University of Washington Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

March 10, 2022 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Zoom**

Meeting synopsis:

- 1. Call to order
- 2. Review of the minutes from February 10, 2022
- 3. Vote on Class C resolution (attached).
- 4. FCAS: discussion on general education proposed changes Ann Huppert & Jason Johnson
- 5. Chair updates
- 6. Subcommittee updates
 - a. Course/Teaching Evaluations + Faculty Peer Review
 - b. Student Accessibility/access
- 7. Update on final exam scheduling issue
- 8. Good of the order
- 9. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 10:33 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from February 10, 2022

The minutes from February 10, 2022 were approved as written.

3. Vote on Class C resolution (attached)

The council reviewed the final version of the class c resolution operationalizing sensible, fair, and equitable adjustments to students' academic responsibilities (Exhibit 1).

A council member made a suggested change of language to "definition **and/or rules** of a sensible, fair, and equitable...". The council did not approve the change.

The council voted to approve the version as originally written.

4. FCAS: discussion on general education proposed changes – Ann Huppert & Jason Johnson

Ann Huppert (Chair FCAS) and Jason Johnson joined the council to discuss policy matters specific to general education and proposed language inclusions to Scholastic Regulations Chapter 114 (Exhibit 2). The changes would be more aligned with peer institutions and better reflect UW values.

Members emphasized their appreciation of these changes. The council noted their support to endorse the

Members emphasized their appreciation of these changes. The council noted their support to endorse the final legislation.

5. Chair updates

Chair Halverson shared an outline of Spring Quarter 2022 work for FCTL. This included imminent crisis items such as finals scheduling, masks, flexibility around student work, etc. Subcommittee work would need to be summarized for the next academic year, particularly for identifying the central challenges around Course/Teaching/Peer Evaluations and Student Accessibility/the Changing Classroom Environment.

6. Subcommittee updates

- a. Course/Teaching Evaluations + Faculty Peer Review
- b. Student Accessibility/access

Student Accessibility/access: Members mentioned the overlap and differences between DRS accommodations and broad accessibility. General accessibility benefits a population which could use DRS services but ultimately does not. They considered defining the specific topics to address, such as universal design.

Course/Teaching Evaluations + Faculty Peer Review: The subcommittee noted the UW administration has been conducting work on this topic for several decades. Members suggested additional communication between council committees and other university-level groups. Members questioned actions of the provost office and emphasized coordination with OEA or other departments.

7. Update on final exam scheduling issue

Matt Winslow provided a written update regarding adjustments to the final exam schedules. They noted that shifting values often results in potential conflicts for students, reducing abilities for instructors to complete grades in a timely manner, or evening courses having early morning finals. Winslow made plans to join FCTL at the next meeting for another update.

8. Good of the Order

A member mentioned their faculty have questioned returning of scantron services. Sean Gehrke noted the return of that service in Mary Gates Halls is likely very small. Room scheduling for active-learning courses is prioritized for different instructing types.

A guest noted the Technology Teaching Fellows application period is open and encouraged faculty to apply.

Tom Lewis stated UWIT is working on technology pilots and analytics products.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Minutes by Alexandra Toyoda, faculty council analyst, xanport@uw.edu

Present: Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Fred Bookstein, Lynn Dietrich,

Casey Self, Kristin Gustafson, Thomas Halverson (chair), Lauren

Graham, SoYoung Kang

Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Kat Eli, Deb Raftus

President's designee: LeeAnne Jones Wiles

Guests: Tom Lewis, Sean Gehrke, Pen Moon, Ann Huppert, Jason Johnson

Absent: Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Kathleen Peterson, Ruben

Cases, Anne-Marie Gloster, Rania Hussein Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Lukas Illa

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FINAL FCTL Class C Adjustments and Adaptations

Exhibit 2 – FCAS GE for Faculty Councils 2Mar2022

Class C Legislation: Operationalizing sensible, fair, and equitable adjustments to students' academic responsibilities

Increasingly, requests are being made to faculty to adjust and/or adapt students' academic responsibilities within their courses for reasons that are non-disability related. For example, students are requesting to come late/leave early from class on a regular basis, or to have changes made to their assignments/projects for the course, or to have their exam schedule altered or adjusted in some way. Reasons given for these requests may include but not limited to health issues, military service, participation in Husky Athletics, or religious observance. Currently, there is very little guidance for faculty in terms of what defines and determines the parameters of a "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustment or adaptation as it relates to students' academic work and responsibilities in their courses.

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL) has been asked to define and operationalize what "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustments or adaptations for students would be within this context, that meet UW Faculty Code and is useful and fair to both faculty and students. Accordingly, during winter quarter 2021 FCTL launched a survey to explore adjustments and adaptations requested by students, outside of the scope of disability requests, for students around a number of factors related to teaching and learning. The survey was sent through the Senate to all voting faculty on all 3 UW campuses. 364 faculty completed the survey, and the results of the survey are available upon request.

The FCTL used the results of this survey to guide the drafting of this Class C resolution.

Resolution:

WHEREAS, the challenge of defining and operationalizing what constitutes a "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustment or adaptation of student academic work and responsibilities has been a persistent and growing problem on all three UW campuses. This challenge was exacerbated during the 20-21 academic year due to the global pandemic and social unrest in our country, and the incredible stress and strain it put on our students and faculty, as well as multiple UW systems/structures.

WHEREAS, FCTL recognizes that ultimately the decision to grant a non-disability related adjustment or adaptation to a student lies with the faculty (in accordance with UW Faculty Code), currently there is limited and inconsistent information/direction for faculty and instructors seeking general guidance on what are considered to be "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustments or adaptations they can make for students in regards to student academic work and responsibilities.

WHEREAS, academic units have different policies and practices pertaining to their curriculum needs and expected outcomes, and should be afforded some degree of flexibility in their determination of what constitutes a "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustment or adaptation of student academic work and responsibilities within the context of their teaching/learning environment; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate recommends that academic units consider the following:

1. To maximize engagement and consistency, academic units should design and lead a formal process to define (operationalize) for faculty and students what will constitute a "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustment or adaptation of student academic work and responsibilities within their academic unit. This process should include a recognition and acknowledgement of UW DRS/ADA requirements, as well as clearly outline within academic units what are recognized to be the limits for granting adjustments and adaptations for students. Faculty/academic units can then work within these parameters and stay reasonably consistent and fair/equitable in their granting of adjustments and adaptations to all students.

- 2. Academic units should share their definition of a "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustment or adaptation of student academic work and responsibilities with all faculty and students.
- 3. Academic units should review their definition of a "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustment or adaptation on a regular and consistent basis (yearly, at a minimum), and make corrections or updates when appropriate.
- 4. If cases arise where "sensible, fair, and equitable" (non-disability related) adjustments are not clearly or sufficiently defined by an academic unit, these units are encouraged to support their faculty in making decisions determined to be in the best interest of the faculty, students, and courses.
- 5. Nothing in this resolution is intended to change, alter, or supersede Washington State Senate Bill 5166 (2019) pertaining to religious accommodation, and/or constrain any present or future processes for handling appeals or other special situations.

Submitted by: Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning



CONTEXT

- FCAS initiated a "policy census" in Summer 2019 in order to identify and prioritize policy matters that may require FCAS action – this work is ongoing
- A subgroup was formed in Autumn 2020 to review policy matters specific to general education, with a particular focus on intersections with the Scholastic Regulations
- FCAS will review proposed legislation on March 10, for possible advancement to the SEC on March 22 and the Senate on April 7

PRIMARY INFLUENCES AND SIGNIFICANCE

- Report on Undergraduate Learning Assessment (UW Office of Educational Assessment, 2021)
 - Proposed requirement descriptions maintain fidelity to how academic department chairs and program directors describe what they are already doing with their non-major courses
- Report of the Task Force on Undergraduate Degree Requirements (College of Arts & Sciences, 1994)
 - Proposed requirement descriptions are grounded in, as best we can tell, "original intent" of the current general
 education requirements
- Review of peers' general education programs/requirements ("peer" = the 34 public member institutions
 of the Association of American Universities)
 - Proposed requirement descriptions and nomenclature, as well as proposed advancements in curriculum governance, bring us into stronger alignment with our peers, nearly all of which have revised their general education programs and requirements at least once since the time of our last major change in early 1990s

PROBLEM STATEMENT

We are losing a common understanding of the substance of our general education requirements. As a result, our governance of courses that meet these requirements has diminished over time, as has our ability to explain to students and others how these requirements contribute to the meaning of a UW baccalaureate education.



RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. At this juncture, clarify rather than transform the University's general education program
- 2. Modify language of <u>Chapter 114</u> of the Scholastic Regulations to frame general education requirements in a more consistent manner and provide a touch of guidance
- 3. Establish a tri-campus General Education committee or council to serve as a steward of general education requirements and courses

Current **Proposed B. Required Credits B. Required Credits** To be eligible for graduation from the University with the Bachelor's degree, To be eligible for graduation from the University with the Bachelor's a student shall satisfy all other specific requirements and shall offer a degree, a student shall satisfy all other specific requirements and shall minimum of 180 credits. offer a minimum of 180 credits. 1) The requirements for graduation shall include: 1) The General Education requirements for graduation shall include: a) No fewer than 40 credits of general education courses approved a) Areas of Inquiry. To ensure that students may develop a by the appropriate school or college, including no fewer than 10 foundational understanding of what kinds of questions can be asked and what kinds of problems can be addressed through a credits in each of three areas of study: The Natural World, Individuals and Societies, and The Visual, Literary, and Performing range of disciplines and fields of study, no fewer than 40 credits Arts; of courses in three Areas of Inquiry (Arts and Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences), to include no fewer than 10 b) No fewer than 12 credits of writing consisting of 5 credits of credits in each Area English Composition and two additional writing-intensive courses (the latter may be satisfied through several options: "W" courses, b) Writing. To ensure that students may learn to practice and use writing, broadly conceived, to solve problems, develop senior seminars, senior thesis, or courses for which students and faculty contract for a substantial amount of writing); critical thinking, and deepen learning, no fewer than 12 credits of courses to include 5 credits of English Composition and two c) No fewer than 5 credits of courses devoted to reasoning skills additional courses designated as writing-intensive ("W") (courses to fulfill this requirement include quantitative, symbolic, or formal reasoning which may be satisfied within the discipline). c) Reasoning. To ensure that students may learn to critically evaluate and effectively use information through the application of symbolic and/or numeric methods, or the theoretical study d) No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural, political, and thereof, no fewer than 5 credits of courses expressly focused economic diversity of human experience at local, regional, or on the development of such reasoning skills global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in d) Diversity. To ensure that students may learn... no fewer than increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus X credits... language TBD, following the work of the diversity on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and requirement task force contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, 2) Courses taken to fulfill the Writing, Reasoning, Diversity, and major ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course requirements may apply as appropriate to the Areas of Inquiry activities should encourage thinking critically on topics such as requirements power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across differences. 2) Courses taken to fulfill the writing, reasoning, diversity, and major requirements may apply as appropriate to the general education

requirements.

A NEW TRI-CAMPUS GEN ED GOVERNANCE BODY: WHAT WOULD IT DO?

- 1. Build and maintain a common understanding of the purposes and goals of the UW's General Education program
- 2. Serve as the stewards of University-level General Education policy and guideline statements, documents, etc. (e.g., qualifying course criteria, core learning goals and outcomes at the course- and program-levels)
- 3. Interface with other governance bodies (e.g., FCAS, FCTL, FCSA, University Curriculum Committee, other curriculum committees) and administrative units (e.g., Office of the University Registrar, Office of Educational Assessment, teaching and learning centers, advising centers) as appropriate, TBD
- 4. Engage with institutional accreditation processes

