

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach met at 8:30 a.m. on Tuesday, **December 7, 2004**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair William Erdly presided.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the October 5, and of the November 9, 2004 FCEO meetings were approved as written.

Identify FCEO Proposed Actions – (listed in the 2003-04 FCEO Annual Report)

Erdly said the council must determine what is “actionable” among the proposed action items. “What do we recommend, whether in Class ‘C’ Legislation to the Faculty Senate, or in some other kind of document?” Goldsmith said it would be useful to ask FCEO ex officio member David Szatmary (Vice Provost, UW Educational Outreach) about item #2 on the list – start-up funding and development for outreach courses –and, specifically, to find out what is considered “standard policy” in Educational Outreach as regards start-up funding, and to ask him about other items on the list. Szatmary said there is a three-year amortization process for online courses. But the first consideration for any potential course is its marketability. [These are necessarily self-sustaining programs.] “If a course is not marketable, we can’t carry the cost of the development of the course.”

Erdly asked if there is a particular mechanism by which an individual faculty member, or a department, submits a request for a course in Educational Outreach. Szatmary told the council that a departmental chair usually calls Educational Outreach and initiates the process of development for an outreach course.

Szatmary said workshops on online course development are being offered. At one workshop, Catalyst representatives will discuss their tools for outreach development and instruction, and their ideas on outreach pedagogy. Erdly asked Szatmary if a faculty member brings an idea for a course to his or her chair, and then that chair contacts Szatmary at Educational Outreach. Szatmary confirmed that this is how the mechanism works. Erdly said, “Of course, it may be that a faculty member has an idea for a course, but does not know what needs to be done.” Warnick – speaking from experience – said, “You just get into it [setting up and teaching an outreach course] and then figure it out as you go.”

Erdly said items #2 [start-up funding and development for outreach courses and #6 [faculty/departmental resource guides for those engaging in EO activities] can be linked. Szatmary was asked: What if someone has an idea for a course that is not part of an existing program? Szatmary said someone can propose an entirely new and individual course, but again, it must be a course that is marketable.

As for summer quarter, Szatmary said, “There is a flexible budget for summer quarter; it’s a market elasticity issue.” Erdly added that summer quarter is “an issue at all levels,” something that President Emmert has remarked on several times. And the legislature definitely is interested in summer quarter, with the UW being increasingly unable to enroll the state’s student population seeking admittance to the University. “The faculty should be represented with a position on summer quarter,” said Erdly. “And it is important to address this issue during the 2004-05 academic year.”

Goldsmith said, “We are mandated to teach only those courses that are guaranteed to be filled, and specialized courses that aren’t taught during the academic year.” Asked about the funding situation, Szatmary replied that he does not know at present what the funding situation will look like after the legislative session. He pointed out that there are proposals from the HEC Board and the legislature. “Some are complicated; some aren’t,” he noted. “And we have K-12 and Running Start coming in, and some of those credits *aren’t* being brought in.” He said, “We won’t get much more funding. People will

pay more tuition; President Emmert has stressed this point time and again. Will we get funding for fee-based programs? We will get some funding. The numbers are somewhat stable.” Warnick said, “There is tension between demand and these other factors with respect to summer quarter.” Erdly reiterated that items #2 and #6 could be linked in an informational document as Class “C” legislation, and that item #5 [availability of, and funding for, tenure/tenure-track faculty lines within EO] “is crucial.” Erdly said it would be interesting to know how many tenure-track lines are funded by self-sustaining programs. “Tenure-track lines are guaranteed funding,” he noted.

Wilkes wondered if the 12 items on the list (13 including the Class “B” legislation of 2001 that the council is reviewing for possible legislative revision) are adequately covered in the material actually submitted thus far by council members assigned particular items. Erdly pointed out that he has received statements from council members on bottleneck courses, knowledge management, library and other core resources, and use of emeritus faculty. Some have yet to turn in their statements, and a couple of voting members are no longer on the council. Wilkes said that if all statements submitted to date were sent to him he would see that they are on the Website he has created for this project, if they are not already on. Erdly said he would send him all that he has thus far.

Erdly said, “There are a lot of issues. I’d like to build an integrated document for our next meeting. I’ll depend on your statements on the items you’ve been assigned, and that Scott will place in his Website that we will all be able to access. I’ll write a draft for an integrated statement from the council, and we’ll go over the draft at our first meeting in Winter Quarter.”

Szatmary said, with respect to the “costing out” of outreach courses, “An operations group is dealing with costing out. They want to see what’s involved in the overhead, and what other services are involved: staffing, etc.” Erdly said, “As regards #11 [methods and criteria for developing self-sustaining, for-credit courses and degree programs via EO)], there are four or five major considerations of what’s involved.”

Wilkes said it is hard to reach a potential audience to survey; at least he found it so in the case of Physics. Erdly said, “We can’t do *all* of these items this year. But a very important issue is knowledge management strategies. What are the guidelines for these strategies? They can’t be solved, but they’re exceedingly important. And the use and reuse of content, and shared resources with faculty: these are all important issues.” Deardorff said the “reusability of content” issue is complex. In many instances, faculty surrender the copyright of their original material to publishers, which results in a myriad complexities surrounding intellectual property rights. And when material is put on the Internet it is immediately prey to Google and others, and thus quickly can be in the hands of those other than its target audience. And using visual art taken from Websites requires formal permission in most instances. Eberhardt said that when faculty think about distance learning, one question they are confronted with is: What happens with the course material when the course is over? Szatmary said, “The *use* of material is what is important, not the IP issue: the issue of content going bad over time, and the use of material in another form.”

Szatmary recommended Mac Parks, Associate Vice Provost for Research, as someone with whom the council could profitably discuss many of these issues. Erdly said he would ask Parks to visit the council.

Erdly stressed that “it would be useful to outline the issues at this stage, to determine which ones we *can* address, and which ones we can’t.” He set out six major areas:

- “Dimensions”: resource guide for course development (and others) – includes items #2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13: marketing, finance, development activities, “IP”, resources, quality, and research are all related to this area;
- Summer quarter – #9 and #1;
- Library / resources – #3;

- Content reuse – #8;
- Transfer of courses / credits – #10;
- Faculty representation – #4.

Szatmary told the council: “For me, a communication strategy would be most useful. What communication strategy would be of greatest help to faculty? In Educational Outreach, we have a presentation for fee-based programs that covers many of the items on your list. So I would be most interested in your ideas on how best to communicate to faculty.” Wilkes said, “We would like to see your presentation.” Goldsmith corroborated Wilkes, and said if Szatmary let the council know when the next presentation would take place, council members who are free at that time could attend and see how the presentation incorporates the items on the FCEO list. Szatmary said it might be best if he were to bring a truncated power point presentation to an FCEO meeting, with an accompanying print-out. He said he would send Wilkes “the elements of the presentation”. Erdly said, “This could be a good Class ‘C’ document.” With respect to transfer of courses, Szatmary said, “This is a larger issue. UW Bothell is considering this issue now.” Szatmary also informed the council that he will be speaking with President Emmert, and will ask him about fee-based programs and revenue strategy for the University. He will report back to FCEO at its next meeting on his discussion with the president.

Next meeting

The next FCEO meeting will take place in January 2005. Council members who have not returned the schedule availability forms they were mailed are encouraged to do so at their nearest convenience. The Winter Quarter 2005 faculty council schedules are being determined now.

Brian Taylor, Recorder

PRESENT: *Professors* Erdly (Chair), Brock, Eberhardt, Goldsmith, Warnick and Wilkes;
Ex-officio member Deardorff and Szatmary.

ABSENT: *Professors* Berger, Daniali and Zierler;