

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Outreach
Friday, November 9, 2007
Gerberding 36

Chair Kate O'Neill called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approve agenda (Chair)
2. Welcome new members (Chair)
3. Approve minutes from meeting of October 5, 2007 (Chair)
4. Discussion of Distance Learning issues
5. Discussion of EO faculty issues

1. Approve agenda (Chair)

With five excused absences (Erdly, Kyes, Lam, Olavarria, Wilkes) and eight council members present, quorum is established.

Rob Harrison moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Brenda Zierler and approved unanimously.

2. Welcome new members (Chair)

ALUW representative Lauren Ray and faculty member Leslie Breitner were introduced to the committee.

3. Approve minutes from meeting of October 5, 2007 (Chair)

Rob Harrison moved to approve the minutes from the October 5th FCEO meeting. The motion was seconded by Brenda Zierler and approved unanimously.

4. Discussion of Distance Learning issues

Kate O'Neill:

The resource guide for developing DL courses created by Jeffrey Wilkes outlines some guidelines for what faculty need to do if they want to develop a DL course. Included are guidelines on financing and a sample MOA. From the last meeting, there may be a need to develop more detailed guidelines which includes information on what is involved in sustaining a DL course after the initial development. The impression is that there appears to be funding for development, but not for the infrastructure needed to sustain the course.

Dave Szatmary:

To clarify, Jeff's guide is for fee-based degree programs. EO's Distance Learning Design team developed an online resource guide.

ACTION ITEM: Dave Szatmary will email the online resource guide to FCEO.

There is a distinction between fee-based and state-funded online courses. Fee-based DL courses have the infrastructure, whereas state-funded DL courses typically do not have the funding to develop the infrastructure.

Rob Harrison:

After the initial development, we do not receive any reasonable funding to keep the course going. Our funding is not tied to enrollment. Even if we have 1,000 students enrolled, we do not receive additional funding.

Brenda Zierler:

The funding does not match the amount of work it takes to get an online course approved and to deliver it. The approval process involves the department, the tri-council, and upper campus. There is a separate approval that is needed if the course is delivered at least 50% online. It is more complicated for faculty to get a DL course through the approval process and to develop it than a classroom course.

Leslie Breitner:

I have been doing an online curriculum and teaching since 1998 and would say that it is easier to manage an online course. An online course is easier to deliver if the DL component is part of another course or program. However, the model becomes more difficult as the number of students increase.

Rob Harrison:

I teach an environmental science undergraduate course that is available online and in the classroom simultaneously. The online course is more difficult. Students need 20% more personal time in an online course. Online students are also more varied. Online courses are not more difficult to teach, but you do have to put in more time with the students.

Brenda Zierler:

It would be helpful to gather information on all the DL models. Each model has a differential in cost as far as delivery.

Kate O'Neill:

Why are DL courses developed in the non-fee-based arena? It sounds like it is an institutional decision-making problem. Faculty are being encouraged to respond to student demand but there is not a departmental or school-level support once the initial development funds go away.

Brenda Zierler:

In our case, development is being driven by the nursing shortage. Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) wants to increase access by offering courses online, but we cannot offer them as fee-based courses.

Kate O'Neill:

We should find out what departments are offering non-fee-based, DL courses.

Dave Szatmary:

There are almost no state-funded DL courses because there is no state-funded infrastructure to develop and deliver DL courses. There is no infrastructure as far as educational technology. There is no funding for designers, a LMS, or tech support. Catalyst is under-funded. For this reason, most DL courses are administered by EO, which does have the infrastructure in place.

The university has many other financial priorities. To jump start things on the undergraduate side, I submitted a proposal to include online courses in the time schedule. Thus far, the proposal has been reviewed by the Provost, the Board of Deans, and student leaders. We should get more information once a student focus group has met.

Matthew Keifer:

There is a concern about the quality of DL courses. The topic of quality assurance needs to be included in any proposal.

Brenda Zierler:

Every course, whether it is online or classroom, goes through the same approval process. The fact that a course is online does not necessarily impact quality. A bad course will be bad whether it is delivered online or in the classroom. There is a lot of data that suggests that DL courses are just as rigorous. The real issue is that instructors are not trained on how to use technology in their teaching.

Leslie Breitner:

It does not make sense to develop the course and not support the teacher. It is possible to turn a great teacher into a great online teacher with some support.

Kate O'Neill:

Most of the issues seem to stem from a resource allocation problem and are not really within our control. Maybe we should look at the reasons why faculty choose not to do DL courses.

Dave Szatmary:

Last year, the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) charged a subcommittee to assess the priorities of UW faculty about their technology needs. The subcommittee looked at courseware needs and the available tools and found that faculty do not want new technology, but rather support for existing technology. The subcommittee recommended that four to five departments be given funding or resources for educational technology activities. The resources currently available to instructors are variable by college. The proposal was not approved.

ACTION ITEM: Dave Szatmary will email the courseware subcommittee proposal to FCEO.

Rob Harrison:

Catalyst does training, but they are very interested in new technology. It would have been more beneficial for faculty if Catalyst was able to improve on existing technology.

Kate O'Neill:

It seems that we may need to do some information gathering. The process would be time-consuming and difficult in such a large institution. We could try approaching the departments through the Faculty Senate or perhaps conduct an online survey.

Dave Szatmary:

Since this is a resource issue, should we gather feedback on the proposal to include DL courses in the time schedule? If this proposal is approved, students would no longer register through UWEO. They would pay a fee that would support instructional costs. It would be a way to solve the resource issue without putting more money in the pot centrally. UW is behind other universities as far as online courses and the proposal would be a way to secure the resources to move beyond the barriers.

Rob Harrison:

It would help us a lot if the committee could just specify how the tech fee can be spent.

Kate O'Neill:

To summarize, we need feedback on Dave Szatmary's proposal and the technology fee. It will be grassroots fact finding at the department level. I will start the process with the Faculty Senate. We will also need a subcommittee to define the issues so that it can be brought to the Faculty Senate or other faculty councils.

DECISION: Leslie Breitner, Rob Harrison, and Dave Szatmary will serve on the subcommittee. Brenda Zierler will serve as the chair.

5. Discussion of EO faculty issues

Joel Ozretich:

To summarize, Kate O'Neill asked us to generate two memos. The first was about our operations manual and the changes made to it. We indicated that we were satisfied with the changes will review the manual periodically. The second memo was drafted in response to a request from the Faculty Senate for clarifying information about Extension Lecturers. We included data on who we are, how many of us there are, what courses we teach, our compensation and benefits, and our policies for hiring and dismissal. This memo [distributed] contains brief answers to those questions. We can provide more detail if necessary.

Kate O'Neill:

In the interval since our last meeting, I have spoken with Dan Luchtel and have worked with Dave Szatmary to define the information we need from EO. We agreed that ELP faculty are distinct and as such, we will collect more detailed information on the group in addition to basic data about other people teaching for EO. This council will provide data on the number of instructors and programs, and the review process.

The issue that is on the table is the status of ELP lecturers. Currently, ELP lecturers are not members of the faculty for purposes of shared governance. Would this council recommend their inclusion in shared governance to the Faculty Senate?

Rozanna Carosella:

Our dilemma or ongoing plight has been that we are neither fish nor fowl in the university. Our primary function is teaching and we teach a wide range of courses and students. We also work with UW departments and other organizations. The perception is that we mainly teach ABCs or grammar. Although we do teach those courses, we have grown over the years because we have so many different programs.

We have tried to grapple with issues such as representation within our department, EO, and the university. How is our voice heard? How do we represent our concerns? It is important because our interests may not always be identical to other units. We have realized that we are not fully able to represent ourselves. To be fully recognized and enfranchised with the rest of UW faculty

has grown in appeal. We initiated a conversation with the previous Faculty Senate chair and were encouraged to begin conversations about this issue. Our goal is to become fully enfranchised members of the community. We believe that we have made significant contributions to the UW and would like to bring our expertise to the table more fully on issues such as instructional quality. We have an enormous resource. We are ideally positioned to interact globally. We would like to be in a position where we can work directly with faculty as faculty ourselves.

Joel Ozretich:

Even though our job is teaching, we are neither faculty, professional, nor classified staff. We are defined as “other academic personnel”. In the area of retirement benefits, we are more similar to faculty. If we go to the Benefits Office, they are not really clear about who we are. Our status is not clear to us or anyone on campus.

Kate O’Neill:

Is it your intention to write a more formal proposal?

Daphne Mackey:

We have some concerns about which committee would be best to handle this request. We thought that the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs would be appropriate.

Kate O’Neill:

Any proposal you submit will definitely have to go through FCFA. There are two ways for ELP lecturers to participate in shared governance. Either your titles will have to be changed or the Faculty Code will have to be revised to include a status in the code for you without changing your titles. FCFA would have to review both options. EO is within the jurisdiction of this council and it will be this council’s responsibility to gather pertinent data. Your petition will go to FCFA.

With regards to the data, we need a high degree of granularity with respect to ELP instructors and less with other instructors. Faculty Senate is interested in people who are full time teachers. If the ELP instructors are teaching core courses then there is some concern that these appointments are not properly reviewed by the English Department. Who is minding the course review, appointment, and merit review process? The Faculty Senate will be interested in the answers to these questions. Also, are there people without voting rights who are functioning identically to full-time lecturers?

Are there core teaching functions that are moving out from the department into EO? In the university of the future, will the faculty be doing research while all the basic instructional services are provided by EO? Is this the direction of this

institution and if so, do we have an effective policy for the people who will be affected?

For now, we will begin our research with ELP lecturers so we can decide if their role is functionally equivalent to other faculty. We need data on the status of people who are teaching core programs.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:44 a.m. *Minutes by Shannon Tang, Administrative Assistant, University of Washington Educational Outreach.*

Present: *Faculty members:* Breitner, Harrison, Keifer, O'Neill, Zierler
 President's designee: Szatmary
 ALUW: Ray
 PSO: Corbett
 Guests: Rozanna Carosella, Daphne Mackey, Joel Ozretich

Absent: *Faculty members:* Erdly, Kyes, Lam, Larson, Olavarria, Wilkes
 ASUW: Esteban