

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2010, 3:00-4:30 PM
36 GERBERDING

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Activity Based Budgeting – Bruce Balick
4. Council Restructuring
5. Adjournment

Call to Order

Chair Wenderoth called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Approval of the minutes from the October 30, 2009 meeting

The minutes of the October 30, 2010 meeting were approved.

Items Discussed

1. Announcements

Chair Wenderoth announced that the Annual Teaching and Learning Symposium is on April 20th, and March 1st is the deadline for proposals. Chair Wenderoth also announced an update on the entity replacing the Center for Instructional Development and Research (CIDR). As of now, the name will be the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. They are currently searching for a director. Guest Bruce Balick reminded members about the Annual Undergraduate Research Symposium on May 21st. Chair Wenderoth suggested that would be a good event for legislators to attend.

2. Activity Based Budgeting

Presentation by Faculty Senate Chair Bruce Balick

Chair Wenderoth presented the timeline the Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) steering committee is supposed to follow. Major parts of that timeline include a presentation on May 15th, and implementation on July 1st. Balick began his remarks by stating there is no UW ABB proposal yet and that it is in an embryonic state. He would like FCIQ to be his sounding board for ABB issues.

Balick then presented a report that the College of Arts & Sciences completed over the summer. The report had been sent to members before the meeting via e-mail. Balick also reminded the Council that ABB is an administrative action and does not go through the Faculty Senate, but that FCIQ will provide significant input as part of the process. The Council's main concern is that ABB does not have a measure for quality as an output and therefore won't be incentivized. The

idea of attempting to quantify quality was an issue the Council wrestled with throughout the meeting.

Balick brought up a recent survey put together by the ASUW, GPSS, and Student Regent Ben Golden. The survey asked what issue student felt most important, and the number one item was quality of instruction. There was again discussion about the need to incentivize quality. The Council discussed a few possible measures and difficulties with such measures. Padvorac stated that the ABB initiative is about money, which means it is about being efficient, and producing more research. The incentive is to be cost efficient without regard to quality. Janssen presents a scenario in which departments would not have tenured track faculty and instead would be made up of only lecturers and part-time lecturers, because that would be the most efficient way to teach.

Balick discussed how the faculty would be the element that maintains quality. The faculty care about reputation and prestige. Both reputation and prestige are needed to be competitive for grants. There was discussion on how departments and colleges can act as firewalls to prevent the incentives from getting too carried away. At the schools that currently have ABB, the practice is only carried out at the University level. Balick contacted colleagues at the Universities of Michigan and Minnesota, which have both implemented ABB. Most of the colleagues at those schools had not heard of ABB (which means it wasn't affecting things within the department/college). Because schools can act as a firewall of sorts, the quality of the Dean can become even more important.

The question as to why this change was necessary was discussed. The administration says that it is to increase transparency. The need for the ability to explain budgetary decisions to legislators was discussed. The timing was also discussed. 2009-2010 is the first year that tuition revenues are a larger proportion of the education budget than State Support. Because of this, students are now the University's main constituents as opposed to the State. A part of ABB is tracking student activity. Money would follow student activity, and in a way, follow those constituents.

The Council discussed how the incentive for student hours could cause changes at the University. Balick shared the experience of what happened at Indiana University's Music Department. They were very well regarded, but taught nearly on a one-on-one basis and were asked to increase their student hours. In response, they created music appreciation courses for non-majors. Chair Wenderoth pointed out, that for the most part the number of credit hours is fixed, and this would only likely change the distribution of those hours.

3. Council Restructuring

Chair Wenderoth brought up the topic of combining FCIQ, the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach (FCEO), and the Faculty Council on Educational Technology (FCET). There are multiple motivations to consider such a restructuring. One is that attendance for FCEO and FCET is not very good. The second is that the faculty senate office has been dramatically slashed and having fewer Councils would help lessen the work load. Additionally, it is not always clear which Council should consider certain issues. An example given was when FCIQ was interested the instructional quality of the educational outreach programs.

Lewis attends all three Councils and said there is roughly 70% overlap. He stated that when the three Councils began, the issues were different and over time, the issues of the three committees have converged.

There was some concern expressed by Janssen about having less people involved. A compromised was presented by Padvorac that would create a model similar to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). FCAS has a subcommittee structure in which the subcommittees meet regularly and then report to FCAS. One aspect of the idea that the Council particularly liked is how it would maintain the expertise of all three Councils. There was further discussion as to how this would work logistically. The questions remaining for the Council include whether or not subcommittees would have to record minutes, and if so, who would record them. The Council liked the idea and agreed to pursue it further.

Adjournment

Chair Wenderoth adjourned the meeting at 4:31 p.m.

Minutes by Alex Bolton
Council Support Analyst
bolt@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Wenderoth (Chair), Henry, Janssen, Merati, Nelson
 Ex-Officio Reps: Padvorac
 Regularly Invited Guests: Lewis, Lowell, Lenz

Absent: **Faculty:** Allen, Edgar, Salehi-Esfahani
 President’s Designee: Taylor
 Ex Officio Rep: Hornby, Nkeze, Small
 Regularly Invited Guests: Sugatan