

**University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Educational Technology**

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology met Thursday, November 24, at 2:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding. Chair Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges convened the meeting at 2:36 p.m.

**Present:**

Professors: Berger, Gillis-Bridges, Goldberg, Kirschtel, Zivot  
Ex-Officio: Albrecht, Lewis, Macklin, McMurrer, Pilcher

**Absent:**

Professors: Brixey, Kitts, Leggott, Prakash, Rojas, Roth, Sinanan  
Ex-Officio: Szatmary

**Synopsis:**

- 1) Best Practices document - discussion
- 2) Technology Infrastructure - discussion

**Minutes/Agenda/Announcements**

There are no minutes to approve, as the FCET Recorder, Linda Fullerton, was injured, has been hospitalized, and has not been able to complete them. The agenda was approved.

**Best Practices document**

Continuing the project begun in October, Gillis-Bridges presented a draft outline of concepts the Ed Tech Best Practices document might include. She would like today's discussion to make the concepts, all of which relate to pedagogy, more specific.

Gillis-Bridges' draft is in four sections - Section I contains the rationale and objectives for the document, Section II covers teaching goals at the UW (do we want to include SLOs?). Sections III and IV address ed tech infrastructure, ed tech learning opportunities for faculty, and support for ed tech at the UW, as well as possibilities for developing an ed tech culture at the UW.

Arnie Berger would like to see a "road map" approach to the document - don't focus on the technology itself, focus on what the faculty member wants to do and have the document describe ways the technology can help. Brainstorm what people want to do, and create a report section that answers those needs.

Michael Goldberg would like to see a broader scope to the document. Unless faculty understand the entire learning environment, they can't possibly make good choices. Focus on ed tech's place within the UW environment, and ways faculty can be effective as possible in teaching and learning.

Should there be a preamble that states the goals of ed tech, and a review of what is currently being done? Best Practices can also go beyond what's already being done at the UW. What is being done better at other schools? The EDUCAUSE Website

<http://www.educause.edu>

includes "Effective Practices" case studies FCET may want to look at.

McMurrer suggested the document could include a road map to all the different organizations on campus that support educational technology, a brief description of what they do, their Websites, and how to access their services. This should include Classroom Support Services and Classroom Assignments – knowing how to "operate" the technology of the room assigned is an important faculty responsibility.

It is important to identify the audience for the document. A document for higher-level administrators will be quite different from a how-to document intended for the faculty at-large. This might be addressed via an Executive Summary for administrators and a more lengthy "nuts-and-bolts" document for faculty. Faculty need to be able to look at the document and answer the question "where does this fit into my life?"

The document should include impediments to the adoption of each technology described, to give a clearer picture of the time and effort required to implement it and the costs/benefits.

Gillis-Bridges asked whether there are really two documents being discussed. Zivot asked how much energy junior faculty can afford to expend on a project such as this. Albrecht said it can work FOR junior faculty, if they bring in the money to fund what they are doing, and publish the results. At present, this also depends completely on the faculty member's field – a situation that must change. The UW is so heavily weighted toward research that there is less "credit" given for innovations in teaching.

A Technology Award might draw attention to ed tech, encourage innovation, and create some buzz. A Technology Fee levied on football season-ticket holders might raise money for the award. Use the Jumbo-tron and the Husky Marching Band to promote it. It helps to do something with pizzazz. The report needs a sales job – terms like accountability and effective learning will help do that job.

For the next meeting, December 15, Michael Goldberg will draft a one-paragraph preamble on efficiency and accountability in technology infrastructure. Gillis-Bridges will talk to George Bridges about money that may be available and to FCIQ about possible overlap in functions.

Gillis-Bridges asked members to bring to the next meeting examples of what other institutions are doing with ed tech.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*