaching & Learning will exercise oversight over the goals for the use of learning analytics.
- The Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs or designee, will exercise oversight for the principles for the use of learning analytics.
- As needed the above governance structure will be re-evaluated and modified in order to stay consistent with the evolving data governance structure at UW.

Security & Privacy

- UW ensures the security and privacy during the collection and use of student learning data by following appropriate laws, methods, policies, and procedures.
- UW will practice data minimization when collecting and retaining student data used in learning analytics, and follow a data specific data retention schedule.
- UW will practice de-identification and anonymization where and when it is appropriate and practical, for example with public reports.

Student data used in learning analytics

Common data sources that are in scope

- *Enrollment information.* Data includes degree program affiliation, campus affiliation, and demographics provided by the student.
- *Transcript data.* Data from past and current courses, including grade data.
- *Data from teaching and learning tools.* Activity in tools like Canvas, Panopto or PollEverywhere, such as viewing patterns, number of discussion board posts, and log-ins.
- *UW system data.* Data from MyUW, MyPlan and other student systems.

Common data that are **not** in scope

- *Location.* Data collected on students current and past locations using GPS and IP address identifiers.
- *Health information.* Disabilities and data on visits to student health centers and disabilities
- *Complaints.* Formal complaints made by a student
- *Affiliations.* Affiliations not directly related to academic success, such as religious or political affiliations.
- *Social media activity.* Student activity on third party social networking sites

In order for UW to achieve the goals outlined above, no new data are collected. All data comes from source systems.