University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
May 9, 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 April 11, 2019
3. Challenges and opportunities for faculty access to Zoom "pro" accounts – Erik Hofer, AVP for Academic Services & Deputy CIO
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 10:30 a.m.

2.   Review of the minutes from April 11, 2019

The minutes from April 11, 2019 were approved with minor edits.

3.   Challenges and opportunities for faculty access to Zoom "pro" accounts – Erik Hofer, AVP for Academic Services & Deputy CIO

Halverson, the chair, summarized the council's interest in increasing access to Zoom across the University. The council previously considered using the student tech fee and/or departmental funds to pay some portion

Erik Hofer, AVP for Academic Services & Deputy CIO, attended the council and presented a report on Zoom usage at the University. Hofer shared the University is approaching a usage level (individuals using departmental funds) that would justify obtaining an enterprising license. Hofer is trying to develop a funding model and asked the council to collect examples on how Zoom is used in the classroom by faculty and students.

A member asked if using a cost benefit analysis could be used to persuade the University. Hofer responded that in his experience this argument is not as effective or compelling, and that he was looking for examples that demonstrate innovative teaching practices.

Members shared some benefits of Zoom and constraints they have encountered without full Zoom access.

Potential Benefits and Current Constraints
- Zoom's ability to create interactive breakout rooms within the platform. This feature promotes active learning while also improving access.
- Zoom is better than other static platforms (e.g. Skype).
- May improve learning experience for online only students.
- No time limit with Zoom Pro accounts which offers an uninterrupted session.
- ASUW has received requests from students for increasing access on campus. The Student Disability Commission has specifically advocated for increased use of Zoom and other online options.
- ASUW is also concerned about students' health (physical and mental). Students who become ill may feel compelled to attend class in person to avoid missing lectures.
- Unavoidable circumstances - student parents who have to care for a sick child.
- Meeting space constraints – not always able to find meeting rooms on campus. Zoom would also allow people from the Bothell, Seattle and Tacoma campuses without traveling.
- Inclement weather/events (e.g. snow, earthquake) where campuses are closed. Faculty could use Zoom to provide remote instruction.

Another member mentioned that Hofer should also consider upgrading classrooms so that they can accommodate Zoom and/or Panopto.

The chair summarized that the council wants to both alleviate potential problems, but also promote a better learning environment for students who may be unable to attend classes in person due to illness, disabilities, sick children, etc. Other members commented that increasing access to Zoom in the future seems like a necessity. Tom Lewis commented that the University is using about 3200 licenses. Approximately 40 percent of these licenses are HIPAA compliant and are used to provide healthcare. Lewis suggested that for these purposes funding might be provided centrally rather than utilizing the Student Technology Fee.

Hofer also noted that some of UW's peers facing similar issues. He requested that the council compile use cases to adequately reflect value. He also requested to attend the council at a future meeting to present his argument and proposed funding model. The chair asked the council members to send summarized use cases to the Council Analyst.

4.   Announcements

Angelia Miranda raised that students often bring issues/concerns regarding teaching and learning to ASUW. Miranda wondered how to best address their issues and if it was appropriate for them to present at future FCTL meetings. The chair suggested that the future ASUW Director of University Affairs could coordinate with the council so that ASUW priorities could be heard (possibly once per quarter).

The chair shared several updates:
Synopsis of the religious accommodations law (Exhibit 1)
Upcoming Forum on the Evaluation of Teaching (Exhibit 2)
Teaching evaluation task force charge letter (Exhibit 3)

A member asked where the guidance will come from regarding religious accommodations. The chair shared that the University Registrar has some strategies

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

      Nothing new to report. Updates are coming soon.

   b. *Diversity and Equity Informed Pedagogies*

      The subgroup is interested in recommending that the Diversity requirement have a coordinator or authority within the FCTL. The subgroup also discussed the creation of a cross-University task force to move the assessment of the Diversity requirement forward. Ideally, a task force would have representatives from several faculty councils (FCMA, FCAS, FCTL, FCSA, ASUW, and other stakeholders). The idea would be to have one representative from each relevant faculty council and stakeholder on a task force or coordinating body/group.

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

      The Evaluation of Teaching TF (task force), which has been assembled, received a charge, and had its first meeting. When there is more information on how the TF is going to proceed, the subcommittee will figure out how to support this work best from the teaching and learning perspective.

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

      LeAnne Jones Wiles presented final recommendations for the exam guide (Exhibit 4). The council voted to endorse the recommendations.

6. **Good of the order**

The chair asked the subcommittees to write a brief synopsis of their work over the course of the year.

7. **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
          Ex-officio reps: Judith Howard, Angelia Miranda, Amanda Hornby
          President's designee: LeAnne Jones Wiles
          Guests: Katie Malcolm, Tom Lewis, Erik Hofer

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

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – Synopsis of the religious accommodations law.pdf
Exhibit 2 – Upcoming Forum on the Evaluation of Teaching.pdf
Exhibit 3 – Teaching evaluation task force charge letter.pdf
Exhibit 4 – Final Recommendation for the Exam Guide.pdf

Exhibit 1

New law requires professors in Washington to accommodate religious holidays

April 30, 2019

SPOKANE, Wash. (RNS) — A new state law makes it easier for college students to take time off for religious holidays.

Gov. Jay Inslee signed Senate Bill 5166 into law on Monday (April 29), making Washington the first state requiring that institutions of higher education provide academic accommodations to students who need them for religious observances. This includes rescheduling exams and permitting absences, as long as the student notifies the professor of the needed accommodation within the first two weeks of class.

College professors will also be required to add information about religious accommodations to their syllabuses.

The law requires colleges "to reasonably accommodate students who, due to the observance of religious holidays, expect to be absent or endure a significant hardship during certain days of the course or program," according to the state Legislature's website.

"Passing this bill sends a powerful message to all students that students of faith, and especially those in minority faith traditions, matter and are welcome in our educational system," said Rabbi Allison Flash, assistant director of education at Temple Beth Am of Seattle.

Flash, along with other faith leaders, has been advocating for this legislation. It's a step forward, she said, for Washington's educational system.

"Students should not have to choose between upholding their academic responsibilities and honoring their faith traditions. This bill allows students of faith to honor both parts of their lives," Flash said.

The idea for this measure came in 2017 when University of Washington student Byron Dondoyano decided to observe Ramadan with his Muslim peers.

"I did it for a week and it was really tough,"said Dondoyano, who is not religious.

Around the same time, he saw an article about UW-Bothell Professor Bryan White, who held finals after sunset for his Muslim students.

The article prompted Dondoyano to look at university policies regarding religious accommodations. What he discovered, he said, was inadequate and hard to find.

"They weren't empowering students to request accommodations," he said. "In this political climate, I felt something needed to happen."

He teamed up with his Muslim classmate Mennah El-Gammal to work on changing UW policies.

Later, the pair met state Sen. Bob Hasegawa at a lobby day, and he agreed to sponsor their efforts as a statewide bill. Soon after, members of the Council on American-Islamic Relations, the Jewish Federation of Seattle, the Anti-Defamation League and other organizations threw their support behind the students' idea.

"It has really been a team effort," Dondoyano said. "These religious accommodations aren't just a problem for one religion. It's something everyone can get behind."

Dondoyano, a junior majoring in law, societies and justice, hopes that Washington's actions to protect religious students will inspire other states to do the same.

J. Cody Nielsen, founder of Convergence on Campus, a nonprofit organization that supports religious, secular, and spiritual diversity within higher education, said the bill sends a message that "all forms of religious identity" are welcome on campus.

"Requiring institutions to take seriously the religious accommodation needs of students in the classroom goes a long way toward ensuring that institutions are upholding the 1st Amendment's Free Exercise Clause," he said.

(This story has been updated.)

Exhibit 2

Invitation to Forum on the Evaluation of Teaching at UW

Jason Johnson <jej@uw.edu>   Wed, May 1, 2019 at 1:49 PM
To: "senate_elected@uw.edu" <senate_elected@uw.edu>

Dear Colleagues,

In April 2019, the Faculty Senate launched a tri-campus task force to review teaching evaluation policies and practices and to, however appropriate, make recommendations for change. On Thursday, May 16, 2019, the task force will be hosting visitors from three peer institutions (Colorado State University, University of Oregon, University of Southern California) where teaching evaluation reform efforts are well underway. All members of the UW community are invited to learn how our regional colleagues are variously addressing methodological issues (e.g., bias, validity) and policy matters (e.g., renderings of teaching evaluations in merit and promotion processes) that have become increasingly salient in postsecondary education discourse over the past several years. To maximize options for participation, three duplicate sessions will be offered (9:00-10:15, 10:45-12:00, and 1:00-2:15) in which the panel will briefly present key insights from each institution followed by Q&A. This dialogue will propel the work of the task force as it develops a work plan for the 2019-2020 academic year, so having as many voices as possible from all three campuses will be important. All sessions will be held at the Ethnic Cultural Center on the Seattle campus and a remote option will be available for those unable to participate in person. May calendars can be especially tight so please know that individuals are welcome to arrive late or leave early as needed.

Please RSVP by completing the form below:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfgeIDTFkM-VVTRbaZAgygIOJ9m-863YRyP2rhchAvoOJSiVg/viewform

Please do circulate this message among your colleagues.

Questions? Don't hesitate to be in touch with either of us.

Regards,

Jason Johnson (jej@uw.edu) and Robin Angotti (riderr@uw.edu)
Co-Chairs, Senate Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching

---

senate_elected mailing list
senate_elected@u.washington.edu
http://mailman13.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/senate_elected

Exhibit 3

W UNIVERSITY *of* WASHINGTON
FACULTY SENATE

Task Force on Teaching Evaluation

Co-Chairs
Jason Johnson, Assoc. Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, UWS, jej@uw.edu
Robin Angotti, Associate Professor, STEM/Teaching, UWB

Faculty and Faculty Council Representatives
Radhika Govindrajan, Associate Professor, Anthropology, UWS, rgovind@uw.edu
Brent Lagesse, Associate Professor, STEM/CSS, UWB, FCTCP, lagesse@uw.edu
Mary Pat Wenderoth, Principal Lecturer, Department of Biology, UWS, FCFA, mpw@uw.edu
Margo Bergman, Senior Lecturer, Milgard School of Business, UWT, FCWA, mwb4@uw.edu
David Goldstein, Principal Lecturer, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UWB, FCTL, davidgs@uw.edu
Andrea Otanez, Lecturer, Department of Communications, UWS, FCMA, aotanez@uw.edu
Timea Tihanyi, Senior Lecturer, Department of Art, UWS, FCTL, timea@uw.edu
Larry Goldman, Lecturer, Department of Chemistry, UWS, FCTCP, goldmanl@uw.edu
Ann Culligan, Lecturer, Department of Psychology, UWS, FCSA, anncv@uw.edu

Student Members
Giuliana Conti, School of Music, GPSS representative, gpsspres@uw.edu
Angelia Miranda, Jackson School of International Studies, ASUW representative, asuwbdua@uw.edu

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a member of the Task Force on Teaching Evaluation. This is an effort by faculty representing all three UW campuses. Your participation and contribution to this very important work is highly valued. It is a task force that will focus on review of our present evaluation methods to highlight deficiencies and shortcomings and then make recommendations for how we might change and improve our evaluation of teaching at University of Washington (UW) for the future. Membership was chosen in an attempt to elicit teaching perspectives that are broad and diverse across our university while also keeping the number of members small enough to remain effective and manageable by the task force co-directors. A variety of teaching faculty ranks, disciplines, and student teaching levels, undergraduate, graduate and professional, are represented as are minority and women faculty.

GOAL:

The UW is committed to the highest standard of teaching in support of our core mission to educate undergraduate, graduate and professional students in preparation for success in their chosen careers and fulfillment of their avocational aspirations through a love of life-long learning. The regular evaluation of faculty teaching is essential for faculty to continuously improve their delivery and transmission of knowledge to students. Accordingly, faculty senate leadership is charging this task force with a goal to design a state-of-the-art model for evaluation of teaching effectiveness that generates trustworthy and useful for faculty teaching improvement via student and peer feedback while mitigating bias.

Exhibit 3

FACULTY CODE REQUIREMENT TO EVALUATE FACULTY ON TEACHING EFFECTIIVENESS:

Chapter 24 of the *Faculty Code,* "Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members," provides a framework for teaching evaluation policy and practice and thus serves as an important backdrop for the work of this task force. Section 24-32, "Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members," Subsection C arguably functions as a working definition of teaching excellence insofar as it specifies high quality teaching attributes and behaviors. Section 24-57, "Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations," Subsection A refers back to these attributes and behaviors as the grounds upon which teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated and stipulates that evaluations are to be conducted by students and by faculty colleagues as well as how and how often. For student evaluations, the UW-provided "assessment of teaching procedure" is to be used "unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure." At least one course per year is to be evaluated by students. For peer evaluations, "procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college" are to be used. The required frequency of evaluation by colleagues varies depending on faculty rank and imminence of appointment or promotion decision-making. As such, the UW Faculty Code properly leaves significant room for interpretation regarding teaching evaluation.

BACKGROUND:

Critical questions related to calling on students to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their college and university instructors have been raised with increasing clarity and urgency in recent years—internationally, nationally, and here at UW. Reasons for concern vary, including but not limited to: suboptimal completion rates, especially with the turn to online formats; potential for racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation and age-related bias, both implicit and explicit; trustworthiness of data as actual indicators of teaching quality and/or student learning rather than other renderings such as course satisfaction, popularity of the faculty member, easiness of course content; integrity with regard to students' ability to accurately judge certain dimensions of instructional quality such as whether the instructor is an expert in their field; and reductive quantitative measure approaches to utilizing evaluation data in merit and promotion decision processes such as, on the five point Likert-type scale the faculty member scores 4.1 so must be a very good teacher.

Maintaining the teaching evaluation model status quo without regard to thoughtful and thorough examination is decreasingly a viable option. Mindful of the complexities and multiplicities of problems and solutions needing to be considered in faculty teaching evaluation, senate faculty council chairs recommended that this senate task force be created to facilitate a concerted and accelerated inquiry and change effort for the present model.

SPECIFICALLY:

This task force is required,

1) To develop is a collective understanding of how the evaluation of teaching is to be undertaken throughout the University in the future, and

2) To assess and evaluate teaching evaluation policies and practices and make recommendations for change following review of the policies and practices of peer institutions engaged in teaching evaluation reform.

Questions to consider under 1) may include;

- What, if any, university-wide policies outside of the Faculty Code – either tethered to or independent from it – govern or guide the evaluation of teaching?

Exhibit 3

- What, if any, policies govern or guide the evaluation of teaching within colleges and schools, whether by elected faculty council by laws or other means?
- What proportion of courses are evaluated using the Office of Educational Assessment's "Instructional Assessment System (IAS)"?
- What practices are associated with the evaluation of courses via tools or instruments other than the IAS?
- What systems, norms, and resources are in place in colleges, schools, and departments to support peer evaluation of courses?
- What policies and practices are established in colleges, schools, and departments to govern or guide interpretation of student and peer evaluation information in matters of appointment, re-appointment, merit, and promotion?

Questions to consider under 2) may include;

- In what ways does Subsection C of the *Faculty Code,* Chapter 24, Section 24-32 function well as a working definition of teaching excellence and how might code language be modified, if necessary, to provide a better University-wide definition?

- In what ways does our current approach to evaluating teaching advance our aspirations for teaching and learning and in what ways does it fall short?

- What policies and/or practices are in place in colleges, schools, and departments that might be adopted or adapted to serve UW at the university level?

- What policies and/or practices are in place at peer institutions that might be adapted or adapted to serve UW at the university level?

Specific recommendations for changes to the *Faculty Code* and with reference to Chapter 29, "Amendment of the *Faculty Code,*" and guidance on an implementation work plan for the 2019-20 academic year is a desired outcome.

Co-chairs of this task force, Robin Angotti and Jason Johnson, will work with you to develop a preliminary report of findings and recommendations. Among these recommendations should be a suggested work plan for the 2019-2020 academic year. We recognize that you have many demands on your time, and so greatly appreciate your willingness to take on this work.

Thank you.

Joseph Janes
Acting chair, UW Faculty Senate

Exhibit 4

Final Recommendation for the Exam Guide

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

1. **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.

2. **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.