

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

June 2nd, 2016
10:30am – 12:00pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from May 5th, 2016
 3. Discussion and advisory vote on the tenure and promotion guidelines document (Beth Kalikoff)
 4. Course Evaluation Catalog - update on status and plans (Nana Lowell)
 5. Grad student view of self-supporting program issues
 6. Annual report draft (Jeff Wilkes)
 7. Pre-planning FCTL agenda for AY 2016-17 (Dan Turner)
 8. Open discussion
 9. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

Wilkes called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

2) Review of the Minutes from May 5th, 2016

The minutes from May 5th, 2016 were approved as written.

3) Discussion and advisory vote on the tenure and promotion guidelines document (Beth Kalikoff)

Kalikoff (Director, Center for Teaching and Learning) noted the draft Guide to Evaluating Teaching in Tenure & Promotion Cases has sustained some changes since the council last reviewed it, mostly centered in the “Student Evaluations” section. She explained the changes in other sections of the draft document were largely clerical.

Kalikoff explained the Guide has been made more direct and “bold” in its recommendations concerning the use of student evaluations, and is now much more explicit relating to known best practices in utilizing student feedback constructively.

There was some discussion of the potential inaccuracies in student course evaluations, and the ways that individuals in the university community might misread, or make incorrect insinuations from course evaluation data.

There was a request that student course information relating to CEI (Challenge and Engagement Index) data be more explicit, so faculty understand the kind of data they are reading. The change in the document was agreed to.

Kalikoff explained the document has not yet been publically distributed, and will only be when several faculty councils, The Board of Deans and Chancellors, and other bodies have approved it. She explained she would like the council to take a vote to endorse the document, and the use of it by tenure and promotion committees at the UW. She noted the council would have to trust her to make the changes in the document that were just recommended.

Wilkes made a motion stating:

The Guide as distributed, including additional revisions given in the June 2nd 2016 council meeting, is approved by the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning.

The motion was approved by a majority vote of council members. The Guide was endorsed by the council.

Wilkes thanked Kalikoff for her work on the document, and for presenting to the council.

4) Course Evaluation Catalog - update on status and plans (Nana Lowell)

Nana Lowell (Director, Office of Educational Assessment) gave an update on the Course Evaluation Catalogue (CEC). She explained the online interface for the catalogue is running through dated software, and a great deal of work is required to publish the data for the university community. She noted the work involved in keeping the CEC up and running makes it unsustainable, and there is currently a plan to retire the catalogue. She explained OEA applied for funding to provide an alternative to the CEC, but it was not granted. She noted she wanted to bring this information to the FCTL.

After a question, Lowell explained the CEC would have to be fully reevaluated before an alternative resource could be developed, with an approximate \$70,000 in development time necessary for the project. She noted there is little hope for receiving the funding necessary to complete the project.

Lowell explained the council should ask what the purpose of the catalogue is; does it serve faculty, and does it serve students. Discussion centered on the idea that historical course evaluation data is very important, and an integral academic tool. Some faculty members commented that they had not looked at the catalogue in many years, however. One member explained the scheduling in their department has made it so students do not actually know who is teaching their course until right before it begins, making the data less useful for those students. Overall, many members commented on the importance of the course evaluation data.

A comment was made that web analytics data should be collected to reveal if students actually use the CEC. It was noted UW students might use the popular website "Rate my Professor" as an alternative if they do not have access to the CEC, which is arguably a less accurate source of information.

Alcantara explained that as a student, he uses the CEC regularly, and added that he is also curious how many other students use it. A member commented that she feels the CEC puts some pressure on faculty to “perform better,” knowing that data is going to be posted publically. Discussion on the topic ended due to time constraints.

5) Open Educational Resources – John Danneker & Chelle Batchelor

Chelle Batchelor (Coordinator for Access Services, Libraries) and John Danneker (Director, Odegaard Undergraduate Library) explained they have joined the council to discuss Open Educational Resources (OER). OER are teaching and learning research resources that have been released under open license that permits their free use and repurposing by others. OER can be full courses, course materials, lesson plans, open textbooks, learning objects, videos, games, tests, software, or any other tool, material, or technique that supports access to knowledge. They explained the University Libraries have been made aware that many UW students are interested in moving away from traditional hardcopy textbooks, and the Dean of University Libraries has, in response, proposed a pilot that members of the libraries have taken up.

Batchelor noted to be considered OER, the “5 R’s” must be satisfied:

- ❖ Retain: Users have the right to make, archive, and "own" copies of the content;
- ❖ Reuse: Content can be reused in its unaltered form;
- ❖ Revise: Content can be adapted, adjusted, modified or altered;
- ❖ Remix: The original or revised content can be combined with other content to create something new;
- ❖ Redistribute: Copies of the content can be shared with others in its original, revised or remixed form.

It was noted several on-campus groups have made public statements in support of OER use at the UW, including the Associate Students of the University of Washington (ASUW).

Batchelor noted the main goal of the Dean’s Task Force on the topic is to raise awareness of OER for faculty at the UW, and to better understand who is already currently utilizing OER. The Task Force is also seeking statistics relating to money that might be saved through OER, and other data. A workshop was held this academic year to give information on open textbooks hosted by the UW Libraries, she explained. It was noted that data gathering is underway in the UW bookstore to provide more information on OER. Batchelor explained the UW was also invited to join the Open Textbook Network (OTN), which supports faculty use of open textbooks.

Danneker listed some guiding questions the Task Force has for UW faculty, including:

- ❖ What are best ways to engage you and other faculty in conversations?
- ❖ What benefits and challenges do you see?
- ❖ What types of support from the Libraries would you like?

❖ Other ideas, questions, concerns?

A member noted he would like to have an example of how an academic course that depends on a textbook could be moved to an open resource course. He explained a lot of work is involved in gathering necessary materials from open resources. Batchelor explained one faculty member went through a list of course reserves, and matched up names of chapters in her traditional textbook, to the names of chapters in course reserves. She then broadcasted the information to her faculty colleagues.

A member noted some of the ancillary material found in textbooks is not available through open resources, such as quizzes and other included exams, which is one difficulty in only using open texts.

One member noted the Open Textbook Library is a great resource for a faculty member looking to incorporate OER in their courses. A member mentioned "Lumen Learning" as another organization that has done this work for faculty members in the past.

Danneker noted he is open to feedback from council members, and would encourage additional feedback electronically given the meeting is time constrained.

Council members thanked Batchelor and Danneker for presenting on the topic.

6) Grad student view of self-supporting program issues (Eldridge Alcantara)

Alcantara offered his opinion on fee-based programs at the University of Washington, a topic discussed in the last FCTL meeting. He explained in his department, there are two masters' level programs, one evening program and one normal program - each have their own set of courses. He noted the cost of the fee-based program (evening program) is more expensive. There was some discussion of how the same degrees at the UW, whether offered fee-based or tuition-based, should have the same level of quality.

One member explained the administration of fee-based programs is often more difficult to manage than tuition-based, though only a handful of programs exist within fee-based and tuition models simultaneously.

One faculty member noted his department has expressed concern over students being identified by whether they are in a fee-based or tuition program. He noted this topic should become one for the council's agenda in the next year.

Wilkes explained often the only way to start new programs/initiatives is through self-sustaining programs - if funding is not awarded by the State for such programs.

7) Annual report draft (Jeff Wilkes)

Wilkes explained he has drafted an annual report on the council's activities during 2015-2016 (Exhibit 1).

8) Pre-planning FCTL agenda for AY 2016-17 (Dan Turner)

The council held some discussion of items to address during the next academic year. Turner (nominated chair, 2016-2017) noted the FCTL is largely a policy body, given its charge in the Faculty Code, and that function is important. However, he noted the most important work he sees the council addressing is not necessarily through policy, but evaluating pedagogical resources. He specifically listed assessing teaching and learning and onboarding of new faculty members as a few early ideas.

Bookstein added that he would like the council to address holistic evaluations of potential students for capacity constrained majors. He also mentioned some issues surrounding TAs, noting these may be another area the council might address.

Olavarria mentioned university student capacity is growing and has been for a number of years, and this has brought a new array of issues for faculty. He asked that the council consider addressing these issues. Wilkes explained one historical function of the FCTL has been to get necessary resources to university divisions for it to do its job.

Alcantara explained he would be continuing in the next year, and would like to address peer evaluations in teaching.

9) Open discussion

Lewis noted the functionality for students to “opt out” of the Vericite database is being built-in to the software during the summer, and will be available if the service is chosen for contract with the UW (as discussed in the previous FCTL meeting). The council thanked Lewis, as this was a main concern when a contract with Vericite was mentioned previously.

Branon explained the copyrighting of MOOCs at the UW was recently approved. He added that the UW-Educational Outreach name change to “UW Continuum College” will be officially rolled out during the summer; the abbreviation will be “UW-C.”

10) Adjourn

Wilkes adjourned the meeting at 11:49 a.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Jeff Wilkes (chair), Dan Turner, Fred Bookstein, Jaime Olavarria, Jennifer Taggart, Jan Spyridakis, Timea Tihanyi, Ellen McGough
Ex-officio representatives: Eldridge Alcantara, Deci Evans, Terry Ann Jankowski
President’s Designee: Ed Taylor
Guests: Tom Lewis, Nana Lowell, Beth Kalikoff, Rovy Branon, Christine Sugatan

Absent: **Faculty:** David Masuda, Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges, Brenda Zierler, Kathleen Peterson

Ex-officio representatives: Gordon Lucas

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCTL Annual report

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
June 2, 2016

**To: Members of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning From: Jeffrey Wilkes, chair
Draft annual report from FCTL**

At the beginning of the 2015-16 academic year, Senate Chair Norm Beauchamp sent us a letter requesting our attention to specific concerns:

“The Senate office did a background review to help identify goals for your council. This included review of minutes from last year’s meetings, review of discussions at Faculty Senate meetings, and selected outreach for topics. Recommended goals and / or topics for discussion include:

- Discovering meaningful statistics connecting to faculty concerns and problems in assessing teaching, examining specifically how to define “teaching” (e.g. does it include mentoring of graduate students?), including ways to promote education of faculty over findings.
- Studying the pros and cons associated with altering the way the summer quarter budget is treated under Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB), addressing specific questions as posed by the ABB Review Committee, and reporting back to the faculty senate and university administration
- Continuing ongoing analyses of classroom spaces and room usage efficiencies.

We have addressed these and other issues in our meetings over the course of the year. Our main accomplishments are summarized below.

1. Course evaluations catalog (CEC) and MyPlan

We began by reviewing plans to replace the existing CEC with summary information presented to students as part of their MyPlan web displays. After some discussion, we made a set of recommendations regarding the information to display and the format to be used in the very limited screen space allowed. The discussion provided a learning opportunity for members, and important insight into the content of CEC statistics. However, unresolved concerns about the MyPlan display led to the project being put on hold. { Update on status at today’s meeting }

2. ABB review committee: Summer quarter policy and liaison with PCE

We were asked by the ABB Review Committee (chaired by Jack Lee) to discuss and comment on possible impacts on teaching and learning from a potential change in summer quarter management and organization. The change would be to move from the present PCE-managed self-supporting model, to a funding model based on ABB funding through regular tuition revenues; in effect making summer quarter a “regular” quarter equivalent to the other three.

Our detailed discussion led to a report sent to the ABB Review Committee (attachment). To summarize our conclusions, “In terms of teaching and learning impacts, a majority of the council would feel no need for a change.... However, one important point was, what is the administration’s driving motivation to once again consider a change? FCTL members (and faculty in general) do not have a clear idea from previous reports on the topic.”

3. Learning spaces

We were asked by a Learning Spaces committee (chaired by Bruce Balick) to discuss and comment on possible impacts on teaching and learning from options considered for alleviating the shortage of classroom space. After a presentation by Balick, our discussion produced a number of ideas and suggestions, but we concluded there is no clear, unambiguous evidence that proposed changes in class scheduling would have direct impact on student learning. The Balick committee's report draft was provided later, and FCTL members offered comments.

4. FCTL Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning Effectiveness: Resources Map

The subcommittee prepared an extensive outline of existing resources and systems that support innovative and effective teaching at the level of the colleges, departments, courses, and administration. The goal was a map that encompasses accessibility, interactions and overlapping entities related to teaching resources, to allow faculty to more easily find resources and employ them effectively. Work on the project continues.

5. UWEO/PCE liaison and advising

Vice-Provost Rovy Branon was a regular attendee at FCTL meetings and requested our comments and suggestions on two concerns:

- The use of UW “branding” (official UW logo) for MOOCs developed and offered by UW faculty. The proposal is for MOOCs to be treated the same as the UW’s other non-credit offerings, and to be vetted and managed by PCE (Professional and Continuing Education). UW partners with third-party platform developer Coursera to administer MOOCs, though, unlike many other U.S. universities engaged in similar partnerships, the UW currently does not allow “credentialing” of its MOOCs, which amounts to placing the purple “UW” logo on MOOC certificates of completion. (Currently, the area on certificates where the insignia would be placed is blank space.) It appears that most of our peer institutions allow this connection. The council agreed that there was no good reason to prevent this from our perspective, and passed a resolution endorsing the move.
- Name change for UWEO: the organization currently is referred to by three legacy names, UW Extension, UW Educational Outreach, and Professional and Continuing Education. A consulting firm and UW marketing team suggest “Continuum College”. FCTL members pointed out that care should be taken not to have this abbreviated to UW-CC which implies a 2-year institution. Comments and advice were taken into account.

6. UW-IT liaison and advising

Tom Lewis, Director of UW-IT Academic & Collaborative Applications, has been a regular attendee and valuable informant and advisor to FCTL on topics related to software for support of teaching and learning. He requested our comments and suggestions for a number of topics, in particular impacts on faculty of anticipated retirement of some Catalyst toolkit applications, the use (and value of) the TurnItIn anti-plagiarism system, and relative priorities for faculty among some potential additions. The trend is steadily toward contracting commercially-developed applications rather than in-house development.

7. Next year

The present council has been a very effective and lively forum for discussion of issues central to the teaching mission of the University. In AY 2016-17, Dan Turner will serve as FCTL chair. Our June meeting ended with a discussion of topics to focus on in the coming year.