

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Instructional Quality**  
**November 13, 2003**

**Present:** Carline, Coe, Devasia, Greenwald, McGovern, Castic, Bowen, Jacobson, Lewis, Lowell, Holmes, Brooks, Trudeau

**Absent:** Cooper, Copland, Kemp, Wenderoth, Bridges, Conquest, Pitre

**Guests:** Gerry Gillmore, Stanley Chernicoff

**Synopsis:**

1. Approve minutes, approve agenda
2. Student Learning Objectives--SLO and its future
3. New tutoring programs – Chernicoff

Chair Jan Carline called the meeting to order at 8:35. The agenda was approved. The minutes were approved

Carline asked Wayne Jacobson for a brief update on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning project. Jacobson commented that they are presently looking at ways to move the project forward. The group has been meeting monthly and talking about ways to give attention to people who are doing this kind of research in the classroom. Jacobson has met with a representative from the Human Subjects Office to talk about ways of doing research within the boundaries of the classroom, while still complying with the Human Subjects requirements. The group would like more participants.

Carline cited the UW libraries as a good example of students moving from paper to electronic resources. How are they handling this, and how much are students using these electronic resources? It would be good to know, and to “lift up” good examples. Where does this research get published? Is it being accepted as scholarly work? Jacobson said that some people are making a career of this kind of research, and there is a long list of publications, but he is not certain how this research is viewed in various UW departments. Carline suggested that FCIQ may need to develop a list of journals where the work has been published – Jacobson reported that CIDR and UW libraries are working on this.

**Student Learning Objectives**

George Bridges has inherited the Student Learning Objectives from Debra Friedman and is now responsible for SLOs.

SLOs were mentioned in the recent accreditation as a good goal, but it was also noted on the deficiency side that not enough has been done with them. Do all courses have objectives? Are all outcomes documented? Bridges and the Provost are setting up a working group with the Undergraduate Education Office, FCIQ and an expanded faculty group so this can move forward. Gerry Gilmore is also working on this, and wants to involve the Graduate School as

well. There will be an Arts and Sciences retreat in January to address this. The thrust is to create a system each department can customize and use in its own way.

As FCIQ works on a computerized way to integrate and manage course information, it is important that a place for the new SLOs be included, and that there is a way to connect objectives with the evaluation of success. Jan Carline will convene an FCIQ subcommittee with more accelerated regular meetings, to address SLO issues.

Some disciplines, e.g., professional degree requirements such as ABET or ChemE, have strict learning objectives and outcomes – studying these programs and analyzing the way they developed their objectives, and how the objectives are measured, may be a good first step to a system that can be used throughout the University. In some areas, Senior exit interviews are used to determine whether objectives have been met. Talks with employers can also be useful for determining long-term results. It would be good to get handouts from ABET and ChemE to see what they have developed and understand how they did it.

It may be difficult for disciplines such as the arts and psychology to develop these kinds of objectives. It may be useful to ask departments to look at the structure of their degrees to see what's implied about what is needed for a degree. It may also be useful to assess electronic portfolios to discover what kinds of projects are being presented as good examples of what has been learned.

Because SLOs are currently in such a state of flux, it is important to understand the will of the faculty in this area.

In addition, FCIQ needs to decide what role the Council would like to have, to do, to be, to represent, in the revamping of the SLOs. How do we provide a voice that reminds departments that whatever is done should link up with the evaluation of success? Is this an instructional issue? A quality issue? How can FCIQ involve other faculty in designing the process? To whom do we report? Who wants to hear about it? Who's willing to work? What is the process for a bottom-up approach? It took Engineering three years to develop their objectives – what kind of a timeline should be setup to manage this process?

Since Arts and Sciences is having a retreat on this subject, FCIQ might ask to be kept abreast of their progress via periodic reports. It would also be important to have someone responsible for bringing the ICD system back together and getting it used. How to remind faculty to use it? This kind of course information is much more important to students since the advent of online registration.

At the next meeting, FCIQ should set some objectives, so as to have a common voice for these programs and discover what kind of systems can be set in place.

### **Center for Learning and Undergraduate Enrichment -(CLUE) - Stan Chernicoff**

Chernicoff described in detail an impressive new tutoring program that is designed to improve large class teaching and learning. The program seeks to create a “culture of learning” by providing a structured time and place where students can come together to study and exchange ideas. The study program takes place in Mary Gates Hall Sundays through Thursdays, and includes evening discussion and review sessions that supplement 26 large lecture courses. Drop-in centers in Chemistry, Math, Physics, Writing, Computer Science, French, Spanish, and Statistics/Economics are also open from 7 p.m. to midnight, Sunday through Thursday.

The course-based study groups are led by a paid graduate student who is designated and mentored by a professor. Discussions are based on the course content for that day – professors sometimes join the groups as well. At the drop-in centers, students can come and join a study group at any time throughout the evening.

This innovative program, which is unique to the UW, is presently drawing 1200 students per week, including commuter students, some of whom are carpooling to come back to campus at night. The UW Alumni Association is doing some outreach to the program, providing pizzas on some evenings.

Chernicoff sees the program as a huge success. He said the program is funded for this year, and he hopes to see it funded into the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:01 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*