

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

May 9, 2024

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Zoom

Meeting synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Consent agenda
 - a. Minutes from April 11, 2024
 3. Chair updates
 4. Subcommittee updates
 - a. AI communication pathways
 - b. Merit/promotion evaluation materials (vote on FCTL - Class C Resolution Concerning the Roles of Student Course Evaluations v3)
 - c. Student evaluations
 5. Good of the order
 6. Adjourn
-

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 10:32 a.m.

2. Consent agenda

a. Minutes from April 11, 2024

Chair Self asked for any discussion of the consent agenda. There was no discussion. The consent agenda was approved.

3. Chair updates

The chair noted the FCFA Class A legislation pieces had moved through the Faculty Senate regarding transparency in both retention offers and the promotion process.

The Provost working group on the quality of teaching has met to finalize the revised core of elements of excellent teaching. Chair Self stated their plans to develop a first draft of legislation over summer for final review in Autumn 2024. Recognize instructors for the excellent teaching they already do and create supportive pathways for others to achieve excellent teaching.

4. Subcommittee updates

a. AI communication pathways

b. Merit/promotion evaluation materials - vote on FCTL Class C Resolution Concerning the Roles of Student Course Evaluations

c. Student evaluations

FCTL subcommittees provided updates to the full council.

AI communication pathways: summarized values of AI in teaching and learning, highlight primary concerns, identify existing resources and communication tools to share, and suggestions for best practices around AI. The Provost taskforce on AI was looking for proposals from its working groups, particularly

the curriculum minor modeled after data science minor or as stackable certificates for undergraduates. There was a second proposal on grouped various tools to pilot, such as student focus tools or smart tutoring, and a third proposal on an AI guided individual degree. Council members discussed instructional design resource discrepancies across departments, peer institution centers on AI, and feedback on the Provost working group AI survey. UW Bothell conducted an AI panel with faculty and a recording was to be shared with council members.

Merit/Promotion Evaluation materials: Members were invited to provide feedback on an updated draft Class C resolution (Exhibit 1). A motion was made to approve the resolution as revised. The resolution was approved and forwarded to the SEC for consideration (12 approve; 0 oppose; 0 abstain).

Student evaluations: from the pilot study, there was a 10% response rate of instructors. Members planned for analysis during the summer after an additional pilot survey. The chair encouraged members to recruit colleagues to fill out the survey, particularly studio classes.

5. Good of the Order

A member shared a news article regarding MIT and DEI, noting the Faculty Senate may be asked to discuss in the future.

Chair Self shared their student achievements (<https://artsci.washington.edu/news/perspectives>).

Several members mentioned their experience at the student zone on the UW Quad.

Academic Student Employees (ASE) and graduate students were also planning a union strike and the council discussed how to plan for the quarter.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

Minutes by Alexandra Toyoda, Policy & Legislative Analyst, xanport@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Fred Bookstein, Casey Self (chair), Anne-Marie Gloster, Duong Than, Ranjini Grove, Leighann Chaffee, Laura McGarrity, Stuart Reges, Kimberly Ambrose
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Brandy Lawence (PSO), Lauren Ray (ALUW)
Faculty Code Section 21-61 C: LeAnne Jones Wiles
Guests: Bree Callahan, Tina Miller, Sean Gehrke, Karin Roberts,

Absent: **Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Rania Hussein, Sunita Iyer, Alison Crowe
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Joey Rotondo (GPSS)

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCTL - Class C Resolution Concerning the Roles of Student Course Evaluations v4

Class C Resolution Concerning the Use of Student Course Evaluations

WHEREAS teaching is central to the mission of our University; and

WHEREAS faculty have been concerned for more than twenty years about the use of student evaluations in University processes, including but not limited to Promotion and Tenure decisions¹; and

WHEREAS advances in information technology have induced a radical change in the praxis of student evaluations as continuous course engagement; and

WHEREAS advances in information technology have made it possible for every instructor to review the full student evaluation record over multiple years and courses, and follow trends over time and experience; and

WHEREAS aspects of the student, the instructor, the syllabus, and the curriculum all interact within the context of learning and the classroom experience in respect of both student and instructor expectations;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost consider the following recommendations for the use of course evaluations in the management of this institution:

1. The principal purpose of the student evaluation process should be acknowledged as assisting faculty to identify areas of improvement and growth to better serve the University's teaching mission;
2. Students should be offered guidance on how to approach completing the form and the evaluation's purpose, including an explanation of how the University will use evaluations over the current academic year and subsequent years;
3. Every faculty member should be encouraged to review multiyear trends in their numerical student evaluations, along with qualitative comments, as part of their own self-evaluations;
4. Faculty engaged in peer review should align the dimensions of peer review with the student evaluation criteria whenever appropriate;
5. Faculty members should be encouraged to solicit feedback from students during a quarter and to use feedback to adjust teaching or pedagogy as appropriate;
6. The Office of Educational Assessment should be empowered to build tools by which instructors can straightforwardly compile and examine trends of their mid-course and end-course summaries and commentaries over multiple teaching assignments and academic years;

Submitted by the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

¹ [<https://www.washington.edu/assessment/course-evaluations/using-results/fciq-recommendations/>]