

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Outreach
Friday, October 5, 2007
Gerberding 36

Chair Kate O'Neill called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Introductions and welcome (Chair)
2. Approve revised agenda (Chair)
3. Approve FCEO minutes from June 4, 2007
4. Review of FCEO's basic purview under Faculty Senate (Chair)
5. Discussion of issues forwarded by last year's council

1. Introductions and welcome (Chair)

Present council members introduced themselves and were welcomed by the Chair, Kate O'Neill.

2. Approve revised agenda (Chair)

With one excused absence (Matthew Keifer) and eleven council members present, quorum is established.

The original agenda was revised to include the approval of minutes from the June 4, 2007 FCEO meeting. Jamie Olavarria moved to approve the revised agenda. The revised agenda was approved unanimously.

3. Approve FCEO minutes from June 4, 2007

Bill Erdly moved to approve the June 4, 2007 FCEO minutes. The motion was seconded by Rob Harrison and approved unanimously.

4. Review of FCEO's basic purview under Faculty Senate (Chair)

From the Faculty Code, Section 42-47, FCEO "...shall be responsible for all matters of policy, academic and nonacademic, relating to distance learning, continuing education, UW Extension, and summer school programs."

5. Discussion of issues forwarded by last year's council

Kate O'Neill:

According to the June 2007 minutes, there are several carryover issues. The status of ELP instructors and issues related to their contracts were dealt with in a temporary fashion last term. In addition to the Senate Chair's data collection request, issues related to ELP instructors will be a major agenda item.

Realistically, getting proposed legislation in front of the Senate Executive Council will take a long time unless it is a minor issue. If the issue is complex or has political ramifications, the proposal will likely be sent back to the council with questions. The council will then have to deliberate. The process will be further drawn out if the input of other faculty councils is required. In order to have the proposal read by the Faculty Senate twice, it will have to be submitted to the SEC by the end of winter quarter. Otherwise, it will be delayed until the next year. The issue of the status and identification of ELP lecturers in the code may raise complex and detailed issues and those issues may concern other faculty councils as well as FCEO

The goal of today's meeting is to draft a work plan for the term. If there are burning issues that require legislation, we need to focus on that. FCEO members are welcome to bring issues to the table.

Brenda Zierler:

It would be important for the council to discuss funding for DL courses.

Jeffrey Wilkes:

There is tremendous enthusiasm for start-ups, but we need a method for sustenance. We need to disabuse administrators of the "vending machine model" of DL courses.

Rob Harrison:

Regular tuition charges do not have anything to do with the funding of the course. There is a misconception that teaching a DL course does not require input once it is set up.

Bill Erdly:

It might be helpful to have a document that describes the process and effort involved in setting up DL courses.

Brenda Zierler:

Part of the President and Provost's strategic plan is to improve access, but we do not have the infrastructure to accomplish this task.

Rob Harrison:

A related agenda item is Catalyst, which keeps revising software. It requires a tremendous amount of time for teachers to learn the new software. Catalyst also does not

support any of the old versions. We have chosen to use other software. Catalyst is not listening to teachers of large classes. We do not have the resources to teach students how to use the tool.

Bill Erdly:

It would be good to share this with FCET.

Robert Corbett:

The HECB looks at DL as a way of extending access. There are so many different versions of DL; it would be nice to have an inventory of what is available.

Brenda Zierler:

There is quite a range of DL course models. We need to understand that especially in light of charging fees.

Rob Harrison:

A memo that outlines what instructors can spend their DL activity money on would be very useful. Can I hire a programmer or buy a computer? Currently, the guideline regarding activity fee money is generic. We need more specificity.

Dave Szatmary:

Last may, we submitted a proposal to the Board of Deans requesting a fee on all fee-based online courses. The request is still in the preliminary stages and we still have to talk to a lot of people.

ACTION ITEM: Dave Szatmary will distribute a summary of the proposal to the council.

Brenda Zierler:

We should look at best practices (efficiencies, policies, cost) for faculty who want to work on this.

ACTION ITEM: Jeffrey Wilkes will email the URL for the FCEO working website to council members.

Rob Harrison:

UC Berkeley is offering a number of DL courses for free. We need to be aware of this.

Dave Szatmary:

We are thinking of joining the Open Courseware Initiative. These courses are basically vapor ware. We have a few courses which do not have instructors that people can access for free. Other universities, such as Carnegie Mellon, are offering free online courses as well.

Kate O'Neill:

The issue of ownership of content might be a source of some concern to faculty.

Dave Szatmary:

There was a committee to address this issue in a broad perspective. It became so contentious that the committee dissolved and could not resolve the issue.

Kate O'Neill:

A major agenda item is to address the issues surrounding ELP lecturers. Perhaps the ELP lecturers present (Joel Ozretich, Daphne Mackey) could summarize for the new members.

Joel Ozretich:

Most of EO courses are taught by part-time faculty or campus faculty who will occasionally take on one DL or outreach course. ELP is one of the few programs where lecturers are full-time, appointed on a quarterly or annual basis. These instructors are called Extension Lecturers. We are not officially Lecturers and not officially staff or faculty.

The issue of our appointment letters is, for the most part, resolved. One of the outstanding issues is our status. Are we faculty or not? The Faculty Senate is aware of the issue. We do not know if it will be addressed this year. Part of the issue is our working conditions. We need to review our handbook in comparison to the Faculty Handbook and determine how it is different or similar. Within our unit, we have tried to clarify the Operations Manual, our version of the Faculty Handbook.

Daphne Mackey:

It was agreed last year that FCEO will review the changes.

ACTION ITEM: A copy of the ELP Operations Manual will be sent to Kate O'Neill.

Dave Szatmary:

Not all of the ELP manual deals with instructors. We agreed to postpone looking at the manual until a status definition was achieved. If it is determined that ELP Lecturers are

faculty, then they would come under the Faculty Handbook and it would be a lot of wasted time to go through the ELP manual.

Bill Erdly:

The manual needed to be updated to reflect changes in the appointment letters.

Daphne Mackey:

Some changes to the manual were made during summer to make sure that it is consistent with the appointment letters sent out during the summer.

Our primary concern is our status and we would like to be in line with the university. In that regard, reviewing our manual was relevant. We were told that there would be a committee formed to review the manual.

Kate O'Neill:

This is the reason Dan Luchtel (Senate Chair) charged us with gathering data on all EO faculty. The issue is whether we are dealing with similar groups of people. Anything we do with regard to status with ELP could set precedent with other teachers. Our data gathering task is principally focused on this issue of status.

Brenda Zierler:

Do ELP Lecturers belong to an academic department?

Daphne Mackey:

We are part of Academic HR. It is unclear.

Joel Ozretich:

Our courses and appointments are reviewed and approved by English Department, but our processes, such as merit reviews, are done within the ELP department.

Kate O'Neill:

To make sure that we are all on the same page, it would be helpful if the Extension Lecturers could provide a memo of the issues that would be appropriate for our review. Dan Luchtel is asking whether this council thinks that this issue is of general import to designated faculty. Is this something the council wants to think about in a larger sense? It seems that there is an overlap of issues. We need the council's feedback on what you think we need to be looking at in a broader sense. Please email your summation and responses to me between now and our next meeting in November.

Brenda Zierler:

It is unclear how the status of these instructors is related to DL. Is it within our purview to determine whether they should be faculty?

Kate O'Neill:

One of the major missions of EO is DL and to the extent that there are instructors who are related to DL, there is some overlap with the issues. If the university as a whole is moving in the direction of providing educational content in non-traditional means, including DL and EO programs, do we want to be thinking about the implications of that in terms of funding and status of the people involved?

Dave Szatmary:

All of the programs are fee-based and the faculty is appointed by academic units. We have approximately 1,000 Extension Lecturers. There are approximately 70 Extension Lecturers with annual and quarterly contracts and they are almost exclusively in the ELP program. Those with hourly contracts work mostly in certificate and non-ELP courses. It will be a complicated and time-consuming matter to look at all 1,000 Extension Lecturers. Adding to the complexity is the fact that we have credit courses (Academic English Program) and non-credit courses (Intensive English Program). ELP Lecturers teach both credit and non-credit courses.

Rob Harrison:

Our college does not hire lecturers, but researchers to teach. These particular appointments are incredibly important to the university. I do not think it is recognized or rewarded. If there is anything we can do to clarify the issue, we really ought to.

Dave Szatmary:

Fee-based programs require a minimum number of people to continue. For that reason, we cannot offer long contracts.

Daphne Mackey:

Although it is an annual contract, we have always been under the assumption that our contracts would be renewed.

Joel Ozretich:

We do not have a formal process for reviewing the Operations Manual and having faculty input. Basically, revisions have been done by staff administrators. One of the recommendations from last year was that we should have a formal process of review that involves faculty.

Kate O'Neill:

We request one memo on the Operations Manual and one on the issue of status. Since ELP lecturers are not technically faculty, there is not any shared governance. For that reason, there is considerable complexity involved with deciding how to deal with the issue.

Bill Erdly:

Another issue we should address is the description of how courses are going to be taught in the time schedule. Is the course classroom-based, DL, or a hybrid? This information would be useful to students.

Dave Szatmary:

An issue that will be increasingly more important is the question of when or why a program should be fee-based, as opposed to state-funded. Physics, for example, did not have the resources and asked to transition to a fee-based program. However, due to FTE requirements, the program had to remain state-funded. The catch 22 is that, ultimately, the program may fail due to lack of resources and they would not be contributing any FTEs.

The expansion of DL is a funding issue. On the state side, there is no infrastructure for delivering online courses. There is no mechanism to make that happen like there is on the fee-based side

Annie Lam:

It would be helpful to get a better understanding of what we are dealing with. How many departments have DL courses? How are they funded? How many of these courses are administered by EO?

Kate O'Neill:

It seems that we have quite a number of large issues that we need to address. We should work on having a division of labor. I will take our discussion to Dan Luchtel and see if we can get a narrower focus with respect to what data we are supposed to gather about which teachers in which programs in EO. Until our next meeting, I encourage you to send emails to me with your thoughts on how to approach these issues. The major agenda item for our next meeting is to decide what steps we will take and who should spearhead those steps.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:29 a.m. *Minutes by Shannon Tang, Administrative Assistant, University of Washington Educational Outreach.*

Present: *Faculty members:* Erdly, Harrison, Kyes, Lam, O'Neill, Olavarria, Wilkes,
Zierler

President's designee: Szatmary

PSO: Corbett, Brown

Guests: Daphne Mackey, Joel Ozretich

Absent: *Faculty members:* Keifer, Larson

ASUW: Esteban