

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

June 6, 2019

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Mary Gates Hall 224

Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from May 9, 2019
 3. UW pronoun project – Helen Garrett, University Registrar and Chief Officer for Enrollment Information Services
 4. Subcommittee reports
 - a. *Goals and Principles of Learning Analytics at the UW*
 - b. *Diversity and Equity Informed Pedagogies*
 - c. *Evaluation of Instruction for Improvement of Teaching: Course Evaluations*
 - d. *Educational Policies/Procedures around Teaching and Learning*
 5. Good of the order
 6. Adjourn
-

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from May 9, 2019

The minutes from May 9, 2019 were approved as written.

3. UW pronoun project – Helen Garrett, University Registrar and Chief Officer for Enrollment Information Services

Helen Garrett, University Registrar and Chief Officer of Enrollment Information Services, updated the council on the UW Pronoun Project (Exhibit 1). The project is an initiative designed to provide faculty and instructors with additional information related to student identity. Students will have the option to identify their pronouns which will be displayed on class rosters for faculty and instructors to use. The project team is currently planning the implementation phase and has drafted guidelines and frequently asked questions.

A member asked about the implementation timeline. Garrett responded that they will work over the summer.

Halverson, the chair, also asked Garrett to speak on religious accommodations mandates. Garrett responded that communications will come from the Provosts office. The University Registrar will work with faculty over the summer to create suggested guidance and develop mechanisms (online forum) for students to make accommodations requests.

4. Subcommittee reports

- a. *Goals and Principles of Learning Analytics at the UW*

Tom Lewis reported that they are still working on the predictive models that will deliver a “student engagement score.” The subcommittee will consider next year if the University should use engagement scores. Studies at other institutions have revealed bi-modal perspectives, and so they will also discuss who should have the data.

b. Diversity and Equity Informed Pedagogies

Amanda Hornby mentioned the general education assessment and the diversity requirement. The subcommittee may recommend a task force to assess the diversity requirement. She will meet with Jason Johnson and send a report/recommendations to the chair.

c. Evaluation of Instruction for Improvement of Teaching: Course Evaluations

The subcommittee provided an attached report (Exhibit 2).

The Faculty Senate task force will continue to pursue this issue next year.

d. Educational Policies/Procedures around Teaching and Learning

The subcommittee spent the year considering how to update procedures and increase awareness around scheduling Saturday Finals.

Moving forward, the subcommittee wants to have a larger conversation around student accommodations/resources (medical excuse notes, mental health, etc.). The members also recommended cross collaboration with the Faculty Councils on Student Affairs and Academic Standards.

5. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Thomas Halverson (chair), Fred Bookstein, Sri Devi Duvvuri, Mark Zachry, Time Tihanyi
Ex-officio reps: Judith Howard, Angelia Miranda, Amanda Hornby
President’s designee: LeAnne Jones Wiles
Guests: Helen Garrett, Katie Malcolm, Tom Lewis, Jason Johnson

Absent: **Faculty:** Kathleen Peterson, David Goldstein, Amy Howells, Laurianne Mullinax, David Masuda
Ex-officio reps: Maria Zontine

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – UW Pronouns Project Overview.pdf

Exhibit 2 – FTCLSubcommittee_CourseEval_FinalReport_2018-19.pdf

University of Washington Pronouns Project

Status: Draft

Updated: May 9, 2019

Implementation Team:

Jen Self, UW Queer Center

Nathan Dors, UW-IT Identity Management

Helen B. Garrett, Office of the University Registrar

Lauren Manes, UW-IT Academic Experience Design and Delivery

Thomas Mercer, Foster School

Purpose

This document describes a minimum set of outcomes and deliverables for the UW Pronoun Project to meet the needs of initial use and to collect feedback for expanded use and further development.

Assumptions

1. **Initial audience is students.** The initial target user audience for pronouns is UW students, at all levels and at all campuses.
2. **Individuals choose their pronouns.** Individuals can go by the pronouns they choose. No institutional review or approval is required.
3. **Good faith.** As with preferred names, institutional policy decisions will start from a point of assuming good faith and sincere intentions of users.
4. **Institutional resilience.** The UW can recover from occasional inappropriate use by a few users. Rare cases of misconduct will be addressed as needed.
5. **Privacy by design.** Individuals have different needs for privacy. The collection and use of pronouns will be guided by UW privacy principles.

Features - minimum viable product

1. **Students can choose the pronouns they go by.**
 - a. Students can choose from a predefined set of common pronouns.
 - b. Students can enter freeform text for less common pronouns.

- c. Students can enter freeform text such as “no pronouns” or “just use my name” or similar if they don’t want to be addressed by pronouns.
- 2. Students can find where to update their pronouns.**
 - a. Students can find the solution from the Office of the Registrar website.
 - b. Students can find the solution from the UW homepage.
 - c. Students can find the solution from within MyUW.
 - d. Students can be guided to the solution from other external documentation.
 - e. Students can be guided to the solution from linked documentation.
- 3. Pronouns will be used within an initial set of applications.**
 - a. UW Canvas
 - i. Class photo roster is developed in-house and implemented as an embedded page; UW-IT can customize it to include pronouns.
 - ii. Could use a third party software application, such as NameCoach
 - b. Adviser tools
 - i. MyPlan adviser view
 - ii. EARS
 - c. Housing & Food Services - TBD
 - d. UW Directory - TBD
 - e. MyUW - TBD
- 4. Pronouns will be introduced to the community with guidance on use.**
 - a. Systems used to set and collect pronouns should communicate clearly to students where they will be displayed and to whom.
 - b. Applications that display pronouns should communicate clearly to students whether or not they are displayed and to whom.
 - c. Applications will adopt institutional guidelines on displaying appropriate defaults for individuals who haven’t set a pronoun.
 - d. Publicity to and guidance for faculty, instructors, advisers, RAs, and other relevant staff is part of a successful launch.
 - i. Faculty, instructors, and staff should be informed about how to respond gracefully,
 - ii. Faculty, instructors, and others who have student-visible profiles in Canvas and other systems should be encouraged to normalize the process by including their pronouns, even if they are cis

Open issues

1. **Default pronouns.** What are appropriate default pronouns for individuals who haven't set a pronoun? What should systems display? "They"? Nothing? "He/him/himself" or "she/her/herself" based on their existing gender marker?
2. **Constrain to a single set per individual?** Can we constrain pronoun collection and use to one set per individual? Or is there significant need from some users to have two or more sets of pronouns that they go by or accept? Anything greater than one set per individual increases complexity as multiple pronoun choices need to be integrated into applications and into everyday use. (Note: when we implemented preferred names, we didn't offer additional names that people go by (other aliases, "also known as", etc.), which would have similarly increased complexity, leading to higher risk of inconsistent and inappropriate use and additional features to reduce those risks, like collecting primary vs secondary names, developing additional guidance on handling individuals with multiple names, etc.

Draft UW Pronoun Project Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

What is the Pronoun Project?

The Pronoun Project is an initiative designed to provide faculty and instructors with additional information related to student identity than currently exists. Students will have the option to identify their pronouns and these would be displayed on class rosters for faculty and instructors to use.

What is a pronoun?

Pronouns provide a grammatical mechanism to refer to an individual without using their name.

Why is the UW implementing the Pronoun Project?

Providing instructors with student identified pronouns allows faculty to not make assumptions about an individual's pronoun based solely on how they may present and/or their name. It allows students to be identified with the pronoun they choose and to create an even more respectful learning environment.

If someone tells you their pronouns it is most respectful to use these. If you don't know someone's pronouns, don't assume gendered pronouns and use gender-neutral ones, like they or ze.

Pronouns are one of the ways we portray our identities. When someone asks you to use their pronouns, they are asking for you to respect their identity.

When someone refers to another person using the wrong pronouns, especially on purpose, that can lead to that person feeling disrespected and can lead to dysphoria, exclusion and alienation.

It is never safe to assume someone's gender and living a life where people will naturally assume the correct pronouns for you is a privilege that not everyone experiences. Choosing to ignore or disrespect someone's pronouns is not only an act of oppression but can also be considered an act of violence.

How will students choose a pronoun?

Students will be provided an opportunity to use a UW developed tool or a third party software to choose what pronouns they wish to use. These will display on the class roster for each student and eventually in additional applications such as MyUW, MyPlan, and EARS.

What are some of the different pronouns a student might choose?

she/her/hers

She is calling.

Her family is nice.

That car is hers.

When in doubt, ask the woman herself.

he/him/his

He is calling.

His family is nice.

That car is his.

When in doubt, ask the man himself.

they/them/theirs

They are calling.

Their family is nice.

That car is theirs.

When in doubt, ask the person themselves.

ze/hir/hirs

Ze is calling.

Hir family is nice.

That car is hers.

When in doubt, ask the person herself.

Note: There are many, many more than the ones that have been listed here.

How do I pronounce the newer pronouns?

When a person introduces themselves to you with their pronouns, they'll normally pronounce it themselves. However, don't be afraid to ask.

Ze is pronounced like Americans pronounce the letter "z," like "zee."

Hir is pronounced like "here" and hirs is similar, but with an "s" on the end.

How do I respectfully ask someone their pronoun?

You can ask "what pronoun do you use?" or "what pronouns would you like me to use?"

What if a student has not chosen a pronoun and it is not listed on the class roster?

Sometimes people just don't want to share their pronouns and that's fine. Usually it's safe to use they/them/theirs unless that person tells you otherwise.

Try to introduce yourself with your own pronouns so that everyone you meet knows that you're a safe space and that you won't assume a person's pronouns. It also prompts them to provide pronouns without it being awkward. (Ex. "Hello, my name is Alex and I use they/them/theirs pronouns.")

You can ask that person, as long as you do so politely, but it is generally preferred that gender non-conforming people come out with their own pronouns on their own terms. Knowing a person's pronouns shows respect for a person and acknowledges that you are not making any assumptions.

What is considered offensive?

There are many terms that are offensive for people that identify as transgender or any other form of gender non-conformance. Some of these would be "it," "he-she," etc. Unless given explicit consent from everyone who will hear it, do not ever use any of these words when referring to anyone, as they are incredibly offensive.

Would calling a transgender person by the wrong pronoun (like referring to a trans woman as "he") be offensive?

If you do it purposefully with malicious intent, yes. If you do it by accident and you meant for the best, apologize.

But, if you continue to do it on accident and make no effort to change, then yes, it is offensive.

What if I make a mistake and use the wrong pronoun?

This is fine and it happens to everyone. What's most important is that you don't make a big deal about it. Just apologize quickly, correct yourself, and move on.

Ex: "Oh, I'm sorry, I meant they, not he."

If you make it a big deal, you draw more attention onto someone who maybe doesn't want it. As long as you portray that you are sorry and you try harder next time, it's going to be okay. Remember; this is more for them and not you, so never make your apology about you. Always make it about the person you have wronged.

What if someone else makes a mistake?

Easy, correct them politely and quickly, don't make a big deal about it.

Ex: "Actually, Ty uses he pronouns."

Do not ignore a situation where people continuously use the wrong pronouns. The mark of a true ally is never giving up on the people you want to help. Plus, gender non-conforming people tend to get tired of always correcting other people, so having a friend to help is amazing.

What if I do not use or choose not to use the pronoun designated on the roster?

You are under no obligation to use a pronoun provided by a student, but we strongly encourage you to do so. The safest approach is to use a student's name if you are unsure of the pronoun.

Links to Pronoun Websites at Other Institutions

- University of Colorado, Boulder: <https://www.colorado.edu/cisc/resources/trans-queer/pronouns>
- Harvard: <https://registrar.fas.harvard.edu/faq/name-changes-preferred-names-gender-pronouns-gender-marker>
- University of Michigan: <https://spectrumcenter.umich.edu/article/designated-pronouns>
- UC Davis: <https://lgbtqia.ucdavis.edu/educated/pronouns>
- Stanford University (Specifically highlighting the use of NameCoach): <https://registrar.stanford.edu/staff/student-services-administrators/name-coach>
- University of Southern California: <https://lgbtrc.usc.edu/trans/transgender/pronouns/>

FCTL Subcommittee for Evaluation of Instruction for Improvement of Teaching Performance and Student Learning

Final Report
June 6, 2019

Members:	Guests and advisory members:
Timea Tihanyi < timea@uw.edu > (chair) Jason Johnson < jej@uw.edu > David Goldstein < davidgs@uw.edu > Sri Devi Duvvuri < duvvuris@uw.edu > Angelia Miranda < asuwbdua@uw.edu >	CTL Katie Malcolm < kmalc@uw.edu > Beth Kalikoff < kalikoff@uw.edu > OEA Sean Gehrke < sjgehrke@uw.edu > Raquel Y Chavez < cyvette@uw.edu > Debbie McGhee < demcghee@uw.edu > Luda Kourenina < luda@uw.edu > ASUW Gabby Rivera < asuwbdcrcr@uw.edu >

Subcommittee accomplishments 2018-19

- Has initiated a connection with various stakeholders (CTL, OEA, ASUW) and explored, in dialogue with these stakeholders, various viewpoints issues and concerns with regard to current assessment practices. A summary of conclusions is below.
 - Solicited input on and explored a range of alternative practices for assessing teaching performance and student learning. See the below for “Re-envisioning an assessment...” + also review CTL resources (URL included) and materials from May 16th Forum with USC, CSU and UofO reps on Course Evaluations.
 - Created an interface with the Senate Task Force for Student Course Evaluations.
 - Made a strong case for using the term “teaching performance” as opposed to “teaching excellence” for observable/measurable instructional conduct. Replacing “excellence” with “exemplary” would allow a more flexible and equitable understanding of this this problematic term. Concluded that definitions of excellence were extremely local and value-based, thus problematic. We are suggesting a DYNAMIC, PROCESS-ORIENTED view of both teaching and learning. The best way to assess this is seems to be the use of a combination of longitudinal and cross-sectional assessment tools. Such process of assessment acknowledges that both teaching and learning performance are unfolding trajectories, which continuously and dynamically change and improve with the help of meaningful feedback.

Significant findings from meetings with stakeholder groups

- Low completion rate reduces reliability of course evaluations.
- Allowing instructor’s REFLECTION on the data as a valid part of assessment also mitigates concerns about “imperfect data”.

- Biggest single issue of concerns for students is the LACK OF FOLLOW-THROUGH. There is a perception of a lack of transparency about the purpose and use of course evaluations. Students “don’t feel empowered” or feedback receiving recognition, acknowledgement of feedback either positive or negative.
- Students feel pressure to fill out course evaluations. Many faculty incentivises participation with extra credit. Students’ perception of what was learned at the moment of learning (short term use value vs. long term usefulness) is unreliable.
- Administered during the most stressful time of the quarter. Extreme opinions are more present, the middle-ground-opinion is often missing.
- Form is too long, questions seem repetitive. Students are using the top part of the form more (summative questions) and exhibit some fatigue on the list of formative questions.
- In the *IASystem* course evaluation forms (1974!) only the formative questions has received some updates in the past decades. Summative questions have remained unchanged.
- OEA has difficulty of testing/controlling for bias with regard to instructor’s race, gender, age, ethnicity. Data received from Office of Equal opportunity is aggregate data, unhelpful in individual cases.
- There are psychometric, statistical and bias control concerns with regard to current analyses of data. No studies available on the effect of how rating culture (e.g. ratemyprofessors.com, likes on social media, Yelp, etc.) have changed responses of feedback/satisfaction.
- Understanding that ASSESSMENT IS A PROCESS, for which effective methods, best practices, opportunities and problems will continue to evolve and change.
- ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF ASSESSMENT of instruction (teaching and learning) must be considered. These include:
 - Peer review
 - Self-assessment
 - Teaching portfolio

=>

Re-envisioning an assessment of teaching and learning using DYNAMIC DOCUMENTATION in a MULTI-COMPONENT QUALITATIVE/NARRATIVE format, which includes both EVIDENCE and REFLECTION.

Teaching Portfolio = Documentation + Narrative reflection

Documentation = Evidence (including all forms of student, peer and self-evaluation)

Provides a longitudinal TRAJECTORY view (evidence of attention to feedback, improvement and change) and a cross-sectional SNAPSHOT view.

Designed to be shared. Has effect across the unit (teaching examples). Especially useful in multi-disciplinary contexts.

Further opportunities for the subcommittee

- Reviewing the existing description of
 - what constitutes student engagement and student learning and
 - how to measure student engagement and student learning.
- Reviewing assessment instruments for measuring student engagement and student learning.
- Facilitate Task Force's work on designing a PORTFOLIO OF OPTIONS for ASSESSMENT TOOLS of teaching performance.
- Developing best practices recommendations for faculty around administering course evaluations. Training faculty to understand course feedback (what it can and cannot do) and to use it for improvement of teaching.
- Developing best practices recommendations around conducting peer evaluations.
- Developing best practices recommendations and mechanisms for training students to provide helpful, constructive feedback while also aware of their implicit bias.
- Increase focus on new faculty (through Faculty Fellows, etc.) in order to gradually change culture toward emphasis on long-term formative assessment.
- Facilitate efforts by Task Force for COMMUNICATION WITH and getting BUY-IN FROM COMMUNITY throughout every stage of this review/revision process.

LINKS and RESOURCES:

Faculty code:

<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>

24-32 and 24-57

CTL Assessing and Improving Teaching:

<https://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/assessing-and-improving-teaching/>

<http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/assessing-and-improving-teaching/self-reflection-on-teaching/>

Rating culture:

<https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/11/why-ratings-and-feedback-forms-dont-work/575455/>

Course evaluation forms: <https://www.washington.edu/assessment/course-evaluations/forms/>

Student course evaluation catalog (CEC): <https://www.washington.edu/assessment/course-evaluations/cec/>