

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach met at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, **February 20, 2002**. Chair Steve Buck presided.

Approval of the minutes

The minutes of the January 23, 2002 meeting were approved as written.

Faculty Preference Surveys

The Faculty Preference Survey will be mailed out to all voting faculty on February 22, 2002. Faculty council appointments are for three-years, though faculty may serve consecutive three-year terms if they so desire. Faculty Senate Chair Bradley Holt said that current discussions in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee about the possible merging of certain faculty councils should not affect council members' decisions on continued service. "FCEO should plan to continue exactly as it is now," Holt said, adding that, at this point, the Senate Executive Committee does not know which councils, if any, will merge, nor when their new status would take effect.

Discussion of issues related to undergraduate Distance Learning programs, including BA/BS degrees and minors

– Note: The following is the revised "Design and evaluation of DL-suffix courses at the University of Washington" as a result of today's council discussion. It is included in the minutes as a record of where the council's suggested Guidelines stood to this point.

Design and evaluation of DL-suffix courses at the University of Washington

From the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach,
Steven L. Buck, Chair
February, 2002

In Autumn 2001, a new category of distance-learning course was approved at the University of Washington. Such courses are designated with a DL suffix, and are treated in all respects like other credit courses offered at UW. Specifically, all DL-suffix courses (hereafter termed just DL courses) must be evaluated and approved through the standard curriculum review process at department, school or college, and university levels.

The intent of the present document is to highlight resources and general issues to help guide both those faculty who wish to teach DL courses and those who are involved in their review and approval.

Resources

Among the many resources devoted to one aspect or another related to distance learning courses and programs, we wish to highlight the following.

- b. Catalyst and UW Educational Outreach (UWEO) have jointly created a well-focused but comprehensive set of web sites that identify and explore issues related to the creation and implementation of distance learning courses.
- c. The UW Distance-Learning Course Designers Group has created a list of guidelines highlighting key issues in to be addressed in the design of courses to be offered via distance learning. The entire list is reproduced in Appendix 1.
- d. The UW Library system contains scores of recent books devoted to various aspects of the design, implementation, and evaluation of distance-learning courses. These can be found via the library catalog.

- e. We have compiled a list of reports, articles, and brief publications related to distance learning that are available on-line from sources outside the UW system. These are listed in Appendix 2 and can all be downloaded by means of a web browser from the indicated URL addresses.
- f. There are various modes of delivery of course content that are grouped under the broad label of “distance learning”. A given course may use a mix of delivery modes, including a classroom-based component. Appendix 3 reproduces the current list of delivery modes and criteria for reporting distance-learning formats established by the state Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Guidelines

Traditional classroom and distance-learning courses share many issues and dimensions that should be considered during course design and approval review. Some of these are reflected on the existing UW Course Approval forms and/or on the attached list of distance-learning issues shown in Appendix 1. We would like to draw particular attention here to issues on which distance-learning courses may require different strategies and solutions from those adopted for classroom-based courses. These are by no means the only issues that should be considered in design and evaluation of DL courses.

The Catalyst/UWEO web site is particularly useful to gain an initial understanding of details of these issues. The resources cited in Appendix 2 and those available from the UW library system can provide a deeper understanding. The wording of these issues is taken in part from the material of Appendix 1 provided by the UW Distance-Learning Course Designers Group.

1. What are the goals for this DL course? How does it support the academic mission of the unit? Why offer it in DL format?
2. What is the intended audience for the course: matriculated students only or mixed matriculated and non-matriculated?
3. Identify the technologies in the course, the rationale for using the selected technologies and the support available for the technologies.
4. Describe the other resources and infrastructure that will help support the class, instructor, and student. These may include libraries, advising, exam proctoring, and instructor training. How will the intended audience of the course gain access to these resources?
5. Describe how students receive feedback and achieve learning goals. Describe the plan and anticipated time to respond to student questions, assignments, and exams.
6. Describe how student interaction with the instructor and other students will be sufficient to meet learning objectives.
7.
 - a. For DL courses with existing classroom versions: Describe how the content of the online course matches the content of the onsite course.
 - b. For DL courses without existing classroom versions: How did you determine the number of credits for the course?
8. What is the maximum time for completion of the course? What is the minimum time into which the course can fit? Could this course be offered on the standard 10-week quarter calendar without sacrificing content or student learning?
9. Describe the instructor’s preparation and training for teaching on-line. Indicate the maximum enrollment per instructor.
10. Describe safeguards for academic honesty.

FCEO discussion with FCEO Chair Steve Buck and FCAS Chair Doug Wadden

Buck said that, without the Distance Learning course approval process in place, it might seem premature to consider Distance Learning programs. “It is useful to share our thoughts on the review process, and the council’s suggestions may have some influence on what comprises the review process for Distance Learning courses.”

Buck pointed out that any new proposed degree program must go through the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) and its Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) for review and approval, before being sent to Tim Washburn, Executive Director of Admissions and Records, and finally, to President McCormick for his signature. SCAP does not review courses, however, only programs. Also, any Distance Learning program that would match an existing degree residence program, and that would seek to avoid the 45-resident credit requirement (45 credits being taken on campus), would go through FCAS and SCAP. But a Distance Learning alternative (for an existing degree program) whose resident credit requirement was fulfilled would not have to go through FCAS and SCAP.

Faculty Senate Chair Bradley Holt said, “We want to be careful because there will be policy and political implications if students are required to take Distance Learning courses as part of the fulfillment of their baccalaureate degree. There could be implications with the students and in Olympia (with the state legislature).”

Wadden said FCAS is asking what its (and SCAP’s) role would be in the degree approval process? “Is there a value judgment made only by the department or college or school? Or is there an oversight body? Could there be multiple host departments for a degree already offered at another campus? Would it be, say, the Psychology department at UW Seattle that had oversight of a particular matching degree in Psychology at another campus? If not, who would have oversight of the degree at the other campus?” Wadden said there is not much “crossover” now at the other campuses, “because you have to be physically present to take the course.”

Holt said, “Technically, all programs and courses should go through the Faculty Senate, since faculty are responsible for all courses at the University. But realistically, we can’t look at courses individually; there are far too many. So we review all degree programs.”

Wadden said, “Defining and maintaining the integrity of degree programs is the salient issue. There are important decisions about programmatic issues to be made. If courses were to become the responsibility solely of departments and colleges – and FCAS and SCAP were not to be involved in the review process – how would equivalence of courses be determined? And how documented? And are there aspects of degree programs that are not course-driven? Who has the final say, especially if they’re duplicate degrees?”

Holt said the Faculty Senate is “supposed to provide oversight of campus and department-level program issues. It is supposed to play an oversight role on Distance Learning courses to reassure the integrity of programs. Unfortunately, many departments are not aware of these things.”

Buck said he will ask Tim Washburn and Paul Lepore, Director of Undergraduate Program Development, to attend the March 20 FCEO meeting. “Since these courses will come through the College of Arts and Sciences, it is critical to get the course approval process in place, and to see what assistance we can give to Paul Lepore and his office.”

Buck said, with respect to the timeline of the council’s suggestions for Distance Learning Guidelines, that he would like to send them out as soon as possible. “We are done now with our suggestions for the

Guidelines, except for changes to be added following today's discussion." [See above.]

Buck said, "Many of these issues are broader than just Distance Learning issues." Some, for instance, will concern tri-campus issues. He said the council, however, should concentrate on Distance Learning, not tri-campus, issues.

Wells pointed out that when she asked her faculty (in Dental Public Health Sciences) what their views were on Distance Learning issues, many knew nothing or very little about DL programs. Wells said many faculty do not know what goals and emphases are in such programs. She said the council's suggestions for Guidelines need to address "how all the parts fit" in Distance Learning programs.

Buck said, "This document focuses only on Distance Learning courses. We are doing course evaluation issues first, and will then address program-related issues, though of course they overlap." Szatmary said, "It depends if it's a new or existing degree program." Wadden said, "We must solve the first part first: DL courses. Then we can deal with DL programs."

Wadden mentioned that FCAS, when shown a UW diploma at its last meeting by Associate Registrar Van Johnson, observed that, on the diploma for UW Bothell, the words "The Regents at the University on recommendation of the University Faculty at Bothell" and the signature of the "Chancellor and Dean, University of Washington, Bothell" are the specific allusions to the Bothell campus. Otherwise, the degree bears the same appearance exactly as a degree from UW Seattle with the exception of the logo of Rainier vista which appears only on diplomas issued for Seattle. On the academic transcript, there is no mention of the campus when the courses are taught at Seattle. For courses taught at Bothell or Tacoma, the quarterly transcript listing is headed by "Bothell campus" or "Tacoma campus". When Seattle is listed concurrently with Bothell or Tacoma campuses, then "main campus" precedes the Seattle listing. Only the college and major are indicated in the header of the transcript for the student's demographic information. The transcript is, then, a record of the student's grades in each course that he took at the University of Washington, broken down by individual quarters. Wadden said, "I bring this up because it could be the appearance of a new degree, rather than an actual new degree, with which a review process is confronted, in certain instances."

Szatmary said, "There will be certain infrastructure requirements to offer these degree programs." Treser said, "A complicating factor is that the other campuses do not entirely want oversight from Seattle. Where is the Educational Outreach piece in all this?" Wadden said, "I'd like FCAS to ask: What is *outside* the DL course structure? What are the intangibles? We need to address the question of equivalence?"

Holt suggested that, for Distance Learning courses, FCEO and FCAS could both be part of the process of approval. "Perhaps a single group could be composed of members of both councils. But that is for you to work out." Buck said, "I would not want to see Distance Learning course applications come to this council." Holt repeated his earlier statement that "academic programs are the responsibility of faculty," and said, "What level of review you do can be various, but review should take place at the faculty council level. The Faculty Senate's role is to evaluate these degree programs."

With the help of the council, Buck drew up the following issues and questions to be considered in Distance Learning course evaluation:

1. Intended population and rationale for Distance Learning program / components (academic mission).
2. Program components and courses
 - Relation of all courses and experiences
 - Sequencing of Distance Learning and non-Distance Learning parts.
 - What part in residence?

3. Student access and resource issues
 - Equipment needs and costs
 - Time for completion
 - Transfers
 - Training
4. Institutional resource issues
 - Resource demands on UW components
 - Advising, admissions, departmental training, staffing, etc.
 - Are all courses available through UW?
 - System infrastructure
 - Support for non-course components
 - Faculty training

Several council members emphasized the importance of “stating up front” the purpose of a new Distance Learning course: its academic mission. “Why a Distance Learning course?” “What considerations went into the decision to establish this Distance Learning course now?” “How does this course support the academic mission of its unit?” “What are the goals of this course?” “Why does this course have to be done as Distance Learning? [demand? fieldwork? etc.]” “Identify the technologies in the Distance Learning course.” “How will the library system be used in this course?” “Identify the resources and infrastructure of this course.” “How will faculty and student training be accomplished for this Distance Learning course?” Buck said he would send the council the revised FCEO Guidelines by the end of the day.

Next meeting

The next FCEO meeting is set for Wednesday, March 20, 2002, at 12:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Brian Taylor, Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Buck (Chair), DeYoung, Jenkins, Treser and Wells;
Ex-officio members Bennett, Deardorff and Szatmary;
Guests Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate; Doug Wadden, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

ABSENT: *Professors* Daniali, Kieckhefer, Kim, Marcovina, Noble and Simpson;
Ex-officio members Rose and Weissman.