**Faculty Assembly Executive Council Meeting Minutes**

Monday, 11/23/2020, 12:30 p.m. – 1:20 p.m.

Open Public Zoom Meeting

***Present:*** *Chair Sarah Hampson, Vice Chair Turan Kayaoglu, Past Chair Marian Harris, EVCAA Jill Purdy, FAC Chair Jim Thatcher, APCC Chair Menaka Abraham, APT Chair Yonn Dierwechter, Randy Nichols, Anaid Yerena, Kathy Beaudoin, Arindam Tripathy,, Marisa Petrich, Jim West, Rupinder Jindal, Maureen Kennedy, Amanda Sesko, Jacob Martens, Mary Hanneman, Monika Sobolewska, Andrea Hill, Annie Nguyen, Sushil Oswal (After Minutes approval), Katie Haerling.* ***Excused****:* ***Absent:*** *Marisa Petrich, Annie Nguyen* ***Guests:*** *Vincent Da (ASUWT President), Sharon Fought (Dean, School of Nursing and Healthcare Leadership)* ***Faculty Assembly Coordinator:*** *Andrew Seibert*

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**
	* Agenda was approved and Recording permission was granted by the Council.
		+ Approval of 11/06/2020 Meeting Minutes
			- Minutes revisions
				* Under Section 6, Milgard School of Business

Language was revised from a Representative.

* + - * Motion to approve the Minutes with the edits listed made by the Chair of Faculty Assembly. So moved by Randy Nichols, seconded by Monika Sobolewska.
				+ ***Vote:*** *16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions*
			* Minutes stand approved with the edits mentioned above.
1. **Announcements**
	* Land acknowledgement
	* Provost Notice from Budget Reduction:
		+ The Provost Notice has come through. The instructions given are already what each unit is doing currently (Modeling the top percentage budget reduction). No additional changes are requested.
	* [School reports - topics:](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1XDGMnSqYCnbtSUNqmC5W5WeUMt9sd5gDcF81v9n8Csk/edit?usp=sharing)
		+ Updates on equity and inclusion efforts
		+ Detailing budget process and how it involves faculty
	* Listening Sessions dates
		+ Winter faculty listening session - Feb 17th 12:30-1:30 (Non-Tenure Track
2. **EVCAA Report**
	* **Budget**
		+ The Provost’s annual report requires us to model budget cuts at the amounts that have already been shared with schools.
	* **Time Schedule Information:**
		+ Information is being added to Winter and Spring quarter schedules to clarify for students how courses will be delivered. The three categories being added in the comments section are Synchronous, Asynchronous, and Hybrid. For hybrid, the category refers **to** how a course will be delivered that quarter, NOT the curriculum designation of hybrid (which at Tacoma means that it will be taught 40-99% online).

Response to a question on whether synchronous teaching is being discouraged: Synchronous teaching is fine but students still have to be provided with resources and assessments that allow them to meet the learning objectives of the course even if they are not able to attend the synchronous sessions.

* + **Spring Quarter:**
		- We expect spring quarter to be in similar mode to winter quarter but there is a chance things can open up more.
	+ [**Peer Teaching Evaluations:**](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1SPuncuw6KNtQe2cIsXj4KL8lKQUeZztZ?usp=sharing)
		- Resources are available to support a variety of approaches to teaching evaluation at the [Center for Teaching and Learning](https://teaching.washington.edu/topics/assessing-and-improving-teaching/). Given that many courses are being taught remotely right now, some sample tools for assessing online courses from other institutions have been shared with deans and are attached here.

Response to a question about peer teaching evaluations for the purpose of reappointment: The Faculty Code provides general requirements for when collegial teaching evaluation is required, please see Chapter 24-57 preamble and Section A.<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2457>. As the Code states, “the teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college,” so faculty should review policies in their schools and ensure there is shared understanding at the school level.

Response to a question about who should conduct peer teaching evaluations: There is no specific requirement in the Faculty Code but there may be policies in schools that answer this question. The general expectation is that collegial review is done by a UW colleague who has knowledge of teaching and understands the role of the course in the curriculum. Subject matter expertise might be needed for some kinds of review.

1. **Feedback and Discussion of Proctoring Ban Resolution Proposal**
	* School Feedback
		+ School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
			- School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences did implement a survey of assessment methods used in their unit and whether they are using proctoring methods. Once representative did state their results of the survey was the majority used Canvas time quizzes across discipline. Some are using methods of proctoring, but not proctorio. The feedback that was given was that a ban would be supported, but would like flexibility to choose ways to monitor themselves (such as Zoom).
				* The representative also added that fostering a culture of Academic Honesty, which may be what the resolution is about, but the representative also added that having a campus-wide statement is essential

Another SIAS Representative also added the hardship of outside proctoring effects the students at UW Tacoma

* + - * Another representative stated: “everyone was positive: There’s no definition of what is “online proctoring” consists of. I think this is a bit vague and there should be more clarification as to what is and is not considered online proctoring. Similarly, the statement about exemptions being provided from APCC or some other body is vague as well. What “other body” can provide an exemption? Who will decide which party can provide this exemption? If it isn’t known now, then should the language be adjusted to indicate that it be determined by APCC or other bodies that APCC may delegate this authority to? Finally – not that it needs to be included in this resolution, but what are the plans for developing the exemption process? Who will lead this? EC? FA? APCC? Seems like the resolution is providing for exemptions to exist, so then it should be certain to ensure that a process exists for those exemptions.”
			* Another representative said that a Faculty member expressed confusion that the banning of online proctoring would require on campus proctoring.
		- School of Urban Studies
			* The School of Urban Studies did not do a formal survey however the representative is happy to do a formal survey moving forward with the help of other units and how they structured the survey. This representative did ask for input from the School of Urban Studies Faculty, but did not hear back.
		- School of Engineering & Technology
			* School of Engineering & Technology did a survey. This representative stated that a Faculty Vote to support the ban was 10, abstain votes were 2, and no votes of 8. Some comments received were:
				+ “Faculty do not need more rules on how they deliver course materials to students,”
				+ “Faculty should be trusted and treated like professionals who were capable of making those valued judgements for themselves and their students,”
				+ “We should implement a ban on 3rd party software,”
				+ “There is a solution to every problem, this ban describes that we should focus on those solutions instead of implementing a blanket policy”
				+ “Regardless of the merit of this particular case, please stop passing resolution and imposing that should be left for individual Faculty to decide”
				+ Proctoring costs to students who cannot afford these costs is a good thing to get rid of.
			* Another representative added that Faculty in this unit would prefer flexibility in this ban.
		- School of Nursing and Healthcare Leadership
			* The Representative had stated that they received no feedback and did not use a survey. The Representative sent a request for feedback in an email.
		- School of Social Work and Criminal Justice
			* The Representative did not do a survey, and received some feedback from Faculty and are in support of the ban.
		- Milgard School of Business
			* The Representative did not do a survey. The representative sent a request for feedback in an email and did not receive feedback from the Faculty.
		- School of Education
			* The School of Education Representative brought it to their Faculty meeting and there were no specific comments, but their faculty was in general agreement of the ban
	+ Summary of Ruben Casas’ findings:
		- The proctor ban started out of student concerns
			* These concerns are equally shared at the UW Seattle and UW Bothell Campuses.
		- Nationally, this concern was also raised, especially for privacy concerns
		- Peer institutions have passed similar bans (UC Berkeley, Stanford, and others)
			* Peer institution minutes were acquired to read and find how Faculty were discussing the ban on online proctoring
		- Consulted with a colleague whose research is on high stakes assessment in academic settings specifically in racial, equity, and access perspective. This colleague works with international students and has said how international students are impacted by outside proctoring
	+ A suggestion from a representative is to use another word for ban, such as guidelines, best practices, etc.
	+ Darcy Janzen will be speaking to Executive Council in regards to the proctor ban
		- Faculty Assembly Leadership will also look into research on how to best propose this in a way that makes it easiest for faculty, while ensuring the flexibility of this proctoring.
1. **Adjournment**
	* Meeting was adjourned at 1:19 p.m.
		+ Next meeting: Friday, December 11, 2020
			- Zoom