

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Educational Outreach**  
Friday, January 11, 2008, 10:00-11:30 a.m.  
36 Gerberding

Chair O'Neill, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Approval of minutes from December 13, 2007.
2. Discuss and finalize DL draft letter
3. Discuss what other work needs to be done on DL issues, including what help/direction our subcommittee members may need
4. Begin review of data on extension lecturers and discuss issues/questions it may raise re: ELP lecturers
5. Adjourn.

\*\*\*\*\*

**1. Approval of minutes from December 13, 2007.**

The Chair called for a motion to approve the minutes from December 2007. The motion was made and seconded, and council members approved the minutes with no comment.

**2. Discuss and Finalize DL Draft Letter**

Chair O'Neill opened the discussion with the draft letter of the distance learning proposal. She noted that President's Designee David Szatmary had offered useful critiques and the council had discussed whether or not to send this proposal to all the Faculty Councils or just FCAS, FCFA, and FCET, who would have a more vested interest in it. Council member Olavarria questioned why the proposal only addressed undergraduate students, worried that many programs that deal exclusively with graduate students wouldn't take an interest in it (for example Pharmacy). Szatmary responded that the mass of the demand for distance learning was with undergraduates, especially in overenrolled classes.

The proposal would add a \$375 fee for any distance learning class in addition to tuition costs to pay for servers and technical support. Educational Outreach currently offers distance learning but matriculated students must pay the EO tuition rates in addition to their normal tuition rate. This additional fee would make distance learning for these students more cost effective because the bulk of their credit hours are included within the tuition cap. Currently the only funding for web-based curriculum is through Catalyst, though many council members mentioned that the classes offered are rarely attended by faculty and the software is awkward to use. Council member Zierler mentioned that the Nursing program now offers a distance learning course but the additional cost is shouldered by grants and gifts, and a concern is what happens when this development funding runs out. An additional distance learning fee would defray this additional cost.

O'Neill summarized that perhaps the proposal was under-inclusive, not addressing both graduate and professional students on one hand and the larger issue of educational technology on the other. While this proposal does have implications towards the larger funding of educational technology, perhaps a preamble could be added that addresses the larger framework of educational technology funding and the graduate school but then refocuses the discussion back to the specific problem of resolving the problems of bottleneck undergraduate courses through fee based distance learning. The committee moved to have O'Neill rework the draft and add the preamble independently and present the letter to the Senate Executive Committee meeting on Monday so all Committee Chairs could be presented with the proposal at once.

### **3. Discuss what other work needs to be done on DL issues, including what help/direction our subcommittee members may need**

O'Neill then addressed the issue of funding for education technology. The HRSA grants are funds to develop a technology toolkit for web development for the Nursing school. Zierler addressed how most of the nursing school's distance learning classes are small and the majority of the cost is paid with outside funding. A minimum requirement for distance learning is an online webpage with assignments, but for classes where discussion is necessary students and faculty currently need voice activated cameras and video streaming, faculty development to use these materials, and support for maintaining the technology side of the course. Grants allow for initial assessment of technology but there needs to be a way to gain more federal funding to sustain the program.

Council members also briefly discussed online courses and technology enhanced courses. They raised several questions: Should there be resources available to help faculty members put course materials on websites? Should there be faculty development programs to educate faculty members on web development or should departments hire students to do web development for courses? Currently funds for these sorts of applications are channeled through Catalyst. Another council member brought up that software called Second Life may be the best way to conduct an online course, yet creating this virtual classroom environment takes funds that a fee based system may or may not be able to sustain.

The council decided to invite Tom Lewis from Catalyst to a future meeting to address what Catalyst can offer for both web course materials and future plans for distance learning. Another council member suggested also asking a representative from the Administrative Technical Advisory Committee to come to a meeting as well. In 2006 ATAC opted to funnel money to Catalyst instead of supporting a proposal to pay students to support faculty web development. Chair O'Neill also commented that she would bring this issue up at the next SEC meeting. Chair O'Neill then mentioned that a subcommittee on distance learning would be formed once this letter proposal was approved. At the next meeting the council would have to decide on the jobs and tasks that needed to be done regarding development of fee based distance learning. O'Neill also said she would check with ATAC, the Senate Leadership, and the Faculty Council on Educational Technology Chair to lobby for support.

#### **4. Begin review of data on extension lecturers and discuss issues/questions it may raise re ELP lecturers**

Chair O'Neill introduced the handout that Szatmary produced regarding data on the Extension Lecturers. She noted that the English Language lecturers were originally housed in the English department but moved to Educational Outreach nearly 30 years ago. As Extension Lecturers, they are not treated like faculty in the Faculty Code, do not have representation in the faculty senate, and must renew their contracts every year, which means they have no job security.

Szatmary explained that there are over 1,000 Extension Lecturers employed by UWEO, most offering non-credit classes. Of the 65 English Language teachers, some teach in UW credit courses, which allow UW matriculated students to meet UW proficiency requirements. The majority teach noncredit courses to nonmatriculated international students who come to the UW campus for additional English instruction

A council member pointed out that these Extension Lecturers would never get voting rights within departments because part-time lecturers were also denied voting rights. Perhaps they could be a separate category, granted some rights under the code and perhaps representation in the Senate.

Szatmary then addressed the annual, quarterly and hourly contract issue, pointing out that the self-sustaining Extension program attendance tends to be volatile, and therefore a maximum of an annual renewal of contracts allows the program to meet the demands for classes without employing faculty who might not be needed.

He also pointed out that many academic units may not want to review Extension Lecturers as part of their faculty appointments. For example, the School of Law faculty might find it difficult to provide a faculty appointment for Extension Lecturers who teach in the noncredit Certificate Program in Paralegal Studies.

The council all agreed it was a complicated and emotional issue, many of these faculty feel emotionally tied to the core mission of UW while excluded from a clear status in the UW Handbook.

The Faculty Council agreed that it might be most practical for these teachers to remain as Extension Lecturers with certain parts of the UW Faculty Code applicable to them. Chair O'Neill and Szatmary decided to talk further about this issue. The Faculty Council also suggested that the request for Extension Lecturers to have faculty status as currently defined would be an issue, which should be forwarded to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs with information shared back to the FCEO.

#### **5. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

#### **Present:**

**Faculty Members:** Breitner, Keifer, Kyes, Lam, O'Neill, Olavarria, Zierler

**President's Designee:** Szatmary

**Representatives:** Brown, Caromeyer

**Absent:**

**Faculty Members:** Erdly (excused), Wilkes (excused), Harrison, Larson

**Representatives:** Ray, Esteban, Corbett (excused)

*Amy Underkofler, Research Assistant Faculty Senate, amyunder@u.washington.edu*