

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., March 7, 2013
142 Gerberding Hall

Agenda:

1. Call to Order
 2. Approval of minutes from February 7, 2013, meeting
 3. Student Access to Evaluation Data – Nana Lowell
 4. Tom Lewis Update
 5. Report on E-Learning Review
 6. Adjourn
-

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Carline at 10:36 a.m.

2. Approval of minutes from February 7, 2013, meeting

The minutes of the February 7, 2013, meeting were approved as written.

3. Student Access to Evaluation Data – Nana Lowell

Carline introduced Nana Lowell, Director of the Office of Educational Assessment who gave some background to this issue that has recently re-surfaced after being apparently resolved some years ago.

Course evaluation results have been considered to be public records, and prior to 2004 they were posted openly online in the Course Evaluation Catalog (CEC). In 2004, faculty members raised concerns regarding the prominence given to course evaluation results by Google searches. It also was noted at that time that the recently established contract for academic student employees stipulated that TA evaluations should not be made available to the public. After discussions with the AG's office and the senior vice provost, the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (FCIQ) determined that online access to course evaluation results should be restricted to UW NetID holders, and that members of the public could request results from the Office of Educational Assessment (OEA).

This seemed to be working smoothly until a few weeks ago when the CEC was hacked by a group of UW undergraduates as part of a course project, and one year of course evaluation results were posted openly on the internet at (<http://uwevals.eugk.com/>). As a result, faculty who Googled their names might find (again) that the first reference listed was linked to this website containing only UW course evaluations. This site has since been temporarily deactivated, but the issue of vulnerability of the CEC to hacking remains.

The central question, however, is whether course evaluation results are in fact public records.

Carline has asked the AG's office to determine whether course evaluation results are correctly defined as public records. Student evaluations of faculty are undertaken as a usual business practice which suggests that they should be public per RCW 42.17. However, some institutions consider them to be part of faculty personnel files and as such confidential.

If course evaluation results *are* public records, then evaluations of classes taught by faculty can be posted on the CEC whether or not it is vulnerable to breaches of security. We would presumably need to remove all evaluations of courses taught by TAs. Currently we remove evaluations of classes that are taught by TAs and evaluated using Forms F (quiz sections) and H (labs). We assume that TAs are not the primary instructor for these types of classes.

If course evaluation results *are not* public records, then we may not be able to continue to make them available online via the CEC. We would need to consider whether to fix the CEC, remove it altogether, or replace it. One possibility for replacement is to add course evaluation results to MyPlan. UW IT has applied for their third year of STF funding and could add access to course evaluation results to next year's programming (per Darcy Van Patten, Director of Student Information Systems).

Carline's sense of the Council's discussion was that it is mixed about what should be made public – but also that what information can be made available, should be presented in a way that is more user friendly and accessible. He reiterated that he had put in a request for clarification to the AG's Office about what is and is not public record. Once that is determined, he suggested that the Council be in touch with the Provost's Office about the possibility of securing funding to improve the way the CEC information is provided online.

4. Academic and Collaborative Applications Update

Tom Lewis, Director of Academic & Collaborative Applications introduced Peter Wallis, an Instructional Technologist on his staff, who gave a PowerPoint Presentation on A Classroom Engagement Continuum. The major intention of this presentation was to discuss the software tools that are available to engage students electronically in discussions during lecture and other class presentations. This software ranges from a totally instructor controlled system such as Turning Technologies and ResponseWare to a system that allows students to communicate freely with each other, with the possibility of the instructor monitoring the communication during class. The council provided commentary to Mr. Wallis about their uses and preferences for such software. Interest ranged in intensity from strong approbation to skepticism. No single approach or software was affirmed by the council. The issues of cost and equipment were a concern to all, members with the preference that any system would not require fees to students or purchase of single purpose equipment. As in use of any technology, training for users, faculty and students, is important.

5. Report on E-Learning Review

Carline introduced this discussion by recalling that the subject of on-line courses was thoroughly during the first year after the creation of FCTL. During that time, a research assistant was able to help Carline create a literature review of the subject which he distributed in a two-page handout. He explained that the draft letter to President Young on the subject includes all the information in the two-page report. He asked Council members to take a moment to read the letter (noting that the first paragraph would be revised) in order to discuss the merits of the letter.

Reaction to the letter included that the action items are too "fuzzy" – it would be better to be specific about what needs to happen and by a set date. Another council member questions whether President Young was the most appropriate target of this letter. Would it be more effective going to whoever would be assigned to carry out such a plan? Another comment was to bring the point of the letter to the first paragraph instead of leaving it to the last page. Discussion of who might be involved in pieces of this already underway or being planned include Baldasty, Cauce and Trosvig.

One Council member offered three "big bullets" as a starting point for discussion of this request:

- A technology expert that deals with Academic & Collaborative Application;
- A learning specialist in every department whose focus is how best to use technology;
- More TAs (graduate students are much more adept at technology than many faculty members).

Having come to adjournment time, Carline encouraged Council members to come to the next meeting prepared with their own "wish lists" related to teaching, learning *and* technology.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:01

Present: **Faculty:** Carline (Chair), Turner, Olavarria, Masuda, Martin-Morris, Salehi-Esfahani, Wilkes

Ex-Officio Reps: Sugatan, Kutz, Randall, Corbett

Guests: Peter Wallis, Tom Lewis, Nana Lowell

Absent: **Faculty:** Harrison, Yeh, Elkhafaifi (on leave), Kyes, Zierler, Nelson

President's Designee: Taylor

Ex-Officio Reps: Jankowski