

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY
MONDAY, December 10, 2007, 2:00-3:30 p.m.
211B Mary Gates Hall

The Chair, Mary Pat Wenderoth, called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of minutes
2. Discussion of 10 year review process:
 - Todd Mildon, Registrar, will present information on UW Roadmap project (Data and information management as it relates to teaching and learning)
 - Delineate the issues concerning the 10 yr review process and discuss suggestions for solutions
 - Current process
 - http://www.grad.washington.edu/Acad/existing_prog_review.htm
 - Organizational change submitted by Nana Lowell
 - In Friday's (11/2) e-mail
3. Ad hoc committee on Academic Quality and Rigor- joint with FCAS
 - Need one more member
4. Update report on UW-SOTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Symposium)
5. Update report on summer quarter issues:
 - Length of quarter, separate exam period? Faculty pay
6. Update report on Ways to recognize excellent teaching
 - Compile best practices from departments and schools at UW
 - Subcommittee
7. Adjourn

1. Approval of minutes.

Council members approved the minutes with no comment.

2. Discussion of the 10 Year Review Process:

Todd Mildon, Registrar

Todd Mildon, Registrar, addressed the council on the UW's Strategic Roadmap for Information Management and Administrative Systems as it relates to teaching and learning. He handed out a power point presentation that highlighted the Office of Information Management's (OIM) leadership, goals, work plan, and scope. He explained the collaborative nature of the roadmap and the project structure. He noted emergent themes that include curriculum management, data support, and problems with the way curriculum gets reviewed. Mildon acknowledged that the process needs to be streamlined.

Mildon noted the increasing importance of the availability of data of every type. He added that decision makers would be provided access to rich data and to common tools so that they can work with the data effectively. He noted that the priority is to look to places

where they have the biggest weaknesses. Council member Gerry Baldasty was asked how the OIM could have helped him in the 10 year review process. Baldasty replied that something that would tell them what kind of data and reports would be available to assist them in the process.

Council member Nana Lowell handed out a list of “required appendices” in the 10 year review process. She explained that the list of appendices represents the kind of data already requested at the point of the process and provides ways to facilitate the data needed. Council member Don Janssen inquired about a system to correct data mistakes and to capture individual data errors. Mildon replied that as more data is pulled from around campus and pushed out, they see more issues, despite efforts to “cleanse” the data.

Wenderoth suggested working on a 10 year review packet once a year so that it is an ongoing process versus a fire drill. It would also enable departments to build up a vision as to how they are getting there, or not. Mildon spoke about automated reports that are put out once a year. He talked about how they could be improved to come out on a quarterly basis and how it could be used toward the 10 year review process. Baldasty noted that it would be important to find out what departments would make of that in light of the expectations that come with reports and how they get used.

Mildon then asked the council what kind of data would be most relevant. Janssen replied that a course revision form is needed; one set of information that carries the most recent course information. Mildon spoke about the data model that would be needed, and its advantages. Lowell noted that it would allow for a more standard process for course review. She emphasized the need for flexibility in the review process. Mildon suggested leveraging the work of Lowell’s group with the Administration’s efforts.

The council briefly discussed ways to streamline the effort for departments. Lowell noted that the group is identifying needed data, and next must find out particular data needs. Lowell suggested that a 10 year review model should be an integral part of their strategic planning at the Provost level. Council member Namura Nkeze asked about getting course information automated. Council member Craig Allen inquired about having a warning system to alert for any variance from the standard. Mildon noted that rich data on course information is not currently a priority. He also explained that there is not much history in place in order to create a warning system, but that the future could possibly offer one. He suggested building a service oriented system done at the local level with departmental developers. The Chair emphasized the importance of access to departmental data. The guests were thanked for their time and presentation.

Wenderoth suggested that for the next quarter they form a small subcommittee to ask what kind of information departments would like to have, advisors too. They would then help to fill out with particulars, the categories listed on Lowell’s handout on required appendices.

3. Ad hoc committee on Academic Quality and Rigor- joint with FCAS

The Chair noted that they need one more member on this committee and that she would put out a request.

4. Update report on UW-SOTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Symposium)

Wenderoth updated the council on the UW-SOTL event. She noted that they would be sending out requests for proposals after the winter break. SOTL is scheduled for May 6th in the HUB. They are still deciding upon the faculty speaker(s) and noted that they were looking for teachers who were doing creative things in the classroom using different approaches, and more reflective processes. She asked that council members send the names of nominating faculty to her and Wayne Jacobsen. Wenderoth also spoke about sending out a save-the-date pdf some time in early January.

5. Update report on summer quarter issues:

This topic was tabled for discussion at another meeting.

6. Update report on ways to recognize excellent teaching

This subcommittee has not yet met.

Wenderoth inquired if there were any other topics to discuss. The discussion returned to the 10 year review process. Janssen suggested that if they were given data they might not be as likely to look at it as if they put it together themselves. Council member Wayne Jacobsen noted the importance of crafting the right balance. Council members discussed having more than one person in departments involved in the review process in order to learn more about their own department.

President's Designee Ed Taylor spoke about the university accreditation process from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. He suggested a future agenda item should be a discussion of the accreditation process and what problems might arise in light of the UW's upcoming 5 year review. Action: Ed stated that he would get a copy of the initial review from the first assessment done and make it available to the council. He also suggested that this council might consider the articulation between the three campuses as the issue concerns instructional quality at UW. Taylor also suggested that the council invite to speak Ana Mari Cauce, Cheryl Cameron, and/or Phil Hoffman, all administrators familiar with the accreditation process.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, mmkane@u.washington.edu, or 543-2884

Present: **Faculty:** Allen, Baldasty, Edgar, Janssen, Underwood, Wenderoth (Chair)
President's Designee: Taylor
Ex Officio Reps: Nkeze
Regularly Invited Guests: Lewis, Lowell, Jacobson
Faculty: Salehi-Esfahani (excused), Ward (excused)
Ex Officio Reps: Holmes (excused), Hahn