

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning**

January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
10:30am – 12:00pm  
Gerberding 142

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order
  2. Review of the Minutes from December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017
  3. Announcements/events
  4. Mary Pat Wenderoth/Phil Reid: Follow-ups from our discussion from December
  5. Discussion around Faculty 2050: Evolving questions...
  6. Subcommittees reports
  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 December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

The minutes from December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017 were approved as written.

**3) Announcements/events**

There were no announcements.

**4) Mary Pat Wenderoth/Phil Reid: Follow-ups from our discussion from December**

Halverson noted he followed up on the discussion the council held in the last meeting concerning two potential systematic changes requested to be considered by former FCTL chair, Mary Pat Wenderoth: (1) starting Autumn Quarter on a Monday rather than a Wednesday/making Thanksgiving week a break week, and (2) rotating the UW final exam schedule. He used a PowerPoint as part of his presentation (Exhibit 1). Halverson explained both Wenderoth and Phil Reid (Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs) are interested in attending an upcoming FCTL meeting to discuss those topics as well as potential outcomes, noting this may occur in the council's February meeting.

Wenderoth's original questions were read aloud, along with Phil Reid's written responses (Exhibit 1). Reid explained (in writing) that he is amenable to exploring the idea with the Provost if there is faculty support in FCTL. Reid was also concerned about units conducting final exams on Saturdays, as not all Saturday finals are tracked and protections thus may not be in place to ensure that students don't end up with several finals on the same day. He recommended the FCTL contact the Registrar to garner a list

of units holding Saturday finals. It was noted FCTL would contact the Registrar to seek this information. Members felt the scale and scope of the problem needed to be identified.

Halverson explained an additional discussion will be planned for a meeting in which Wenderoth and Reid are able to attend.

## 5) Discussion around Faculty 2050: Evolving questions...

Halverson introduced the topic – reminding the council the President, Provost, and faculty senate leadership are interested in evaluating trends and forces shaping the UW faculty of the year 2050 as a new initiative, and FCTL has been asked to weigh in on the topic. It was noted the UW faculty of 2050 are currently being hired, and this initiative is a mechanism to prioritize areas of importance and engage in future planning. The initiative also ties in with the arrival of a new Provost, who will join the UW during summer of 2018. Halverson explained FCTL is meant to view the initiative through its lens of issues relating to teaching and learning, and noted he would like to present the item to members and hold a discussion. He proctored discussion using the meeting's PowerPoint (Exhibit 1).

### *The Professoriate Reconsidered – What Might Faculty Look Like in 2050?*

Halverson explained an article on the topic from 2015 surveyed 1553 faculty and administrators and boiled down their responses to a few of the biggest challenges reported to be facing the faculty of the future (*The Professoriate Reconsidered – What Might Faculty Look Like in 2050?*) (Exhibit 1):

- ❖ Competing tensions between faculty and the administration around the evolving role of faculty within institutions- a lack of a shared vision around how to prioritize needs/move forward into the future
- ❖ The reluctance of unionized faculty groups to “get on board” with the exploration of models that fall outside the traditional models

A slide was shown on what the surveyed university members said they would like to see in relation to the topic (Exhibit 1):

- ❖ Increasing the number of full-time faculty/reducing the reliance on part-time faculty
- ❖ Creating “teaching-only” tenure-line positions
- ❖ Revising and restructuring incentives and reward structures and policies to better reflect different institutional priorities
- ❖ Developing a broader view of “scholarship” (Boyer’s Scholarship Revisited)
- ❖ Create policies to stop the tenure clock for family or other personal needs
- ❖ Equitable pay and inclusion in shared governance (transparency)

Related questions for members to consider in relation to the UW were shown; members and guests were asked to discuss potential responses in 2-3 person groups (Exhibit 1). After 10 minutes of discussion, small groups were asked to present summaries of their conversations.

### *Discussion*

A member noted many tenure track faculty of the baby boomer generation are currently retiring, and will continue to do so in the next 5-10 years. He explained this fact presents an opportunity to alter faculty demographics and engage in culture shifts.

A member felt the higher education finance system requires attention, as it is mainly fiscal motivations driving the trend to hire large amounts of part-time lecturers in certain units. Another member agreed, and noted more teaching lines should be developed on promotable tracks. A member commented departmental chairs need to be the main drivers of this effort. He explained the role of the lecturer (i.e. the instructor) is becoming increasingly important, and changes need to be made to provide better job security and career advancement opportunities to faculty in those roles.

There was some discussion of creating clearer expectations for new faculty (both those who teach and those who mainly do research) in order to better convey conditions for promotion. Another member noted there should also be a focus on providing appropriate levels of mentorship to new faculty.

It was noted it is the students who are the university's primary stakeholders, and students who most value what universities do. It was noted evolving to better serve students should be a focal point of the initiative.

A member explained entire industries are evaporating due to technical improvements and brand new technology. He explained he has observed a shift in the way faculty work now as opposed to in the recent past, as they rarely come in to their offices nowadays, being that much of their work can now be completed at home electronically.

There was some discussion of growing student debt being a main driver of problems in higher education, as more and more young people are weighing the worth of higher education with increasing scrutiny, and values are shifting in relation to the rationale students have for attending a four-year university.

A member questioned if the Faculty 2050 initiative is a shared initiative with other higher education institutions in the state of Washington. He noted he asks because, given the size and status of the UW, anything affecting higher education in the state will generally affect the UW last. He noted other universities will see pangs sooner and more clearly, and thus should be consulted on the 2050 initiative.

Halverson explained the item will be considered again in a coming meeting.

## **6) Subcommittees reports**

### *Subcommittee on Identifying Excellence in Teaching*

A member of the Subcommittee explained an event is being planned for spring quarter, 2018, focused on teaching excellence. He noted more details will be shared as they become available.

## **7) Good of the order**

Halverson explained he would like to hold a mid-year check-in with all FCTL Subcommittees in order for each body to present on progress made towards its goals. He mentioned the item might be included for the March FCTL meeting.

## 8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

---

*Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst*

**Present:**                      **Faculty:** David Masuda, Ellen McGough, Mark Zachry, Thomas Halverson (chair),  
David Goldstein  
**Ex-officio reps:** Amanda Hornby, Maria Zontine, Judith Howard  
**President's designee:** LeAnne Jones Wiles  
**Guests:** Christine Sugatan, Jason Johnson

**Absent:**                        **Faculty:** Dan Turner, Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges, Timea Tihanyi, Kathleen Peterson,  
Fred Bookstein, Amy Howells  
**Ex-officio reps:** Navid Azodi, Meixi Ng

### Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCT&L PP discussion slides 1418.pdf

# FCT&L 1/4/18

QUESTIONS & CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE CHAIR

# Mary Pat Wenderoth/Phil Reid: Follow-ups from our discussion from December.

- ▶ Mary Pat would like to come to a FCT&L meeting (perhaps February), and discuss some of her questions- I'll keep you posted.
- ▶ Phil Reid would also like to join us to at an upcoming meeting to discuss the final exam schedule. He did send these initial responses to Mary Pat's question about the schedule:

**2. Rotate the Exam schedule.** If you look at the exam schedule you will see that it has not changed in decades. That is to say that if a class is taught M-W-F at 10:30 - the final is set for Monday at 8:30. Given that the University is trying to spread out courses throughout the day to **maximize classroom use**, one of the major drives of course time is the exam schedule. No one wants finals on Th or F so they avoid those class times. I suggest to rotate exam schedule by the academic year NOT by the quarter. I realize the current schedule has been set up to minimize the number of finals a student has on any one day. Therefore, the rotation would have to be done by row not column, i. e. 10:30 classes would swap with 11:30 classes.

# Phil Reid's initial responses...

- ▶ Changing the final schedule: I proposed that we "reward" folks that taught at less than optimal times (for example, 8:30) that they get an optimal time for their final. There was some sympathy for this idea, but the registrar was concerned about too many things changing at once. Implementation of the new scheduling policy seems to be going well as is the installation of new scheduling software ("25 Live") and dashboards of classroom usage that academic units can use for planning. My feeling is that there will be "bandwidth" to revisit this idea. If it was supported by faculty, that would great. I'd be happy to take that to the Provost and see if he was comfortable exploring the idea.
- ▶ "Goin' rogue". Some academic units (Math) have been offering a saturday final for a while now...it's in the time schedule, etc. Others have noticed this and started to offer their own Saturday final (I have a colleague in Chemistry doing this winter quarter). We did an experiment in Chemistry a while ago where we offered a Saturday final...and it turned out a lot of our students had a math, chem, and a spanish final all on Saturday! What we learned was that students suffer greatly when they have three finals on the same day with minimal time to prep (we had to throw the final grades out!). First step here is to ask the registrar for a list of who is offering saturdayfinals and see how large an issue this is as present. My concern is that it's just not fair to the students.



# Discussion around Faculty 2050: *Evolving questions...*

- ▶ ***The Professoriate Reconsidered- What might faculty look like in 2050***, (2015), Elizabeth Holcombe and Adrianna Kezar
- ▶ While there have been calls for rethinking the role of faculty for 30+ years, little progress has been made- we largely continue to be stuck on a “tenure-track vs. non-tenure” model
- ▶ What faculty will need to do, (via a national focus on access and opportunity for an increasingly diverse student population in HE), has accelerated the need for/importance of teaching, and de-emphasized the traditional research expectations. As a result, to maintain the historical model, HE has seen a massive increase in non-tenure, teaching-only faculty (70% of instructional faculty are now non-tenure)
- ▶ No “Shared Vision” among key stakeholder groups for the future of faculty (Delphi Project)



# Some of the (big) challenges uncovered by the authors.....

- ▶ Competing tensions between faculty and the administration around the evolving role of faculty within institutions- a lack of a shared vision around how to prioritize needs/move forward into the future
- ▶ The reluctance of unionized faculty groups to “get on board” with the exploration of models that fall outside the traditional models

# What current faculty/admin said they would like to see... (n=1553 of both faculty and admin)

- ▶ Increasing the number of full-time faculty/reducing the reliance on part-time faculty
- ▶ Creating “teaching-only” tenure-line positions
- ▶ Revising and restructuring incentives and reward structures and policies to better reflect different institutional priorities
- ▶ Developing a broader view of “scholarship” (Boyer’s *Scholarship Revisited*)
- ▶ Create policies to stop the tenure clock for family or other personal needs
- ▶ Equitable pay and inclusion in shared governance (transparency)

# Questions for us to ponder...

- ▶ At the UW, who currently establishes what the role (expectations) are for faculty? Does this happen in Academic HR, within the Dean's group, Department Heads/Area Chairs, Faculty Senate, all of the above... Is this consistent across campus(es)/Should it be?
- ▶ What do you see as the difference between what (current) faculty may want (the future role of faculty to be), and what institutions/society will need from their institutions in the future? What will students want/need? What will our evolving society need from our graduates?
- ▶ Where will we need to start in terms of preparing future faculty for these new roles? elementary schools, high schools, undergraduate, graduate, all of the above?
- ▶ Who should be involved in making the decision(s) about what the role of future faculty should be?