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

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes from January 10, 2013, meeting
3. Demonstration of Canvas and ARS Initiatives – Tom Lewis
4. Policies for Response Rates for Electronic Evaluations of Courses – School of Public Health
5. Standards for Program Evaluation of On-line Degree Programs
6. Adjourn

---

1) Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Jan Carline at 10:38 a.m.

2) Approval of minutes from January 10, 2013 meeting
Minutes from the January 10, 2013, meeting were approved as written.

3) Demonstration of Canvas and ARS Initiative – Tom Lewis
Chair Carline introduced Tom Lewis, Director of Academic and Collaborative Application, who gave a presentation on the Canvas Product. The Canvas Network "connects teachers to a world of students, and connects students to a world of learning." There are currently 24 courses available on-line with more than 60 courses that have been proposed. Currently 16,200 students participate, and that number increases by an average of 200 new students per day. His handout included a sampling of courses offered by a broad national selection of institutions of higher education, including local venues.

These communities of learners benefit from cross-institutional communication, networking opportunities, and collaboration around learning objectives and outcomes. A wide variety of on-line discussion group possibilities are available for student and alumni participation. The Collections component of Canvas allows educators to build repositories of learning objects that can be pulled directly into Canvas courses as needed.

Summing up, this product addresses academic community, collections and courses by:
- Working with a community to construct powerful learning objectives.
- Learning objectives can be stored in collections and pulled directly into courses.
- Learning objectives can be created and commented on, better helping students to choose appropriate courses.
- Learning objectives used in a course track back to outcomes, so that a student can determine its use and/or value.

4) Policies for Response Rates for Electronic Evaluations of Courses – School of Public Health
Chair Carline introduced this topic by reviewing the difficulty many schools and colleges have in getting students to complete course evaluations of any sort. It's generally better if the requirement for completing an evaluation is clear from the beginning of the course – and included in a syllabus or some similar document. Linking the completion of an evaluation to getting a grade in the class can be very

tricky. Nevertheless, the School of Public Health has had some success. Carline then introduced Dr. Gail Greenwood from the School of Public Health.

Gail Greenwood, Associate Director of the Extended MPH Degree Program, brought a Power Point Presentation to the Council that addressed their Program's approach to achieving a workable response rate for electronic evaluation of courses in the School of Public Health.

She began by reviewing the elements leading to the development of a new policy and ultimately to its implementation. Those developing the policy wanted to tie completion of a student's course evaluation to the posting of his or her grade. They felt the new process must be able to confirm submission of each student's course evaluation while ensuring that student identity is "blinded." Finally, they felt that students should be allowed to submit a blank course evaluation to intentionally opt out; Faculty would be allowed to tell students their grades; and the program would maintain its commitment to students to "do no harm."

The following is a summary of the new course evaluation process:
- Access: Links to the course evaluation is put on the course webpage
- Timing: Course evaluations may be hidden at faculty request, until last few days of quarter
- Grades: Instructors send program their final grades for entry into the system
- Format: Blinded: Students must copy confirmation number and send to the program
- Confirmations: Program tracks receipt of confirmation by student against enrollment
- If course evaluation hasn't been done by the quarterly grade submission deadline:
  - Program submits an X, for no grade
  - Except Spring Quarter, financial aid reviewed, submits "N" (satisfactory progress)
    - unless the student is not making good progress
  - Change of grade submitted for student once confirmation number is received

Reasons for developing a new course evaluation process:
- Poor rates of student participation over several years
- Information skewed for making decisions
  - Results too far to one side or other
  - Lots of repairing to find real areas of consensus
- Lots of failed efforts to encourage participation
  - Belief that nothing else left to try
  - Desire on part of faculty and students to get better results

How consensus in support of the new course evaluation process came about:
- Faculty member initially proposed possible solution
- Faculty discussed at meeting and were OK with possibility
- Student representative asked students and got OK
- eMPH asked for faculty and student input for process

Ensuing question included rate of return of course evaluations. With the new policy, there was 100% return. But of those, less than 10% chose to "opt out" and return a blank evaluation. Before, their rate of return had been 40-60%. Feedback from the users – both students and faculty – has been favorable. Although only in place for one quarter, the drafters of the policy hope that more consistent feedback will help lead to improvements to teaching and learning.

5) Standards for Program Evaluation of On-line Degree Program

Chair Carline reported that although approval of programs comes under the purview of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, that Council has asked FCTL for ideas on what might be included in an evaluation of an on-line degree program. There are procedures in place for the evaluation of in-class programs, but presumably there might be different or additional considerations in evaluating on-line programs. He also mentioned that whereas the undergraduate social science degree program is on hold for now, the undergraduate early childhood education program is moving forward.

One member suggested that the HEC Board would probably be a good resource. Another member said that there are no on-line degree programs in natural sciences among UW peers except for the University of Arizona and Duke – so information from among peer institutions at this point will be scarce. There was concern about how one would go about measuring whether those graduating from UW on-line degree are as well prepared for their careers as those educated on campus. That was followed by discussion of classroom space (or lack thereof) being a chief driver in developing on-line programs. With decreased funding, public universities face a severe classroom deficit going forward.

Chair Carline then distributed a one-page handout addressing program assessment of degree programs to elicit further questions and conversation. One member commented that this work had emerged from faculty skepticism and reflects those sentiments. It asks raises difficult but important questions. GPSS representative Randall said she would like to know what a student would choose an undergraduate on-line degree. She also asked if undergraduate on-line degree programs would be considered a fee-based program? Ed Taylor, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, said he would find out and report back what the relationship is here.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Carline at 11:45 a.m.

Minutes by Susan Folk, Faculty Council Support. slfolk@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Carline (Chair), Turner, Zierler, Olavarria, Masuda, Nelson, Martin-Morris, Salehi-Esfahani, Kyes, Wilkes
Ex-Officio Reps: Sugatan, Jankowski, Kutz, Randall, Corbett
President's Designee: Taylor
Guests: Nana Lowell, Tom Lewis, Beth Kalikof, Gail Greenwood

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