

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach met at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, **March 12, 2003**. Chair Steve Buck presided.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of the January 8, 2003 FCEO meeting were approved as written.

New FCEO chair needed for 2003-2004 academic year

Buck informed the council that a new FCEO chair will be needed for the 2003-2004 academic year. The Faculty Senate asks that chairs serve terms of not more than two years. Buck asked the council to think about “who can step up,” and what the 2003-2004 mission of the council should be. He said, “We will know more about the Rose Report early next year. FCEO *could* merge, informally, with the Faculty Council on Educational Technology.”

Access Program: Report by Norman J. Johnston

Johnston distributed some brief responses from Van Johnson, Associate Registrar, to questions that Johnston had about the Access Program. Van Johnson’s responses follow:

1. Enrollment of Access students

Autumn 2001: 234
Winter 2002: 224
Spring 2002: 189
Summer 2002: 90
Autumn 2002: 221
Winter 2003: 204

2. Curriculum

They take a variety of courses, but a majority take History courses (HIST, HSTEU, HSTAA) as well as Architecture, International Studies (SIS, SISJE), and Art History.

3. Attitude of instructors

From our experience, the feedback we’ve gotten back from instructors regarding the Access Program has been positive. They seem to not have a problem at all with having Access students in their courses.

4. Revenue

The revenue is routed to a budget belonging to UWEO. I hire a part-time employee each quarter to process the registrations for the Access students and maintain the Web site as an information resource. The revenue would cover the funding of our activities but it goes elsewhere. Historically, processing for the Access program was originally handled by UWEO but this is no longer the case. The biennial revenue ranges from \$7,000 to \$7,500.

5. Auditing fee

The \$5 fee is the maximum that can be charged per RCW 28B,15.540 when students audit under this program. The Regents could authorize the waiver of only a part of the tuition and fees instead of the current full waiver (except for the Tech Fee) but that would not go over well with our “seniors” who currently use the program. I don’t think this fee should be eliminated (but I would like the revenue from the \$5 charge in order to cover the expenses currently funded by this office).

6. Legislative authorization

The legislature authorized Access type programs at state universities in 1975. The Regents authorized this program University-wide in 1979 after seeing the success of a test program that provided these auditing opportunities at the UW. The test program began in Autumn 1978 and allowed up to 100 seniors to register as auditors in selected courses.

7. Recent considerations

Nothing that comes to mind at present.

8. An excellent program

It is an excellent program and I have received many positive comments from Access students enrolled in courses at the UW. The number of participants seem to remain fairly consistent so I assume that as some leave the program others join when they hear about it. Unfortunately, there is not much space available for extra students due to the availability problems we are experiencing these days so I don’t believe we could increase the number of participants at present and still leave them with a positive experience. On the other hand, our Access students seem to be able to find interesting courses to register in each quarter.

Today’s Discussion

Johnston said the Access Program is on all three campuses of the University. An Access student is allowed to audit up to two courses. Entrance is easy and occurs late in the registration process. There is a \$5 general enrollment fee and a \$4 fee for credit.

Johnston said the attitude of instructors towards Access students is “very positive.” The unique perspective that Access students bring to the courses is appreciated, as well as the long experience they bring in dealing with many of the issues raised in the courses.

The revenue from the Access Program belongs to University of Washington Educational Outreach (UWEO).

Johnston said, “My own contemporaries have been enthusiastic participants in the Access Program, and have encountered no problems in enrolling in the courses they’ve been interested in.”

Buck said, “There’s an underlying question here: how to maintain outreach ability in times when matriculated student numbers are in danger. In Spring 2003, will we see fewer participants in the Access Program? For space issues are burgeoning.”

Warnick said, “There’s no extra workload for the instructor with Access students in the course. And it’s a great thing to have as much diversity as possible in classes such as these. I don’t see

any downside.” Buck said the instructor has to sign a form for people from the Access Program, but that’s all. Deardorff said, “They don’t advertise these courses.” Johnston said, “Registration forms are available in the Registrar’s Office.”

Buck said, “I’ve had access students for a couple of decades. They bring an interesting perspective to these classes. I’m concerned about the future of these classes. With matriculated students being squeezed into fewer and fewer slots, that won’t leave much room for Access students.”

Goldsmith asked, “What about staff? And those numbers are higher. Will *they* be maintained? Staff will want to keep their availability.” Warnick said, “Link the two programs: staff and Access. There’s more strength that way. Though staff can either audit or get credit for their courses.” Buck said, “It’s not just a matter of us serving the community. They bring much to the class themselves.”

Szatmary said, “There’s a small number of people involved [in the Access Program], and a small administrative cost; so I don’t see any particular problem. There’s a strong orientation towards architecture and history, and other non-technical fields, so these are not overly expensive courses to run. Tuition-exempt students *can* be a problem in classes, with the space-available policy. But that is a very different problem from that of finding space for Access students. *Those* students are seeking degrees.” Buck said, “It sounds as if it would be better *not* to link the Access and staff programs.”

Goldsmith said, “*This* culture devalues the people who have the most experience. Educational institutions *should* support programs such as Access.” Buck asked, “Is there any way or need to raise faculty awareness of this? We could target a memo to the provost and associated departments. We *do* feel this is a worthy program. It might help somewhat to send a memo: a short memo, less than a page.” Johnston said he would do a draft of a memo to the provost, the president, affected vice provosts, and departments most involved in the program. Warnick said, “The goal now should be to maintain what we’ve already *got* in our Access Program.”

Update and possible changes to DL course approval forms

Jenkins said the new Distance Learning Course Application form is better than the previous one. “I came up with these questions, looking over the form: Is this *already* a DL course? If so, stop! Is there an equivalent on-campus course? Is this course *necessary*? My contention is with the front page; the other pages are pretty much all right as they are. We could tweak the front page, but overall it’s better. And there’s no place where one has to justify their DL course.”

Buck said, “The DL Course Application form was done in the Fall. But some issues have evolved since then.” Warnick said there’s a “question about the delivery mode, and that’s now on here.” Berger said, “If we have to fill out a course change form, we ought to take away the rationale factor. Ask: Are you going to offer this course in the Fall. But don’t ask for a rationale; that’s not needed.”

Buck said, “That’s a crux: The degree of justification asked for (for offering a course in the DL format) does seem excessive. We should look at the existing form. If FCEO felt the DL form could be redone on the front page (casting DL courses as a more normal part of the curriculum), perhaps that could be done. Whether the system is ready for that is a delicate question.”

Warnick said, “We *do* want to avoid any scandal, as an institution. The function of these committees, in part, is to ferret out such problems.” Buck said, “Should we *see* examples?”

Responses? Rejections? So we can give feedback?" Deardorff said, "Delivery and equivalency, not content, are the main problems, it seems. And asynchronous vs. synchronous DL modes of instruction. We could have a box to check, which would be an indicator."

Buck asked if the council should "work up a proposal about the changes on the form, or wait and look at new applications first." Szatmary said, "You might put the second form in use, and see what the response is, whether there's a carte blanche rejection. If not, it's all right as it is."

"We should try to help people be successful," said Berger. "This [application] form can be an example. We should keep the form positive and clarifying for those who will teach Distance Learning." Buck said, "Yes, the trouble spots were asynchronous courses and the student composition of DL courses." Jenkins said, "Those issues are identified on the second page of the form. That should help guide the instructors. If any box is filled out 'No,' have a place for explication." Berger said, "The 'No', or exceptions, are important, but don't press on 'rationale'." Buck said, "It will be interesting to see how the 'Check/box' system is set up." Jenkins urged: "Make it as clean and obvious as possible." Goldsmith said, "Yes, but we don't want to simply rubber stamp the proposals."

Jenkins said he would do a "straw revision of the Application Form." Buck asked, "Could you do a revised first page for us to look at?" Jenkins said, "Yes, I'll do that." Buck said he would contact Tim Washburn and find out when he expects to get the next batch of applications [for new DL courses], and see how the process is coming along. "I'm concerned about the progress," he said.

Spring Quarter 2003 FCEO issues

Buck said there will be one meeting on the DL Application process in Spring Quarter. And Arnold Berger will discuss his own experience in DL instruction.

Other issues for Spring Quarter can be discussed via E-mail. If council members have ideas for topics, please notify Steve Buck (sbuck@u.washington.edu).

Next meeting

The next FCEO meeting is set for Wednesday, April 23, 2003, at 9:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor, Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Buck (Chair), Berger, Goldsmith, Jenkins and Warnick;
Ex-officio members Deardorff, Johnston and Szatmary.

ABSENT: *Professors* DeYoung and Wells;
Ex-officio member Warbington.