

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Instructional Quality
December 14, 2004

Synopsis:

1. Susan Kemp: Work with Academic Progress Group
2. Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges: Undergraduate Education Council
3. Update on Innovation Celebration

Chair Jan Carline called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The minutes were approved.

Susan Kemp: Work with Academic Progress Group

In response to reduced budgetary support for the University, increased demand for access to higher education in Washington State, and state legislation in 2003 on the academic progress of undergraduates, Interim Provost David Thorud established a Task Force on the Academic Progress of Undergraduates. Thorud charged the Task Force to identify problems undergraduates have in completing their degrees and to develop strategies the University can adopt to remedy these problems.

Part of this work concerns the degree progress of under-represented minority students, many of whom transfer in from community colleges after the sophomore year with more than 90 credits. The graduation rate of these students is flagging. Susan Kemp reported on the work of the Task Force to find ways to retain these students so they can complete their degrees.

Classroom climate may be a factor in the lower graduation rates for these students, but there is not much information about classroom environments. Nana Lowell's Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) has worked with two groups on the campus climate for diversity and posted their results to the OEA Website at

<http://www.washington.edu/oea/0120.pdf>

Lowell does not know who has made use of this information. She added that OEA can modify their program to accommodate a second questionnaire that could be used to gather diversity-related information. George Bridges has asked that this be done in all classes during Spring Quarter 2005 and periodically thereafter. Lowell is forming an advisory group that includes Rusty Barcelo and Susan Jeffords – Lowell would like a member from FCIQ to attend meetings in January, February, and September. ASUW rep Garrett Parks recommended that Precious Aure, ASUW Diversity Chair, be included in the advisory group. Lowell agreed.

Kemp was interested not just in looking at student opinions, but in finding ways that faculty can do a better job with these students. There is a body of literature about classroom environment, but some behaviors that don't seem like climate issues can nevertheless tend to exclude some students and include others. An OEA survey could reveal some of these. How one asks the question has a bearing on the answer. Climate issues can include physical or sensory abilities, so these should be considered in defining a student survey.

Carline asked what FCIQ wants to do with the information once it is compiled. Should FCIQ make recommendations for using the information? How can faculty use it to improve their teaching? Wayne Jacobson suggested treating the first iteration of the information as an assessment of the instrument. It was agreed that this would be a good approach. Jacobson will confer with Lowell on this suggestion.

Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges: Undergraduate Education Council

Gillis-Bridges reported that much of the first meeting of the Undergraduate Education Council was devoted to an overview of the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE). Topics included descriptions of

class work, the restructuring of the Honors Program, and a lengthy report on the Student Learning Goals (SLG) project. Because there were many new members, the report described the ground-up rethinking of the approach taken to develop the former SLOs, followed by a lengthy discussion of SLOs to bring new members up to speed.

General discussion by FCIQ members of this part of Gillis-Bridges' report added that the prior SLO group wanted the goals to appear on new course applications; Susan Jeffords suggested the goals be reviewed and updated as part of the ten-year review. For large courses taught by several faculty, however, it would be difficult to ensure that the goals were consistent – what's in the database doesn't necessarily reflect exactly what is being taught by different faculty. But the ten-year review is a good time to make sure the materials are up to date.

Carline asked whether FCIQ wants to prepare a resolution that course goals would be required on new course applications, though this would not be enforceable. It was decided to table this and discuss at a subsequent meeting, but to tell the CI Committee that FCIQ is interested in doing this.

Gillis-Bridges continued her UEC report, commenting that the curriculum for the Honors Program is being revamped. She wants more information on the restructuring – who's involved? Faculty? Outsiders? If this is being done in-house, there should be broader involvement by knowledgeable faculty. Concerns about the current Honors Program include questions about its structure, across-the-board quality, and whether it is perceived to be worthwhile compared to other options.

Curriculum development issues include defining the rigor of the program, what students should get out of it, what they will know as a result of the program, and how it will prepare them for future educational or other goals. The Honors Program does not have its own faculty – is this also an issue? What faculty development is being included as a program objective, if any? Perhaps FCIQ should consult with the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) to see whether they are involved in the issues.

Update on Innovation Celebration

Dates for the Innovation Fair have been narrowed to April 12th or 19th. The President was not available on either of these dates, but the Provost is. There is lots of support for the Fair, which is intended to show that the scholarship of teaching is valued by Deans and the UW community at large. Next steps are to settle on a date and a venue, get out a preliminary announcement, and then call for applications.

The call for applications will specify teaching innovations where the faculty member has reflected on the results of the teaching and can demonstrate how it has played out in the classroom. This draws upon the "Scholarship of Teaching" literature, which makes a distinction between good teachers and/or those who have done new work and those who have done systematic reflection on the results of their innovations. Faculty who attend the Fair should be able to understand the difference it will make to them and to their students if they adopt the innovation being demonstrated.

ASUW could help by supporting and pushing innovations in the classroom as components that should be counted toward promotion and tenure. Senior lecturers teach a high number of labor intensive courses for low pay – this teaching is not counted toward P&T, and it should be. Jan Carline and Wayne Jacobson will collaborate on the general announcement of the Fair, which will be emailed before the next FCIQ meeting on January 18, and the application.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:54 p.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

Present: Carline, Coe, Kim, Gillis-Bridges, Mai, Kemp, Wenderoth, Parks, Jacobson, Lowell, Holmes, Trudeau **Absent:** Greenwald, Bridges, Lewis, Brooks

