

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Educational Outreach**  
Monday, November 6, 2006  
75 Gerberding Hall

Chair Margaret Rogers called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Preliminary Planning for Submission of Proposed Legislation
3. Draft of Proposed DL Legislation

**1. Approval of Minutes**

Zierler moved to approve the minutes from the October 6, 2006 FCEO meeting. The motion was seconded by Erdly and approved by Rogers.

**2. Preliminary Planning for Submission of Proposed Legislation**

Rogers suggested that the committee discuss possible questions that will be raised by the Faculty Senate and the Executive Council regarding the proposed legislation to remove the DL (distance learning) designator from student transcripts.

Erdly stated that the committee had previously discussed issues that might be raised by the Faculty Senate regarding the proposed legislation. The current proposal was shaped by those discussions. The first issue is that of quality. Will DL courses go through the same process of assessment and approval and consequently have the same quality or merit as classroom courses? The second issue is defining DL courses. Should a course that is 50% online be designated as a DL course? The criteria are unclear. Lastly, it is important to clarify that EO does not create or own the credit courses. Although they administer those courses, they are not the primary providers. The academic units themselves own the courses and as such, are responsible for the quality of those courses.

Rogers questioned if DL courses should be under the sole purview of this council given that there are DL courses outside of EO. Perhaps the council should request the input of FCAS. Erdly stated that the chair from FCAS met with the committee during the last academic year and agreed that it would be beneficial to touch base with the other chairs and get their current views regarding the issue.

Considering the misconception that DL courses are not developed and approved in the same way as classroom courses, it might be necessary to provide the Faculty Senate with the necessary background before submitting the proposal.

Rogers suggested meeting with the chairs of FCAS and FCFA in December. The committee should also request some time in a couple of Faculty Senate meetings to provide background and then to introduce the legislation. During the preliminary meeting, the committee should make clear that the proposed legislation only affects transcripts. The DL designator will still be kept as

an internal designator and can still be used as a metric for internal purposes. The committee should also provide a list of other public universities that do not have the DL designator on transcripts.

The committee should address as many of the issues as possible because questions will be raised even though they may not be relevant to the proposed legislation. The first issue is how to let students know if a course is DL or how much of the course is DL. A possible solution is to provide this information on the schedule. Second, the legislation should include the definition of DL. Third, we will need to address the perception that DL courses are not as good as classroom courses by providing a body of information that compares the two. Dave Szatmary might know of studies that compare the student performance and satisfaction of DL and classroom courses. The studies will have to be relatively recent. Questions regarding quality may not be relevant if the study was done over five years ago. The technology that impacts DL courses have changed since then. The last issue is residency. Currently, a DL course would not count towards residency requirements for undergraduate degrees. The last 45-60 credits need to be taken onsite.

### **3. Draft of Proposed DL Legislation**

In Erdly's opinion, the preamble should be bolstered by the talking points just discussed. Primarily, the various DL models should be discussed and, if the supporting material can be found, stress that there is no difference in academic outcome between DL and classroom courses.

Erdly states that there are two approaches to the existing legislation. First, the committee can tweak the existing legislation. This is a less radical approach and will not differentiate EO and DL courses from others. The second approach is to eliminate sections and write original legislation.

Changes to the draft:

- "Distance Learning" should be lower case throughout.
- Part III, Chapter 2, Section 7, a: "A matriculated student who wishes to take DL courses should consult with his or her academic advisor before registering." will be moved to section 7b.
- Part III, Chapter 9, Section 3, d, 2: Add "2." and "Delete" or "Omit".
- Part III, Chapter 9, Section 3, d, 4: Replace with "Official UW transcripts will not differentiate between distance learning and classroom courses."
- Part III, Chapter 15, Section 1, 9: Replace with "DL courses will be tracked in the internal UW records, but not specially designated on official UW transcripts." (Part III, Chapter 2, Section 7, a)

The committee will continue to revise the draft at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 p.m. *Minutes by Shannon Tang, Administrative Assistant, .*

**Present:** *Faculty members:* Erdly, Lam, Olavarria, Rogers, Zierler  
Ex Officio: ALUW Deardorff; **PSO:** Corbett;

**Absent:** *Faculty members:* Keifer, Kyes, Larson *President's designee:* Szatmary