

Faculty Council Meeting

March 26, 2024 — 9:00–10:00 am

TPS 110 or Zoom: <https://washington.zoom.us/j/97171736586>

MINUTES

Faculty Council Member	Capacity	Present (P), Absent (A), or Recusal (X) ¹
Ben Meiches	Faculty Council Chair	P
LeAnne Laux-Bachand	Vice Chair	P
Cassie Miura	CAC Representative	P
Jane Compson	PPPA Representative	P
Haley Skipper	SAM Representative	P
Amanda Sesko	SBHS Representative	P
	SHS Representative	
Scott Rayermann	Lecturer at Large (SAM)	P
Anna Groat Carmona	Dean's Diversity Advisory Council representative (SAM)	P
Ex-Officio Members	Capacity	(P), (A), or (X)
Natalie Eschenbaum	Dean	P
Hyoung Suk Lee	Chair, Committee of Chairs	P
Kathleen Pike Jones	Assistant to the Dean	P
Non-Member Participant	Capacity	(P), (A), or (X)
Jessica Asplund	Director of Academic and Finance Operations	P
Jeremy Davis	Associate Dean of Programs & Operations	P
Stephen Ross	Associate Dean of Faculty Development & Student Support	P
Vanessa de Veritch Woodside	Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion	P

AGENDA

1. Introductions, Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment, Agenda (2 min)
2. Consent Agenda: Minutes (1 min)
3. Indirect Cost Recovery (5 min)
4. Teaching Evaluation Policy (20 min)
5. Teaching Modalities (20 min)
6. Transition (10 min)
7. Updates/For the Good of the Order (2 min)
8. Adjournment

1. Introductions, Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment

- a. Faculty Council Chair Ben Meiches called the meeting to order and the council took a moment to reflect on the SIAS Land Acknowledgment and Ground Rules before beginning the business of the meeting.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. No objections to the agenda.
- b. No objections to the minutes of the March 5, 2024 meeting.

3. Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR)

- a. Faculty Council voted on May 22, 2023 to change the ICR policy, which included a review of the policy starting in Winter quarter 2024.
 - b. Faculty Council needs to renew that vote or revise the policy.
 - c. Due to the UW transition to Workday, we still haven't received a report about the monies available for ICR so we have no way to assess the policy.
 - d. It is not likely that we'll have a report by the end of Spring quarter.
 - e. We can't get any feedback from faculty as there is no data.
-

- f. Ben Meiches motions that we extend the current policy for one year unless we get the necessary information sooner; Scott Rayermann seconds; all in favor.

4. Teaching Evaluation Policy

a. Action items:

1. Student Evaluations:
 - a. Course evaluations not sole factor in merit
 - b. Empower faculty to evaluate one course per year
 - c. Continue practice of student evals for all new faculty for three years
 - d. Recommend volitional mid quarter formative evaluations
2. Peer Evaluations:
 - a. Normalization of peer review with consultation before and after
 - b. Conduct training for peer review
 - c. Give faculty credit for peer review service work
3. Self-Evaluation:
 - a. Include self-reflection as part of promotion, tenure, reappointment
 - b. Merit should include a brief, rubric based self-evaluation
4. Teaching Portfolios:
 - a. Option for faculty to include portfolio as part of merit/annual assessment
 - b. Three teaching portfolio workshops per year
 - c. Self-help groups to work on portfolios

b. Comments:

1. The policy has been in place for two years; we did cursory work on this at the retreat last fall.
2. We need steps for implementation especially regarding peer reviews as we don't have a lot of standardization for peer reviews.
3. Tri-campus has the five elements of good teaching and are looking at student evaluations.
4. There is legislation this quarter to adjust merit in reference to the five elements of good teaching.
5. This is a good policy and we should move forward with something manageable work wise, while the decisions are being made at the Tri-campus level.
6. Link to the peer evaluation template from the University of Oregon:
https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/tep-peer-review-template-with-bullet-list-v-jan-4-2024_0.pdf.
7. The final version of the five elements will be shared from the Provost this quarter:
<https://www.washington.edu/provost/future-of-teaching-learning/>.
8. A good place to start would be with meetings before and after the evaluation.
9. We should have a way to keep track of who's evaluating whom to be sure that certain faculty aren't disproportionately doing the reviews.
10. SAM currently tracks this information and SBHS has a template with the before/after conversation.
11. Could we do the pre/post meetings as part of a Faculty Meeting?

5. Teaching Modalities

- a. Modalities were discussed at Shared Leadership and it was surprising to find there is not a negative correlation between the number of online courses and number of students for in-person classes.
- b. None of our programs are approved to be online or hybrid; students should be able to go through every program/major in in-person classes.
- c. There is less evidence that modalities are impacting retention.
- d. Curricular coherence shouldn't be decided by student demand.

- e. Interdisciplinary major pathways are very difficult for students; it's more like a choose your own adventure.
- f. We would have to go through each major and see if there's a viable pathway.
- g. There is no percentage regarding hybrid courses anymore; it's considered hybrid if any part is online.
- h. Modalities should not be changed after students have started registering.
- i. Chairs want a rule to decide the required percentages for in-person, online, and hybrid courses.
- j. If there is interest and demand to develop hybrid or online programs, we can make revisions to the curriculum.

6. Transition

- a. How do we best set ourselves up to transition into new programs in a year?
 - 1. Bylaws
 - 2. Policy reevaluation
 - 3. Leadership training
 - 4. Adjustments to SIAS practice in the interim
- b. Ben has a partial release this quarter and will start working through the SIAS policies.
- b. There is a meeting today with the Chancellor and EVCAA to discuss the RCEP.
- c. The EVCAA has asked for an addendum that clearly articulates the powers that will be delegated to the departments.
- d. We need to consider how ICC and APCC will work after the transition.
- e. A lot of the current Faculty Council members' terms are up at the end of this year; who wants to take on this conversation moving forward?
- f. We also need a vice chair for next year.

7. Updates/For the Good of the Order

- a. No updates were shared.

8. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 am.