****

**Agenda**

**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting**

Friday, March 30, 2018 1:00-3:00pm GWP 320

**1:00-1:05** Consent Agenda & Recording Permission

Approval of Minutes

*Material: March 5, 2018 EC Meeting Minutes – pending - on EC Team Drive*

**1:05-1:10** Announcements

**1:10-1:20** Professional Development Chart: Dean and Director Feedback & Final Dispensation

**1:20-1:40** Revisions to Diversity Designation **REVIEW** Process-**(vote requested)** pg.4-6 below

 - *Menaka Abraham, APCC Chair*

**1:40-2:10** Admissions: Report and Review Current Practices

 - *Karl Smith, Associate Vice Chancellor & Chief Admissions Officer*

 ~ 10 minute break ~

**2:20-2:40** Proposed Policy on Teaching Evaluations-**(vote requested)** pg.2-3 below

- *D.C. Grant, FAC Chair*

**2:40-3:00** Inclusive Pedagogy Readings - *identify reading to share with faculty in your unit*

**Adjourn**

**Upcoming Faculty Assembly Executive Council Meetings**

4/13/18 Executive Council Meeting 1:00-3:00pm GWP 320

4/23/18 Executive Council Meeting 12:30-1:25pm GWP 320

**FAC Proposed Campus-Wide Policy for Teaching Evaluation**

*Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on 2.16.18*

In response to the 2016 Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows, the Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the adoption of the following campus-wide policy:

According to the University of Washington’s “Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices (2016)” and supported by research by the Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows, UWT units should rely on all three of the following methods of teaching evaluation: peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and student evaluation of teaching. Furthermore, each unit should:

* Define the terms Teaching Excellence, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Success in alignment with the UWT strategic plan.
* Provide guidelines and transparency about each component of teaching evaluation (peer evaluation, self-evaluation and student evaluation). These guidelines should clearly identify which kinds of teaching assessment will be used for which purposes, and how much weight they will be given in merit, contract renewal, and promotion and tenure decisions.
* Self-assessment of teaching should take place on an annual basis as part of faculty annual activities reports.
* Effective teaching should be supported with resources such as professional development funds, mentoring, workshops, fellowships, staff resources, etc.

**Addendum: Faculty Code Language**

[**Section 24-32 C**](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html)

The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or continuing education. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

* The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
* The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
* The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;
* The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;
* The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;
* The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and
* The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long- range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

**Section 24-7 A - Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**

To implement the provision stipulated in [Section 24-32, Subsection C](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2432C), the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under [Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH25.html#2532D), or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the title of senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or professor of practice the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

**Proposed changes to the Diversity Designation Review Process**

*Approved by APCC on 2/14/18*

The original diversity designation policy approved by Executive Committee on 6/3/2015 will be amended to add the review process recommendations of the Academic Policy Curriculum Committee’s (APCC) Diversity Designation Review Committee 2016-17. Changes are highlighted below.

***APCC recommendations:*** (from APCC Minutes June 7, 2017 *and the Diversity Designation Review Committee Report, 5/25/17*).

1. Members suggested that future review committees contact faculty who have recently taught the course to ask them to describe how the learning objectives are put into practice and what explicit concepts are covered.

2. Members suggested that future APCC Diversity Designation reviews consider addressing gaps identified in tables 2 and 3, most notably the relatively few courses that address age, disability, or indigenous identities.

3. Members noted the variations in approaches to diversity in the courses and recommended that a future review committee could consider how well students are able to access diversity courses that would provide them this variety.

4. Members recommended that the review only include courses taught in the last year

***UW Tacoma Diversity Designation Policy (changes highlighted)***

***Processes to ensure ongoing quality of Diversity Courses:***

i. Academic units are expected to assess continuity of Student Learning Objectives (SLO) and course descriptions on an ongoing basis.

ii. All D designated courses have at least one diversity related question in course assessments and/or their course evaluations (<http://iasystem.org/help-main/faculty-user-guide/add-questions-to-an-evaluation/>) assessing students’ self perception of learning about diversity. Faculty may use questions that measure outcomes related to specific disciplinary epistemologies and pedagogies. Additionally, here are some sample questions that correlate with the existing criteria for the diversity designation:

 i. How is the value of diversity related to socially constructed group identities?

 ii. Did this course change your outlook on the meaning of diversity? If so, explain how.

 iii. How does what you learned about diversity address concepts of power, privilege, marginality and activism?

 iv. Will you incorporate what you learned about diversity into your everyday life? If so, explain how.

iii. Every three years, APCC will select a random sample of twelve D courses to review that were taught in the last year.

a. Programs will be asked to:

 i. submit the most recent syllabus

 ii. submit the diversity related question responses portion of the course assessments and/or the course evaluations, and

 iii. the contact information of the faculty that taught this course most recently.

b. The faculty member who taught the class most recently will be asked by the APCC to describe how

 i. the diversity-related learning objectives were put into practice, and

 ii. what explicit concepts were covered.

***Criteria for the Diversity Designation\****

To have the D (Diversity Designation) courses must

1. have at least 60% content focused on diversity,

2. provide students with understanding of human diversity with a primary focus on the United States

3. focus on one or more socially constructed identities such as race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, age, ethnicity, and nationality, and

4. have two or more of the following goals and they must be reflected in the course learning objectives:

● To provide an in-depth analysis of at least one socially constructed identity

● To teach about the intersections of socially constructed categories, perspectives and experiences

● To teach students to think critically about power, inequality, marginality and activism

● To explore the customs, traditions, and cultural expressions (art, dance, music, literature, etc.) as they relate to experiences of power, privilege, oppression and activism

● To explore the historical precursors of contemporary power relationships and the interconnected histories of various people as they relate to power, privilege and oppression

● To investigate contemporary society and how institutions like education, law, government, religion, science, health, military, and others contribute to the inequitable distribution of power and privilege in society.

Courses must meet these requirements every time they are taught to have a D designation. Courses that are taught differently at different times, such as TCORE courses, Special Topics courses, Independent Studies, or Internships, cannot not be given a D designation.

***The definition of “Diversity Requirement”, as defined in the UW Policy Directory, Chapter 114, Section 2, Subsection B.1.d is:***

“No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural, political, and economic diversity of human experience at local, regional, or global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on topics such as power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.”

Note that while the above is part of the UW Seattle diversity policy, UW Tacoma added the requirement that diversity in the US be a primary focus of any course with a D designation. This was instituted because it was deemed important to ensure an understanding of diversity issues in the country where students are studying and will most likely live and work after graduation.