

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
March 14, 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 February 14, 2019
 3. Medical excuse notes
 4. Religious accommodations: SB 5166
 5. Zoom enterprise licensing
 6. 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*
 7. Good of the order
 8. Adjourn
-

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from February 14, 2019

The minutes from February 14, 2019 were approved as written.

3. Medical excuse notes

Halverson, the chair will invite Chris Laws to the next council meeting to discuss the Faculty Council on Student Affairs' Class C resolution regarding medical excuse notes.

4. Religious accommodations: SB 5166

The chair notified the council that [Senate Bill 5166](#), *Providing religious accommodations for postsecondary students*, is moving through the legislature. The council reviewed the bill (Exhibit 1). The chair encouraged members to reach out to their legislators if they have specific concerns.

5. Zoom enterprise licensing

Tom Lewis informed the council that of the Zoom use on campus 40 percent of paid accounts are for telehealth. Lewis also estimated that the current cost to for individual Zoom licenses is around \$140K and the estimated cost to license for University-wide use would be \$173K. Lewis noted that there is no central pot of money for the University to pay for this licensing, and that he was unsure what increases

(in requests) the IT Help Desk might experience as a result. Lewis recommended inviting in Aaron Powell, CIO and Vice President for UW Information Technology, to see if UW IT could fund this.

Angelia Miranda commented that the Student Technology Fee (STF) definition may broaden and that it may be an option to explore.

Lewis will talk to the Tech Fee committee and the tech help desk. The chair will invite Aaron Powell or Erik Hofer, Deputy CIO and Associate Vice President for Academic Services, to a future meeting. Miranda will touch base with the STF committee.

6. Subcommittee reports

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

Waiting on the Privacy Office. Working through student data for the retention task force and enrollment management task force. Will report back when there is more information.

b. *Diversity and Equity Informed Pedagogies*

Thanks to Jason Johnson, OMA&D and the quick work of the Subcommittee, there are several diversity requirement-related questions in the SERU survey, being sent to students this spring quarter. This data will be important in helping to assess student learning and better understand student experiences around the Diversity requirement. We are also interested in recommending that the D requirement have a coordinator or authority within the FCTL itself and possibly recommend the creation of a cross-University task force to move the assessment of the D requirement forward in a “sanctioned” way.

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

See summary in Exhibits (Exhibit 2).

d. *Educational Policies/Procedures around Teaching and Learning*

See summary in Exhibits (Exhibit 3).

7. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

8. Adjourn

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

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

Present: **Faculty:** Thomas Halverson (chair), David Goldstein, Fred Bookstein, Timea Tihanyi, David Masuda, Kathleen Peterson, Sri Devi Duvvuri
Ex-officio reps: Judith Howard, Angelia Miranda

President's designee: LeAnne Jones Wiles

Guests: Jason Johnson, Katie Malcolm, Tom Lewis

Absent: **Faculty:** Amy Howells, Laurianne Mullinax, Mark Zachry
Ex-officio reps: Amanda Hornby, Maria Zontine

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – 5166-S.pdf

Exhibit 2 – Subcommittee_Evaluation_Instruction_mprovement_Teaching_FCTLreport_March2019.pdf

Exhibit 3 – Final recommendation for the exam guide.pdf

SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL 5166

State of Washington**66th Legislature****2019 Regular Session**

By Senate Higher Education & Workforce Development (originally sponsored by Senators Hasegawa, Carlyle, Frockt, Palumbo, and Nguyen)

READ FIRST TIME 01/31/19.

1 AN ACT Relating to providing religious accommodations for
2 students at postsecondary educational institutions during exams or
3 other requirements to successfully complete a program; amending RCW
4 28B.10.039; adding a new chapter to Title 28B RCW; and recodifying
5 RCW 28B.10.039.

6 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

7 **Sec. 1.** RCW 28B.10.039 and 2014 c 168 s 4 are each amended to
8 read as follows:

9 (~~Institutions of higher education~~) (1) Postsecondary
10 educational institutions must develop policies to accommodate student
11 absences (~~for up to two days per academic year,~~) to allow students
12 to take holidays for reasons of faith or conscience or for organized
13 activities conducted under the auspices of a religious denomination,
14 church, or religious organization, so that students' grades are not
15 adversely impacted by the absences.

16 (2) Students' sincerely held religious beliefs and practices must
17 be reasonably accommodated with respect to all examinations and other
18 requirements to successfully complete a program. Instructors may
19 schedule alternative times without prejudicial effect before or after
20 the regularly scheduled examination or other requirement to
21 successfully complete a program. Instructors must accept at face

1 value the sincerity of the students' religious beliefs and must keep
2 requests for accommodation confidential unless disclosure of the
3 request is required to facilitate the accommodation with campus
4 administrators. The postsecondary educational institution must make
5 alternative accommodations for a student when:

6 (a) A student's sincerely held religious belief or practice
7 materially impacts the student's ability to perform on an examination
8 or meet a requirement to successfully complete a program; and

9 (b) The student has provided written notice within the first two
10 weeks of the beginning of the program of the specific dates the
11 student requests alternative accommodations from the examination or
12 requirement.

13 (3) Postsecondary educational institutions must:

14 (a) Distribute a copy of the postsecondary educational
15 institution's policy to faculty, students, and administrators, and
16 ensure the policy is published on its web site. Postsecondary
17 educational institutions must also include the policy in any future
18 publication of any publicly available handbook or other document
19 regularly provided to faculty, students, and staff.

20 (b) Provide instructors, faculty, school administrators, and
21 other relevant staff a nonexhaustive list of major religious holy
22 days or festivals for the following two academic years to facilitate
23 planning.

24 (4) Instructors at each postsecondary educational institution
25 must include in each course syllabus a statement regarding the
26 postsecondary educational institution's religious accommodation
27 policy, including a description of the general procedure to request
28 accommodations and informing students of the point of contact by
29 which they may seek accommodation or further information about the
30 policy.

31 (5) Postsecondary educational institutions must provide a process
32 for students to notify the Title IX coordinator, a Title IX
33 coordinator's designee, or a designated staff member if there is no
34 Title IX coordinator, of any grievances with regard to implementation
35 of this section, and to seek redress.

36 (6) No fees shall be imposed on students by postsecondary
37 educational institutions as a result of seeking accommodation under
38 this section.

39 (7) For the purposes of this section, "postsecondary educational
40 institution" means an institution of higher education as defined in

1 RCW 28B.10.016, a degree-granting institution as defined in RCW
2 28B.85.010, a private vocational school as defined in RCW 28C.10.020,
3 school as defined in RCW 18.16.020, and any entity offering academic
4 credit for an apprenticeship program under RCW 49.04.150.

5 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 2.** RCW 28B.10.039 is recodified as a section
6 in a new chapter in Title 28B RCW.

--- END ---

Subcommittee for Evaluation of Instruction for Improvement of Teaching Performance and Student Learning (SEI)

Subcommittee Report for March 2019 FCTL meeting

SEI met with Sean Gehrke of Office of Educational Assessment and his team to discuss questions related to the Instructional Assessment System (IASystem™).

Present:

OEA:

Sean Gehrke <sjgehrke@uw.edu>,

Raquel Y Chavez <cyvette@uw.edu>,

Debbie McGhee <demcghee@uw.edu>,

Luda Kourenina <luda@uw.edu>

Subcommittee members:

Sri Devi,

David,

Gabby Rivera, asuwbdc@uw.edu (ASUW rep),

Jason,

Timea

Meeting Goals and Questions to OEA:

- On Formative and Summative Questions on the Evaluation forms:
 - How questions on various types of forms have been designed/determined?
 - How often are they been revised?
 - How does OEA receive input when it conducts a revision?
 - How do questions reflect the diverse and changing nature of class formats (hybrid, active learning, research, etc.) and teaching/learning methodologies?
 - Why is a screening question for type of course, such as quantitative/technical vs non-technical/non-quantitative, not included?
- On the ratings scale available to students:
 - Could you provide some insight on the descriptors used for the 6 categories (“excellent” to “very poor”)?
 - Why are the scale points 0-5? Why not 1-6?
 - Why are the “medians” reported and why not “means”?
- During data collection, analysis, evaluation and interpretation:
 - What protocols are available to control for biases?
 - and what known/suspected forms of bias has been more difficult to take into account?
- What happens after data analysis and summary?
 - What are the most salient points of recommendations available for faculty/administration for evaluation and interpretation of results?
 - Are there types of summaries available to administration but not may available to the instructor or the program (for example for curriculum planning purposes)?
- On the time frame for faculty administering student evaluations and receiving results:
 - What issues would a more flexible/customizable schedule (for example mid quarter) mean to your office?
 - Are there models available from peer universities for a more frequent / more simplified assessment?

Meeting findings:

Student course evaluation forms were created in the 1970s based on faculty code “teaching excellence”. Formative questions have received some updates since.

Forms K and up have been added in the past decade (reflects some experiential learning type courses).

Summative questions (consistent across forms) remained unchanged.

Faculty is advised to choose the type of form that best suits their course. Forms are currently unable to respond to the variety of teaching formats and styles (active learning, hybrid courses, research).

Major overhauls are difficult, UW entities outside of the tri-campus area rely on use of existing forms.

Needs major revision: Distance Learning Form.

Updates welcome faculty input.

On Measurement scale:

6 choices on the scale were created as to avoid having a median point.

There are two types of scales:

Expressing agreement / Scales for rating (compare form K with form A)

There is a question about what words are associated with the bubbles: (excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, very poor) - psychometrically, the scale seems to be skewed towards the lower end.

There is a known issue of fatigue related to the length of forms:

Redundant and misleading questions, that are more about expectation and perception than factual information.

Results seem to be skewed: students are using the top (summative questions) more and exhibit some “fatigue” on the list of formative questions. - seems to be a desire for shorter forms?

On data analysis:

Segmenting data / accounting for heterogeneity

Bias control:

Summative Q's: controls for class size, reasons for taking course (in the major or elective), relative expected grade.

Difficulty of testing for bias with regard to instructor's race, gender, age, ethnicity - data received from Office of Equal opportunity is aggregate data.

Small gender differences (.1 range) are evidenced. Lower participation rate for online course evaluations is evident, skewing results towards lower scores.

Need training for students, faculty and administrators on how to administer and evaluate and use information from student course evaluations.

On reporting:

Faculty and administration portals (Hi-Lo reports, ratings summary)

On course evaluation schedule:

Faculty is free to administer course evaluation any time during the quarter, however there is only 1/course available.

Some form of mid-quarter formative evaluation may be desirable in addition to the end of quarter evaluation – this places a demand on OEA infrastructure.

Useful links:

To learn more about using results:

<https://www.washington.edu/assessment/course-evaluations/using-results/>

Bias Control

Analysis of student ratings data reveals that student course ratings are influenced by several factors. The best known of these is **student reason for taking the class, class size, and expected grade**. The amount of bias is reflected in the magnitude of the inter-correlations between each of these factors and the ratings awarded. IASystem™ corrects for observed bias by utilizing regression analyses to 1) examine the pattern of inter-correlations in student ratings data, and 2) compute an “adjusted” rating for each the four summative items as well as the combined rating. As an example, the formula for computing the adjusted median for the first summative item is: $\text{AdjMed1} = \text{Median 1} - (2.487 + .003292\text{ER} - .143\text{LS} + .337\text{RG} - 3.8829)$

Additional factors are emerging from ongoing research, including **student demographics (sex and race/ethnicity), rating modality (online vs. paper), and class mode (online vs. face-to-face)**.

UW Course Evaluation Catalog (CEC)

<https://www.washington.edu/assessment/course-evaluations/cec/>

Forms:

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

Final Recommendation for the Exam Guide

<https://www.washington.edu/students/reg/examguide.html>

Introduction:

The committee took time to survey faculty on how they manage Saturday finals and how they go about making accommodations for students who take more than two finals in one day or have a conflict in time. The goal of the group was to provide recommendations to the registrar's office to update the exam guidelines.

Common Saturday Finals

Currently, there are thousands (Aut '16 (7,841) - Aut '17 (8,321) - Aut '18 (8,488)) of students that take a common final on Saturday. The committee sent a survey to 118 faculty who proctored a Saturday final in Autumn 16,17 or 18. The survey had a 23% response rate. When surveyed a majority of faculty (65%) stated that they proctored a Saturday final because the final exam includes students in multiple sections and/or department final for the course. When asked if they currently had dean's approval to proctor a Saturday final 58% said yes. The rest of the response faculty stated they didn't know or had not planned teaching class again or the information sat with student services staff.

Instead of changing the policy that states students are responsible for taking all finals, the committee is proposing changing the procedure for requesting Saturday finals based on the following rationale.

- There isn't a formula for scheduling Saturday finals based on when classes meet during the quarter.
- When there are conflicts on Saturdays students are expected to bounce back and forth from each department to negotiate a make up time. (see appendix a).

Recommendation for Common Finals

Common finals scheduled on the Saturday of finals week often conflict in time with concurrent class sessions for an individual student. This leads to a student having two finals at the same time. To aid students with conflicting schedules the Office of the Registrar will require an alternate (make-up) final time to be scheduled. The faculty member should communicate the alternative final time to students in the class.

Accommodations for more than two finals in one day.

Less than 2% of students taking a final during finals week will have more than two finals in a day (see appendix 2). The day that most students have more than two finals is Monday. The committee asked faculty how they make accommodations for students that have more than two finals in one day. Below are some survey examples that illustrate faculty have already been making accommodations.

- *In most cases, my students told me that their other class' professor would NOT allow any make-up due to the conflict. To accommodate them, I have been offering a make-up a day before (or if necessary, during the final exam week). I have once contacted to professors who were giving their final exams at the same time as mine and asked if they would allow a make-up for their courses. They mostly flat-out*

rejected my request by stating that they have no make-up policy. As a result, I have been posting final exam schedule on Time Schedule and My Plan sites.

- *We have an option for students to take their final on the Friday before the scheduled exam. I would recommend the student take the final then. if that was not possible, depending on individual performance I would talk with the teaching coordinator to make other arrangements.*
- *I would not accommodate such a student. I would point them toward the Final Examination Guidelines (<https://www.washington.edu/students/reg/examguide.html>) which state that, "Students are responsible for taking any number of examinations for which they are scheduled on a given day."*
- *It's important to be understanding of legitimate conflicts, but being over-accommodating sets problematic precedents. Beyond setting aside an alternative testing date, extra accommodations should be weighed carefully, on a case-by-case basis.*
- *Talk to the students to understand what they need. I really do keep their learning in mind for all decisions I make. I encourage the students to talk to me early in the quarter if there is an overlap. Again, I haven't had to work through this to date--but I'd get in contact with the other professor and talk about the best way to accommodate everyone. Moving forward I won't give up a class to take a final early--not the right thing to do. I'm also not going to change the published/agreed to final schedule unless I've got a majority of students that need an alternative time.*

The committee would request the final examination guidelines be updated to include the following statement.

Recommendation for Requesting an Exam Accommodation

To optimize student performance in a course, faculty are strongly encouraged to work with students who may have three or more finals scheduled on the same day. Faculty should arrange for at least one of the finals to be rescheduled.

Appendix A: Example of Student Services Policy in Math

Math Student Services Example

1) Conflict: this is for a student that knows they have something else scheduled the day of the common final.

Submit petition by the end of the 6th week.

The only other course-related conflict we would approve is something like a music concert.

If there is a time conflict with another exam (like Accounting), then the student needs to request the make up with the other department.

The only time we've made accommodations for a student that has multiple, non-time conflicting exams is when they have testing accommodations with DRS. So if a student has 2x on exams, then a student ends up being scheduled for nearly 12 hours of exam time in a single day and we've decide that it is too much and allow a make-up. Otherwise, we default to the University policy that students must take any number of exams they are scheduled for.

2) Illness/Emergency.

Make up exams are always scheduled for the Wednesday of finals week at 6pm in the Math Study Center. If a student can't make this time or there are other issues going on, then an incomplete is often recommended. DRS students that need accommodations with their make-up, schedule the exam with DRS on that Wednesday during the day when DRS is open. But again, we default to the University policy that they must take any number of exams scheduled. So if they already had two exams scheduled for Wednesday, then add the make-up exam they would end up taking 3 that day.

Appendix B: Finals Count

Qtr	Saturday Finals						Monday Finals					Tuesday Finals						
	1 Final	2 Finals	3 Finals	4 Finals	5 Finals	Total Saturday	1 Final	2 Finals	3 Finals	4 Finals	5 Finals	Total Monday	1 Final	2 Finals	3 Finals	4 Finals	5 Finals	Tuesday total
AUT/2016	5,825	735	83	2	0	6,645	15,352	3,329	165	6	0	18,852	12,115	2,011	134	3	0	14,263
AUT/2017	5,870	952	96	5	0	6,923	15,728	3,740	245	3	0	19,716	11,843	1,939	105	0	0	13,887
AUT/2018	6,272	1,036	46	0	0	7,354	15,988	3,789	304	5	0	20,086	12,555	2,575	185	2	0	15,317

Qtr	Wednesday Finals						Thursday Finals					Friday Finals						
	1 Final	2 Finals	3 Finals	4 Finals	5 Finals	Wednesday total	1 Final	2 Finals	3 Finals	4 Finals	5 Finals	Thursday total	1 Final	2 Finals	3 Finals	4 Finals	5 Finals	Friday total
AUT/2016	15,235	4,304	378	17	3	19,937	12,904	1,821	102	5	0	14,832	5,132	418	7	0	0	5,557
AUT/2017	15,019	4,376	320	32	6	19,753	12,140	1,943	125	2	0	14,210	5,173	287	36	8	0	5,504
AUT/2018	14,500	3,013	223	23	1	17,760	13,561	2,333	147	2	0	16,043	4,742	240	13	29	0	5,024

Number of Students Taking 3,4, or 5 Finals in One Day

	Sat	% Total Finals	Mon.	% Total Finals	Tues.	% Total Finals	Wed	% Total Finals	Thurs	% Total Finals	Fri	% Total Finals
AUT/2016	85	1.28%	171	0.91%	137	0.96%	398	2.00%	107	0.72%	7	0.13%
AUT/2017	101	1.46%	248	1.26%	105	0.76%	358	1.81%	127	0.89%	44	0.80%
AUT/2018	46	0.63%	309	1.54%	187	1.22%	247	1.39%	149	0.93%	42	0.84%