

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Outreach
Thursday, December 13, 2007
Gerberding 36

Chair Kate O'Neill called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approve agenda (Chair)
2. Approve minutes from meeting of November 9, 2007 (Chair)
3. Discussion of Proposal for Online Fee-Based Courses in the Time Schedule (Dave Szatmary)
4. Discussion of faculty award for Distinguished Contributions to Lifelong Learning (Dave Szatmary)
5. Review of meeting calendar and work plan for winter quarter

1. Approve agenda (Chair)

With three excused absences (Zierler, Ray, Corbett) and nine council members present, quorum is established.

Jeffrey Wilkes moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Leslie Breitner and approved unanimously.

2. Approve minutes from meeting of November 9, 2007 (Chair)

Jaime Olavarria moved to approve the minutes from the November 9th FCEO meeting. The motion was seconded by Randall Kyes and approved unanimously with one correction: change *Lisa Breitner* to *Leslie Breitner*.

3. Discussion of Proposal for Online Fee-Based Courses in the Time Schedule (Dave Szatmary)

Dave Szatmary:

Our goal is to integrate online learning more fully in UW's offerings by allowing students to take online courses as part of their course load. They would have to pay an additional fee to support infrastructure and instruction costs. The proposal was reviewed by student leaders, who also conducted a focus group. The response was positive.

Discussion:

- The proposal is a financial risk for EO. It would be an issue of economy of scale. The only way it will work is to increase the number of sections and students, thereby achieving economy of scale with infrastructure and instruction.
- The proposal would be piloted with four to five bottleneck courses.
- The online course would be a separate section.
- Fees would be collected centrally. EO would receive funds from central administration to pay for infrastructure and instruction costs.
- Students would take the online course as part of their tuition bundle. As such, students in online courses would count toward state enrollments.

- It does not appear that the proposal would violate any existing rules. Any fee over \$50 would have to be approved by the Board of Regents.
- The real issue is that online courses require more effort and funds. If a department offers online courses, there should be a mechanism to collect the fees for the department.
 - **Kate O’Neill:** There is a public perception that online courses are easier and cheaper. Public Relations should communicate the difficulty involved in developing and delivering online courses.
 - **Jeffrey Wilkes:** It would be helpful if people knew what the fees pay for.
- With regards to compensation, some faculty members may want excess compensations while others may want the compensation as part of their load. The Board of Deans prefers to allow each faculty member the flexibility to choose.
- Online courses will also result in savings as far as buildings and space needed.
- **Annie Lam:** There is definite potential to increase the audience for our courses.
- **Kate O’Neill:** If this proposal was adopted, the devil may be in the details with regards to how departments will be using the funds that are returned to them. FCFA may be concerned about providing some transparencies.
 - **Dave Szatmary:** A budget with administrative, operating, and instructional costs would be created as a first step. There would be no exchange of money. If there is net revenue, it would be returned to the department. We would have an agreement for this return of net revenue. The dean decides how the money would be disbursed, but there is usually a pre-agreement that would address these issues.
- **Dave Szatmary:** If the members of this council support this proposal, then perhaps Kate O’Neill can forward it to the chairs of the other faculty councils. If the other councils are not interested in discussing it, then we can forward the proposal to the Board of Regents. It is critical that we get everyone’s feedback.
 - **Jeffrey Wilkes:** Barring any “gotchas” that we have not considered, the proposal appears to be a good idea.
 - **Kate O’Neill:** We should forward this proposal to FCAS and FCFA.
 - **Dave Szatmary:** FCET’s feedback would also be helpful.
 - **Kate O’Neill:** Should a memo of some of the issues that we have identified be included with the proposal?
 - **Leslie Breitner:** If this proposal works, it expands the reach of the university. There are not enough negatives to prevent at least a pilot.
 - **Jaime Olavarria:** If faculty receives excess compensation, there should not be much resistance from faculty. However, if faculty is expected to teach these courses as part of their load, there will be concerns about compensation.
 - **Dave Szatmary:** We can create budgets to accommodate how faculty would choose to teach as far as compensation.
 - **Jeffrey Wilkes:** We have been teaching online courses without appropriate compensation. This proposal offers a way for us to do this properly.
- **DECISION: Kate O’Neill will send the memo to Jeffrey Wilkes, who will post it on the FCEO web page for comments. The final memo and the proposal will be forwarded to the other councils for feedback.**

4. Discussion of faculty award for Distinguished Contributions to Lifelong Learning (Dave Szatmary)

This award was started three to four years ago. The recipient of the award receives a \$5,000 stipend. The criteria for the award were drafted based on the feedback from this council.

To be considered for the award, the faculty member must:

- be a regular UW faculty member with a full-time appointment at the UW
- be engaged in lifelong learning activities sponsored by the UW
- have been engaged in lifelong learning activities for at least 2 years
- have been involved in activities that resulted in a positive benefit for students, the UW and the community
- have received excellent teaching evaluations
- have been engaged in non-degree programs aimed at adults for professional development, personal interest or career redirection
- must have been involved in innovative lifelong learning experiences
- a letter from the nominee explaining their commitment to lifelong learning would be useful

The nominations have dropped off. Are these criteria appropriate?

Jeffrey Wilkes:

Perhaps the unit chairs should be informed of the award.

Jaime Olavarria:

The phrase “lifelong learning” is not clear.

Jeffrey Wilkes:

Providing a list of past recipients and their contributions would be helpful.

Randall Kyes:

It is not clear if research and tenure track faculty are eligible as well.

Kate O’Neill:

I would suggest replacing “*positive* benefit for students,…” to “*significant* benefit for students,…”.

Leslie Breitner:

Each of the members of this council can send out the call for nominations to the faculty in our department. That would help get the word out.

Are there any volunteers to evaluate the nominations?

DECISION: Leslie Breitner, Jeffrey Wilkes, and Bill Erdly volunteered to evaluate the nominations.

5. Review of meeting calendar and work plan for winter quarter

During winter quarter, we will meet on January 11, February 8, and March 14.

Dave Szatmary:

We are working on the data on Extension Lecturers. This council will be provided with a simple chart that illustrates length of service, credit/non-credit activity, education. We should have this data ready before the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. *Minutes by Shannon Tang, Administrative Assistant, University of Washington Educational Outreach.*

Present: ***Faculty:*** Breitner, Erdly, Kyes, Lam, O’Neill, Olavarria, Wilkes
 President’s Designee: Szatmary
 PSO: Brown

Absent: ***Faculty members:*** Harrison, Keifer, Larson, Zierler (excused)
 ALUW: Ray (excused)
 ASUW: Esteban
 PSO: Corbett (excused)