

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON**  
**FACULTY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH**

The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach met at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, **October 9, 2001**. Chair Steve Buck presided.

**Welcome to and Introduction of new and returning FCEO members**

FCEO members introduced themselves and identified their departments or units in the University. Buck, DeYoung, Marcovina, Wells and Weissman discussed in brief the particular emphases of their work at the University, and explained why they want to serve on the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach. Wells mentioned that there are “remote courses” in the field of Dental Public Health. Marcovina mentioned the expanding role of online communication in medical research, and expressed her strong support of distance learning in advancing the work of research and instruction in the applied sciences. Weissman said she is very excited by the advantages that distance learning can bring to information science. DeYoung is involved with interactive video projects in her teaching of Arabic to groups in four different states, including North Carolina. She said distance learning is an invaluable asset in projects of this kind, projects that otherwise would not be possible.

Buck said that, although he has not himself taught distance learning courses, as Associate Chair of Psychology he has helped coordinate the department’s distance learning and extension courses offered through UWEO. He noted that distance learning in many departments in Arts and Sciences is quite different from what it is in the applied sciences. He said the topics in the distance learning proposal that will go before the Faculty Senate have engaged him since the mid 1990’s. “Hopefully, we’ll soon move past the proposal stage,” he added.

**Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn**

Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn visited the council to thank all members for participating in faculty governance. She said the council should not hesitate to ask her for assistance or advice.

**Approval of minutes**

Without a quorum, a vote for approval of the minutes of May 18, 2001 could not be conducted.

**Report on the Distance Learning legislative proposal – Steve Buck**

Buck said the proposed changes to distance learning legislation passed, by one vote, at the Senate Executive Committee meeting on October 8<sup>th</sup>. The proposal will go before the Faculty Senate at its meeting on October 25<sup>th</sup>. Buck said the SEC discussion was somewhat surprising. The very people who reacted negatively to the legislation are actually proponents, and not skeptics. They feel the proposal goes in the right direction, but that it could move more aggressively than its present wording allows. Buck said amendments could take the proposal farther than it is now, and are likely. He said amendments are likely. “The topics raised for amendments at the Faculty Senate meeting will give a better idea of the responses throughout the campus,” Buck observed. He added, “The purpose of the proposal is certainly not to prevent innovation. But we also need to hear about programs that might be adversely affected by the proposal.”

Buck said the Faculty Senate Office will be sending a notice to all faculty telling them that the proposal will be presented at the October 25<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting, and directing them to the full proposal on the Web.

Buck said the proposal is “on track,” but that “serious discussion” is necessary regarding the dimensions and oversight of distance learning if the proposal passes in the Faculty Senate.

Buck emphasized that he, 2000-2001 FCEO Chair Roger Simpson, 2000-2001 (and current) FCAS Chair Doug Wadden (Faculty Council on Academic Standards), and all those who worked on the shaping and wording of the proposal, tried to find the middle ground necessary to accommodate both the skeptics and the advocates on campus towards the use and implementation of distance learning as a mode of undergraduate instruction.

The DL changes were put into legal format last spring. Some legal language has changed since then (through the contributions of Lea Vaughn, who is also a professor in the Law School, Faculty Senate Chair Bradley Holt, David Szatmary, and others), particularly with respect to the residence requirement and approval for provisional DL programs.

In a compromise with FCAS over the residence requirement, a change in the proposal requires undergraduate students to take 45 out of their last 60 credits in resident, on-campus courses. Individual students will be able to petition to waiver 10 of those 45 credits. But schools and colleges will no longer be allowed to grant exemption from the residence requirement.

Any programs based entirely or primarily on distance learning instruction must be reviewed by FCAS and by college and University curriculum committees. Approval may be granted provisionally up to six years.)

Other changes include new language for “nuts and bolts” (or “housekeeping”) issues.

There is also new language for phasing out “C”-designated courses, and for establishing course eligibility for DL-suffix status (in which grades are to be counted in the GPA). Some people believe that the “C” designation marks DL courses as “inferior,” and that because of the length of many DL courses, and the choice of instructors in some of the courses, they are seen as being other than comparable to residence courses.

A June 2005 deadline will allow one year for the review process for DL-suffix courses to “get up and running,” and three years to go through the review period.

Distance learning programs will be brought to SCAP (the FCAS Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs), but not DL courses. SCAP does not review courses; it only reviews programs.

As for distance learning goals in the 2001-2002 academic year, Buck said that, if the proposal passes, FCEO will need to provide guidance to various college and curriculum committees. (FCAS and others may also be involved in this process.) Key elements of that guidance would include assistance in identifying key issues and dimensions to be addressed that are specific to distance learning, which of course would vary according to academic discipline and need. (Again, the application of these will be different in different schools and colleges.)

Examples of good practices of distance learning will be made available to those who are starting out in such programs. Guidance will be given to those who are engaged in the distance learning course application process. The needs of those engaged in this process will be different, Buck noted, than the needs of those going through the application process for regular classroom courses. “The tangible goal will be to provide guidance with forms and with the dimensions of the review process.”

FCEO comments on distance learning:

Wells said, “The faster we can get something going on distance learning, the better it will be for programs such as Dental Public Health. It’s been going all too slowly for programs like ours.”

Buck said that with such disparate interests within Arts and Sciences and between that college and others such as Nursing, Dentistry, and Engineering, it is hard to come up with University-wide policies on distance learning.

As for student voices on DL, it was noted that ASUW and GPSS representatives on this and other faculty councils have been somewhat hesitant to unreservedly endorse distance learning. The chief complaint has been that, for undergraduate students, the most important single aspect of their University experience is face-to-face interaction both with other students and with faculty. As one GPSS representative on FCEO put it last year, what is most vital in the educational experience to undergraduate students is how one learns, not what one learns. With graduate students, the primary emphasis shifts to what one learns. And for undergraduate students, how one learns has everything to do with face-to-face interaction, and with the give-and-take unique to face-to-face interaction. ASUW representatives have also consistently expressed concern about the longer duration of distance-learning courses providing students an unfair advantage.

#### **Distance Learning at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma**

Buck said it would be helpful to know precisely what is taking place in distance learning at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. For instance, do those campuses have task forces on DL planning? If so, perhaps a member of FCEO could be included in that task force. Also, the two campuses could send someone from their DL task forces – or whatever DL planning committees they may have – to visit FCEO.

Distance learning will be a key issue on all three campuses, Buck stressed. And the campuses may have different goals and practices with respect to distance learning. After all, DL goals and practices have changed a great deal on the Seattle campus in just a few years. They may have changed considerably at the other campuses as well.

#### **Reorganization of Faculty Council structure**

Buck said a task force of faculty council chairs has been appointed by Faculty Senate Chair Bradley Holt to study possible reorganization of the faculty council structure. The task force has been asked to issue a report by February or March 2002. The charge of the task force is “quite broad”: to assess the ways in which faculty councils interweave, with shared interests on certain issues, but with different expertise. (FCEO and FCAS worked together on the distance learning proposal, for instance, but the two councils never met jointly, though members of both councils served on the DL Task Force that was co-chaired by the chairs of the two councils.)

Other councils with shared interests include FCEO and FCET (Faculty Council on Educational Technology), and FCAS and FCIQ (Faculty Council on Instructional Quality). There are other instances as well.

As Buck noted, it is counter-productive if two councils are exploring the same issues and not communicating with each other. Of course it is often the case that different councils have shared interests on some issues, and entirely separate interests on other issues.

#### **Intellectual property rights for Web-based material**

Buck said he would like to be part of the discussions taking place on intellectual property rights for Web-based material. He would like to learn who is taking significant roles on campus in the

discussions and possible actions on this issue, and what those roles are. He thinks FCEO would be interested in following, and perhaps participating in, the discussions on this controversial issue.

Szatmary pointed out that “the whole intellectual property rights issue has devolved into legal questions.” It is a convoluted issue that does not simply deal with material on the Web that has not been published elsewhere. Determining when the University owns particular Web-based material, and when the author himself or herself owns the material, is sometimes an intricate legal issue.

Malcolm Parks, Assistant Vice Provost for Research, and former Chair of the Faculty Council on Research (FCR), is leading a faculty committee on intellectual property rights. Buck will keep FCEO members apprised of what he gleans of that committee’s discussions.

**Next meeting**

The next FCEO meeting is set for Tuesday, October 30, 2001, at 11:30-1:00 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor, Recorder

**PRESENT:** *Professors* Buck (Chair), DeYoung, Marcovina and Wells;  
*ex-officio members* Szatmary and Weissman.

**ABSENT:** *Professors* Daniali, Jenkins, Kieckhefer, Kim, Noble, Simpson and Treser;