University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
January 9, 2013, 10:30 am – 12:00 pm
Gerberding 26

Meeting Summary:

1. Call to Order
2. Chair's Report
3. UW Policy on Posting Instructor Evaluations
4. Online Evaluations
5. Review of the Minutes from October 3, 2013 and Summary of November 7, 2013
6. UW Policy on Posting Instructor Evaluations (Part 2)
7. Amazon e-Text Focus Groups
8. Panapto and Tegrity
9. UW Task Force on Online Learning
10. Possible Joint FCAS-FCTL Working Group
11. ASG MOOC
12. Adjourn

---

1) Start of Meeting

The meeting was started by Chair Allen at 10:30a.m. Allen explained that due to lack of quorum the council will not take official action on items until quorum is reached.

2) Chair's Report

Due to the Board of Regents meeting Karin Roberts is sitting in for Tom Lewis on behalf of UW-IT.

The big item from the recent Faculty Senate meeting is the passage of Class A legislation on Academic Freedom. The results of the faculty vote will be announced shortly.

During its recent meeting the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) had an extensive discussion regarding the Innovating Education Institute. Allen explained that Jerry Baldasty (Senior Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs) will speak about this issue at the upcoming meeting. Allen noted that the main contention surrounded new money being spent towards teaching and research.

The upcoming SEC meeting is scheduled for Monday and Allen requested members to contact him if there are any additional issues/concerns to discuss.

Allen will be meeting with Kate O'Neill (Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate) to discuss the gaps and overlaps of faculty councils. An example is Patricia Kramer's (Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards – "FCAS") suggestion of a joint FCTL/FCAS ad-hoc committee.

3) UW Policy on Posting Instructor Evaluations

Allen discussed Carline's past attempts to refer FCTL's concern regarding the posting of online evaluations to the UW Office of the Attorney General (AG). FCTL is displeased that the AG's office has been ignoring the council's request and it does not appear that any action has been taken. Allen distributed an example of a course evaluation from the Course Evaluation Catalog (CEC) and noted that there is no language that restricts the information to only be used by the intended user. The instructor evaluations are intended to be reviewed by students who are assessing potential classes, but with the recent distribution of the evaluations FCTL may want to recommend that a disclaimer be added which admonishes the use of this information outside the UW community. Allen questioned whether FCTL needs permission from the AG's office to include such language. Another option would be to recommend language for the AG's office to implement.

A question was raised asking about the AG's response to the public release of TA evaluations. That was an issue addressed just but the council but was never reviewed by the AG's office. It was likely an issue that came up last year as part of the TA's collective bargaining agreement with UW.

Allen mentioned that he spoke with Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty) about this issue as well. The concern was first raised when students from the Information School scraped information from the internal site (CEC) and released it publicly. While there is little certainty if there are any restrictions on sharing this information, it does have an impact on tenure-track faculty and their employment opportunities. A suggestion was made to incorporate language into the Course Evaluation Catalogue (CEC) explaining that this information should not be distributed. A comment was raised that this information can be accessed through a public information request. While that is the case, UW could still add the restrictions to CEC.

A question was raised asking if there are any other faculty members complaining about this issue. While there are no examples, it would still be a good practice to have. A comment was raised that this would still not stop students from pulling information from CEC. While that may be the case, it would be nice to have this information on CEC and have the AG's office enforce this rule. A suggestion was made to draft language, but since the council has not reached quorum it cannot take any official action.

A comment was raised stressing the importance that drafting such language would draw attention to the problem once the AG's office is involved. A suggestion was made to send the language to the SEC which would have more authority to contact the AG's office.

A comment was raised reminding the council that students are not releasing information about merit reviews, only instructor evaluations which are available for public access if there is a records request. Additionally, students use external websites like ratemyprofessor.com so they have access to this information anyways. A comment was raised reflecting on the days when access to instructor evaluations was password-protected. Discussion ensued about putting restrictions on protected webpages.

The council discussed possible language to add to CEC. A comment was raised that faculty do not believe students are trying to be disrespectful, but posting information to a public website is inappropriate. Discussion ensued. The language should include a restriction that the information should be only used for individuals in the UW community and that redistribution to anyone without a UW ID is prohibited.

4) Online Evaluations [Exhibits A,B and C]

Nana Lowell, (Director for Office of Educational Assessment) provided an update on the UW course evaluations system project. Lowell's office launched the new system in autumn 2013 and is now using the system to manage all course evaluations at UW Seattle. In order to effectively implement the rollout Lowell's office trained 60 departmental coordinators in how to use the interface.

Lowell's office continues to coordinate online evaluations for the Information School and UW Tacoma and Bothell campuses. Lowell mentioned that approximately 200 other course evaluations were conducted online without being contacted by her office, a result of word-of-mouth within the UW community. The response rate is high (60%), nearly comparable to paper evaluations. Lowell distributed a handout detailing response rates from specific departments. Lowell noted that there were high adopters, such as Economics (65%) and Business (80%). There are about 8,000 courses each quarter at UW-Seattle and courses with multiple sections may also have multiple evaluations. A question was raised asking if any departments are requiring a 100% response rate. Lowell is not sure if departments are requiring online evaluations, but in some cases departments will not release grades until students submit their course evaluations.

A question was raised asking is the system is tracking evaluations for online and hybrid courses. The system is built with an option for faculty to select whether their course is face-to-face, hybrid or online. However, faculty members are ignoring that so it is difficult to get access to that information. A question was raised asking if Lowell's office can categorize results by class size. There is no data on that information at this time since the program has just recently started.

Lowell's office will be taking an institutional approach to increase response rates across campus. For example, links to course evaluations could be located on the UW website or MyUW. The Office of Educational Assessment is having a conversation about incorporating online evaluations with MyPlan which is a tool that will allow access to evaluation results.

The plan for Winter Quarter is to continue training departmental coordinators and update the website to ensure users know the office is in transition. Additionally, an email will be sent out to chairs and faculty to discuss response rates. Lowell's office is also open to meeting with curricular committees to discuss converting to online evaluations and answer any questions. Lowell distributed another handout which is a preliminary draft for faculty and curriculum coordinators about how to use the system. Lowell then asked the council for feedback and asked if course evaluation results should be incorporated into MyPlan.

Concern was raised that it is difficult because there is no certainty what MyPlan will do. MyPlan is a curricular planning tool which will add a component for course registration. At the time of planning out curriculum, students will be able to review course evaluation results before they register.

A question was raised asking if the course evaluations would be actively or passively available. This is something that the council may able to determine. Currently, CEC is passive. A comment was raised stating that if the intent is to encourage students to make decisions based on learning goals, then the change would be beneficial. However, if the intent is to allow students to make decisions based solely off course evaluations then it may be a bad idea. Discussion ensued. An important consideration is identifying the motivation to use evaluations. A suggestion was made to simply provide a link to CEC for students to use if they want to review a course evaluation. Discussion ensued. Concern was raised that students may not even know which professor will be teaching a particular course when they enroll due

to the logistics of course scheduling. Allen mentioned that he will speak with Tom Lewis (Director for Academic & Collaborative Applications) to invited somebody from MyPlan to discuss this.

(Links added)

- http://www.washington.edu/oea/pdfs/course_eval/IASystem_FAQs_Coordinators.pdf
- http://www.washington.edu/oea/pdfs/course_eval/IASystem_FAQs_Faculty.pdf

5) Review of the Minutes from October 3, 2013 and Summary from November 7, 2013

With the late arrival of a council member FCTL reached quorum in order to take official actions. The minutes from October 3, 2013 and the summary from November 7, 2013 were approved.

6) UW Policy on Posting Instructor Evaluations (Part 2)

Allen moved to forward an official statement to SEC requesting the AG's office look into instructor evaluations and add a disclaimer to the CEC website. Lowell provided the following statement:

> *"Information on this site is intended for use by members of the UW academic community. Publication or redistribution of this information to any individual without a current UW NetId is prohibited."*

The statement received unanimous approval.

7) Amazon e-Text Focus Groups

Karin Roberts provided an update on the recent developments of the Amazon e-Text initiative. UWIT is working with Amazon to build and pilot a project that would merge Kindle with UW's learning management system. The goal is to simplify textbook adopting, create a positive reading experience, and help instructors improve student access to course materials. The Kindle feature would allow users to access course material on many different devices and platforms. UWIT is now conducting a focus group with 40 faculty members along with representatives from Amazon to identify methods in which to build out Amazon's Ecommerce search service.

A question was raised asking how the focus group is receiving student input since the focus group does not include students. Karin did not have the information but will follow up with Tom Lewis. Once the pilot is complete the program could officially launch in Fall Quarter 2014. The program would be added to CANVAS as an Amazon Textbook link which the instructor can choose to use for the course. UWIT expects training to occur in the summer in order to use this new feature.

One benefit of using CANVAS will show the analytics in how students are using the Amazon feature. Concern was raised about funneling business to Amazon and restricting access to other providers. Students still have the option to use e-readers from other providers, but will be more difficult. A comment was raised that UW will receive money as part of this partnership through Amazon's "Associates program". Concern was raised that the money will go to UW but not students themselves. Discussion ensued. Instructors will be able to see how Amazon is charging students and determine how much they will be paying for this feature. The potential benefits would be having instantly portable,

digital material. While students are not required to go directly through Amazon to get access to course material, it makes it a lot easier.

A question was raised asking if there is a rental price compared to a full purchase price. For example, rather than paying full price students could just "rent" the material for the quarter at a lower cost. While that is a possible, students prefer to pay the full price since rental costs are not much lower than full price. Concern was raised stating that UW should not sign a contract with Amazon if UW is limited only to Amazon. Tom Lewis is currently negotiating a contract and could speak to that issue at a later meeting.

8) Panopto and Tegrity

UW's current lecture capture system, Tegrity, was bought out by another company and service quality has been gradually declining. UW has been testing another program, Panopto, which has been receiving positive feedback from faculty and students.

9) UW Task Force on Online Learning

Jim Gregory, past Chair of the Faculty and current Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, was present to discuss a new special task force on online learning. FCTL initiated a conversation 3 years ago with a report from Carline which was sent to faculty leadership and the administration detailing the challenges of online learning. The intent was to address issues as UW drifts into the world of online courses and degrees at the graduate level. Currently, with the recent approval of a full online degree for Early Childhood and Family Studies, the upcoming online Integrated Social Sciences (ISS) completion degree, and the number of MOOCs provided by UW Educational Outreach, it is important for the UW community to have guidance before further drifting into online education.

The Provost agreed to establish a joint task force co-chaired by Gregory and Betsy Wilson (Vice Provost for Digital Initiatives and Dean of UW Libraries). During its first meeting the task force discussed the ISS degree with Matt Sparke and heard a report from Dan Grossman who has supervised several MOOCs. In upcoming meetings the task force will prepare recommendations for online learning at UW and address the scope, risks, opportunities, mechanisms and oversight involved.

The task force is designed to be a temporary committee to address how UW is committing its resources and ensure the institution's reputation remains high. The decision should not be ad hoc for those who want to develop online courses due to the high costs of development and implementation. For example, MOOCs cost approximately $30,000 per course. The important, long term concern is how to surrender oversight to FCTL in the future.

10) Possible Joint FCAS-FCTL Working Group

Allen stated that the council needs to figure out jurisdictional issues since online learning covers other councils like FCAS. FCAS has asked to develop a joint subcommittee with FCTL to address a variety of issues related to online learning, such as the distinction between distance learning and non-UW residents.

A comment was raised that the old Faculty Council on Instructional Quality would have never deal with these types of issues. Kramer's concern is that there are gaps and overlap between FCTL, FCAS and the

university curriculum committee which need to be addressed. FCTL's concern is to avoid getting so tied up with online learning that the council cannot address other important issues. Therefore, it would be nice to have a committee that could specifically address online learning. A question was raised asking if the Office of Faculty Governance has enough resources to create committees for single-focused issues. If FCTL was to address online education it would need to meet more than once per month to cover everything. A comment was raised that the magnitude and potential impact are so large it demands the complete focus of an individual committee and FCTL does not have the bandwidth to cover the entire issue.

11) ASG MOOC

David Szatmary (Vice Provost for UW Educational Outreach) was present to discuss recent developments of MOOCs at UW. Eight years ago UW began working collaboratively with peer institutions (Georgia Tech, UC Irvine, Wisconsin) to deliver online certificate programs. Over the summer UW and its partnering institutions were reviewing their portfolios and realized that many were offering MOOCs through Coursera and edX. As a result the group decided to look into developing their own MOOC platform since over 3 million people are registering through these third-party providers.

By managing its own MOOC platform UW and its peers could provide content in a more flexible manner which would be driven by UW faculty. Coursera and EdX have a template model that allows for videos, a midterm and final. However, an ASG MOOC could allow for other formats that could be incorporated into courses. While EdX and Coursera are proprietary platforms, UW could use CANVAS as its own platform. The MOOCs would provide free content and allow UW to split content from assessments which could be conducted by peers, machines, integrated social media, or by an individual professor. Those who wish to be assessed would pay for a credential and could receive a Certificate of Participation, joint certificate from multiple institutions, or advanced credits depending on the course. The business model would be flipped from what Coursera and edX currently offer; UW would recover 90% of any revenue generated while the rest would be allocated to CANVAS. Seven institutions are already interested in this proposal and believe this is a good opportunity to experience with a service that allows for more flexibility while being faculty-focused.

If taken for credits MOOCs would have to go through the university curriculum committee. MOOCs that are offered for no credit would only have to submit their syllabi for academic approval. Currently, none of the UW MOOCs are offered as credit. Once a faculty member is identified to teach a MOOC they will approach the faculty chair for approval. Once their MOOC is approved it must be approved by the dean. A question was raised asking if there is any interest in offering MOOCs for credit. At this time the only interest is in non-credit MOOCs; ASG wants to start simple then expand if the program is successful. Similar to current online courses assessments would be faculty-driven. Currently, UW offers 17 online degree programs so there is experience in offering they types of courses.

A question was raised asking if the people enrolled in MOOCs are considered students. Szatmary explained that MOOC participants are not considered students. However, those individuals who are enrolled in some sort of credential, like a certificate program, are treated like UW students. If a student participates in a jointly-offered program then they are considered students at all of the participating institutions.

A question was raised asking about the resources required to operate this new ASG MOOC proposal. Most peer institutions, like UW, run their MOOCs through their continuing education unit. The unit

would front the money then make the courses fee-based in which the fees would be recovered via the assessments. Coursera has a Signature Track offering that provides participants a certificate, branded by the institution, for $49.99. UW does not participate in Signature Track but other institutions are participating such as Duke and Yale. A question was raised about UW's upfront costs to offer these MOOCs. UW programs that are currently online already have content so the development of courses would be muted. UW Educational Outreach would pay a faculty member's one-month salary to develop and implement the MOOC. While there is a financial risk, it would be less than partnering with Coursera because UW would be able to recover the money. CANVAS would receive 12% of any gross revenues with the rest to the partnering institutions.

12) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Allen at 12:00 p.m.

Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst. gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Allen (Chair), Nelson, Olavarria, Schwartz, Spyridakis, Turner, Wilkes
Ex-Officio Reps: Jankowski
Guests: David Szatmary (Vice Provost for UW Educational Outreach), Nana Lowell (Director for Office of Educational Assessment), Karin Roberts (for Tom Lewis, UW-IT)

Absent: **Faculty:** Carline, Harrison, Masuda, McGough, Yeh, Zierler
President's Designee: Taylor
Ex-Officio Reps: Corbett, McNerney, (no GPSS representative has been appointed)

UNIVERSITY *of* WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT

UW Online Course Evaluations: *IASystem*™

Project update
Faculty Council for Teaching and Learning
January 9, 2014

Autumn 2013

- Introduced *IASystem* version 1.0
    – all UW Seattle course evaluation data previously migrated to online database
    – began using online interface for all course evaluation management (inhouse and departmental)
- Trained 60 departmental coordinators in using online management interface
- Continued online evaluations with iSchool, Law School and UW Tacoma
- Additional 236 evaluations administered online at UW Seattle
- Overall response rate at UW Seattle 63.2%; at UW Tacoma 60.5%
- Met with Karin Roberts re: possible integration of course evaluation student access in Canvas or MyUW
- Scheduled meeting with Darcy Van Patten re: possible reporting of course evaluation results in conjunction with student academic planning and registration in MyPlan
  ** need statement of FCTL opinion regarding type of integration recommended

Winter 2014 (proposed)

- Additional training sessions for departmental coordinators
- Update OEA course evaluation webpages to reflect changes in system and recommended faculty actions to increase response rates
- OEA emails
    – To all chairs offering to meeting with departmental curriculum committees regarding changes in evaluation system, particularly use of online evaluations for face-to-face courses
    – To all faculty noting availability of online evaluations and recommending faculty actions to increase response rates
- Possible additional actions
    – Modify standard notification and reminder emails to faculty using online evaluations to include information on increasing response rates – possibly include dynamic messaging in reminder emails per response rate to date
    – Create new quarterly report to chairs re: courses evaluated, average ratings and response rate

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

FAQs – Departmental Coordinators

How do I get access to IASystem^{TM}?

Access to the *IASystem*^{TM} online interface is controlled by UW NetID. Contact us (iasuw@uw.edu) to be granted access.

Can I request course evaluation packets by sending a spreadsheet to OEA?

We will continue to accept spreadsheets during winter 2013, however, starting spring quarter we will ask that you request evaluations using the online interface.

What if I want to request an evaluation for a course that isn't listed on the interface?

The interface includes all courses included in the current Time Schedule. If the course doesn't appear on the interface, ask your departmental Administrator to have the Time Schedule entries corrected. The course will appear on the *IASystem*^{TM} interface the following Tuesday.

What is the best time to order paper evaluation packets?

We are best able to fill orders for evaluation packets after the 10th day and before the 7th week of the quarter.

Which courses should be evaluated online?

IASystem^{TM} will allow you to set up an online evaluation for any course listed in the Time Schedule according to faculty request. Instructors who wish to use online evaluations in face-to-face courses should plan to implement most if not all of the following strategies to increase student response rate:

- Set an evaluation "open period" that fits in with the flow of the course
- Communicate the importance of course evaluations – most students do not believe results are used to improve courses and aren't aware they are reviewed by department chairs
- Notify students in advance of the upcoming evaluation period and/or schedule it in the online syllabus
- Put the evaluation link in the online syllabus
- Remind students to complete the evaluations
- Award 1-2 points to students who submit an evaluation (either complete or empty)
- Set aside class time to administer course evaluations online (students can respond on mobile devices as well as laptops)

How should I choose the "begin" and "end" dates for an online evaluation?

The evaluation should usually be conducted sometime in the last one to two weeks of the quarter – ask the instructor which time period will fit best in the flow of the class. The optimum "open period" is about eight days. This duration will provide two reminder emails for non-responding students.

When may I print course summary reports?

OEA will continue to print and distribute course evaluation summaries to faculty and departments through summer 2014. Starting in autumn 2014, faculty will be able to print their own course summaries. The online interface allows you to print these reports as well. COURSE REPORTS MUST NEVER BE DISTRIBUTED TO FACULTY UNTIL <u>AFTER GRADES HAVE BEEN POSTED.</u>

Who should receive Hi/Lo and Annual reports?

OEA will continue to print and distribute Hi/Lo and Annual reports to deans and department chairs through summer 2014. Starting in autumn 2014, deans and chairs will have direct access to reports through an online interface, and the reports may also be printed by departmental coordinators.

Exhibit C

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

FAQs – UW Seattle Faculty and Chairs

How do I request an evaluation?

Ask your departmental coordinator to set up evaluations for each of your classes. Contact us (iasuw@uw.edu) if you don't know the name of your coordinator. If your department doesn't have a coordinator, or if you want to request a paper evaluation for an individual class, you can order online.

What if my course isn't listed on the online order form?

All courses listed in the current quarter's Time Schedule are shown on the online order form. If your course isn't included, ask your departmental Administrator to have the Time Schedule entries corrected. The revised list will appear on the following Tuesday.

Can I evaluate face-to-face courses online?

IASystem^{TM} will allow you to evaluate any course (face-to-face, hybrid, or online) using either online or paper evaluations. To evaluate a course online, you should plan to implement at least four of the following strategies to increase student response rate:

- Set an evaluation "open" period that fits in with the flow of the course
- Communicate the importance of course evaluations – most students do not believe results are used to improve courses and aren't aware they are reviewed by department chairs
- Notify students in advance of the upcoming evaluation period and/or schedule it in the online syllabus
- Put the evaluation link in the online syllabus
- Remind students to complete the evaluation
- Award 1-2 points to students who submit an evaluation (either complete or empty)
- Set aside class time to administer course evaluations online (students can respond on mobile devices as well as laptops)

Which evaluation form should I use?

The same evaluation forms are available both online and on paper. The forms were developed to evaluate various instructional formats, but the best way to choose a form is by choosing the questions that will be most helpful in improving the course.

A Small Lecture / Discussion (66K PDF*)	I Distance Learning (100K PDF*)
B Large Lecture (98K PDF*)	J Clinical / Studio (92K PDF*)
C Seminar / Discussion (98K PDF*)	K Project / Studio (100K PDF*)
D Problem Solving (99K PDF*)	L English as a Second Language (269K PDF*)
E Skill Acquisition (98K PDF*)	M Study Abroad (315K PDF*)
F Quiz Section (153K PDF*)	X Educational Outcomes (99K PDF*)
G Lectures / Assignments (97K PDF*)	Comment Form (19K PDF*)
H Lab (152K PDF*)	

Can I add my own questions?

You can photocopy additional questions onto the backs of the scannable forms. The Additional Item Template facilitates creation of a master copy. You will be able to add questions to online evaluations starting in autumn 2014.

How do I administer my evaluations?

If you are evaluating your class using scannable forms, administration instructions (24K PDF*) are included with each evaluation packet. If you are using online evaluations, they will begin and end on the schedule set by your departmental coordinator. You will receive notification emails on the same schedule as your students at the beginning of the evaluation period, followed by subsequent reminders.

How can I compare my ratings with other UW Seattle ratings?

IAS Norms can be computed for individual classes based on the college/department, instructor rank, course level, and class size.

What is the cost to use IASystem?

Each instructor at UW Seattle may evaluate one course (up to 100 students) each quarter without charge, with the exception of Assistant Professors who may evaluate two courses. Evaluations beyond this allocation are charged to the department. The cost to evaluate a course is the same for online and paper-based evaluations.