

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH**

The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach met at 8:30 a.m. on Tuesday, **March 2, 2005**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair William Erdly presided.

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

ABSENT: *Professors* Carlson, Collins, Daniali, Goldsmith and Warnick.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the February 2, 2005 FCEO meeting were approved as written.

Discussion with invited guest Tim Washburn (Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Services) regarding Distance Learning course designators (please see attached legislation

Erdly introduced Tim Washburn, Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Services, and informed Washburn that the council has varying opinions about the wisdom of having Distance Learning course designators, and that the council was interested in hearing what Washburn had to say about this and other DL issues.

Erdly said the council has been asked to give its recommendation this spring on whether to continue designating Distance Learning courses with the DL-suffix. Part III (Scholastic Regulations), Chapter 9 (Continuing Education), Section 3 (Credit Programs), D., of Volume IV of the University Handbook, states: "UW Educational Outreach (UWEO), through its Distance Learning Program, also offers DL-suffix University credit courses to matriculated and non-matriculated students, without regard to their relative proportions. After June 25, 2005, UWEO may only offer University credit courses in Distance-Learning format that have been designated as DL-suffix courses. The provisions of subsections D.1. through D.6 shall continue to apply to non-DL-suffix Distance-Learning courses offered through June 2005 by UWEO, but are superseded by other code provisions in application to DL-suffix courses."

Washburn said there are two sections in the University Handbook that concern this issue. As for Distance Learning and the GPA, when there was a C-prefix before DL courses in the transcript, the grade for those courses was not included in the GPA, and the credit for those courses did not count towards required credits in residency for an undergraduate degree. Washburn said there "has been a DL tag on courses, as well as a definition of a Distance Learning course [51% – or greater – use of Distance Learning technology in the delivery of a particular course, which also is the HEC Board definition of a DL course]." But he said there is some confusion at present about what constitutes a DL course, in addition to the debate about DL equivalency to classroom courses, and whether a DL designator should be included in the transcript. (It is not included at other institutions that he has looked at.)

Washburn noted that "the suffix piece" does not say whether the course is undergraduate or graduate level. "We're working with the Graduate School to determine if DL courses *should* be tagged. Most DL courses have been graduate courses (that have come through the Curriculum Committee). There have been few undergraduate DL courses, and not enough DL courses at the graduate level to do any research. There is the tag now, to allow for a DL 'section', and to note the kind of delivery (the kind of technology) used to deliver the course."

"Now," said Washburn, "all is in place [for Distance Learning courses to be instituted in greater numbers], though the automated notation of asynchronous courses is not yet in place. Administratively, we're ready to support Distance Learning as it rolls out. The tag will be on the transcript in undergraduate courses, and may be so in graduate courses. Correspondence courses have never been considered regular courses at the University, and are not included in the GPA."

Washburn said a lot of proposed Distance Learning courses “had to be sent back. The descriptions [of the courses] were not good in these instances. We need to know more about DL courses. The Curriculum Committee feels there has not been much change in DL courses over the past several years, except for the use of E-mail.” This was surprising, Washburn stressed. “The use of technology seemed behind the curve; it’s been a bit disappointing.” He said the Information School and the School of Nursing have used a lot of newer technology in DL courses, but other schools and colleges have not.

“We’ve been looking at moving from asynchronous to synchronous Distance Learning,” Washburn pointed out. “Synchronous DL is far more efficient. This would be at both the undergraduate and graduate level.” Szatmary said, “The perception is that new technologies were not being used because the courses were asynchronous.” He told the council that surveys showed that half the students wanted asynchronous DL courses, and half wanted synchronous. “If asynchronous courses are approved,” he asked, “can the system deal with that?” Washburn said, “Yes, it can.” Szatmary pointed out that, if a DL course is part of a degree program, the completion rate of the course “goes up considerably”, whether the course is synchronous or asynchronous.

Washburn reiterated the observation that other institutions do not seem to be tagging DL courses, that it’s unusual to do so. Zierler asked, “What is the rationale for tagging DL courses? After all, it’s more work both for faculty and for students to participate in, and to carry out, a DL course.” Washburn replied, “It was a political acknowledgement to faculty who were uneasy about considering Distance Learning courses equivalent to classroom courses, and including them in the GPA.” He stressed that “we should, as an institution, keep track of how we deliver courses. Many institutions have a separate transcript for this kind of activity. If more than half of the course content is [delivered via] DL [technology], it should be tagged as a Distance Learning course.” He suggested to the council that “it could be early to go back to the Faculty Senate, without further research.”

Erdly said, “But the five-year limit is up in June [see the legislative extract above]; we need to recommend something on the DL designator.” Szatmary said, “You get different opinions, but most feel that graduate level Distance Learning need not be tagged on the transcript, though it might be tagged ‘behind the scenes’.” Deardorff said, “Undergraduate students in particular want the in-class experience.” Erdly said, “Quality control should be separate from whether a designator is there or not.” Szatmary said, “Students have made the point that there should not be a DL version *only*, that there should be an option to take the course in the regular classroom delivery mode as well as in a DL delivery mode.” Szatmary said students seemed quite accepting of the hybrid DL/classroom course.

Washburn strongly stressed that “students should know when they register whether the course will be Distance Learning or not.” Erdly said, “That’s on the registrar side; but again, that’s separate from the quality issue.” Erdly said another thing to consider is dual enrollments for undergraduates. Washburn said a key point remains that “45 of the last 60 credits must be residence courses”. He also pointed out a restriction for undergraduates: that a maximum of 90 out of 180 credits can be Distance Learning. He said there is a provision before the legislature that allows for a full Distance Learning degree program to be submitted as an exception to the general policy of prohibiting full DL degree programs. Again, he stressed, “it’s important for undergraduates to have in-person contact with one another, as well as with their instructor.”

Deardorff asked, “Is our system prejudicial to students who start here [at the UW] and end here?” Washburn said, “Transfer credits are not considered equal to our own [credits earned at the UW].” Berger asked, “Why isn’t the hybrid model investigated [and embraced] more?” Washburn said, “At UW Bothell, they do use the hybrid model more than elsewhere.” Eberhardt said, “It’s a cultural change; it will take awhile [to adapt to].” Erdly said, “If we have strong quality control, we could encourage the hybrid model more (and Distance Learning generally). But we need the proper mechanisms in place.” Washburn said, “The Faculty Council on Academic Standards has dealt with special examples of course development, such as one in which a [proposed UW] course was being developed in the Hawaiian language by an instructor in Hawaii. FCAS decided that if the curriculum is developed by another faculty at another institution, there needs to be a faculty member involved here at the UW. Thus, they thought the proposal inappropriate. So one question that arises is: How involved should the University of Washington be with a DL course?”

FCAS also turned down a proposed special topics course because it felt a 198-numbered course for Distance Learning would not be appropriate.”

Eberhardt asked, “What about offering a UW class to community colleges?” Washburn said, “A question would be: What makes it our [the UW’s] course?” Zierler said, “We’re developing [in Nursing] a completely online graduate program. The current classroom program has been reconfigured for DL format.” Washburn observed: “The funding issue is interesting: because of the tuition plateau; there’s not always money to pay for a particular course. We’re still programming parts of this legislation, so let us know if you want to make changes.” Erdly said, “We’ll send you a draft of whatever we do as a council. We need to respond to the June 5, 2005 deadline.”

Presentation: Fee-based Programs – Current Status and Future Plans (David Szatmary)

Szatmary presented an update on “UW Fee-Based Educational Programs: 2003-2004”. He emphasized that “the model at the UW is not unique, but is different from most continuing education-based operations.”

UW Educational Outreach, on behalf of the Provost, provides the infrastructure to allow colleges, schools and departments to offer fee-based programs, which address their academic missions. Major activities include: fee-based degree programs, extension, summer quarter, English Language Programs (ESL/international partnerships) and online learning.

There is a \$17.6 million annual return to the UW (not including UW faculty salaries). Some of this return goes to faculty, and another portion goes to summer quarter. \$8.8 million in state funding is returned centrally in transfer of degrees to fee basis. This is used for budget cuts and salary increases.

UWEO was started in 1912. The current staff includes 181 FTE and 61 part-time employees. UWEO, said Szatmary, is one of the top three Extension units nationally. This is based, in part, on scope of activity, which is particularly far-reaching in UWEO.

Enrollments/registrations in 2003-2004, including summer quarter, totaled 113,430. Gross tuition revenues amounted to \$69.8 million. (The figure for this academic year will be higher yet.) As for credit activity, the total number of students – including summer quarter, online courses, onsite courses, shared access, UW in the high schools, and degrees – was 31,254. Student FTE’s totaled 11,130. There were 219 onsite courses, 1,725 classes, 2,000 online courses, 92 shared access courses, 36 degree programs, and 42 UW in the High Schools programs.

More than 100 certificate programs serve 2,810 students annually in UWEO. Online learning – which has grown dramatically – has nine degrees and 26 certificate programs. The total online enrollment was 24,140. UWEO partnerships include PBS, the Washington National Guard, R1edu, Amazon.com, Heritage College, Pearson/Prentice Hall, Sloan Consortium, SK Telecom, Waseda University, WUN and Chulalongkorn University.

The projected growth of UWEO is that revenue and enrollments will likely grow 10 percent annually with the greatest enrollment increase in onsite fee-based degrees, professional development programs, contracts with business, K-12 initiatives and international partnerships, which focus on academic content.

Szatmary said that President Emmert likes the model that UWEO is currently using. Emmert also believes that the University “will never get the state resources that the University has gotten in the past”, and that new funding resources are needed. Szatmary said Emmert “is also looking at the undergraduate side, and believes the University could have a program constructed on the fee-based model.”

Erdly said, “Legislators in Olympia – democrat and republican alike – agreed on the importance of educational outreach.” Szatmary noted: “We may be looking at a different type of undergraduate program, with the same admission process, but with smaller classes, and with a focus on globalization and diversity.” Berger asked if there is “a strategic impetus under way to put this into being”. Szatmary said, “There are political and financial benefits, but it needs to be communicated to all three campuses.” He said he needs

the council's help in that strategic effort. Erdly said, "There's the education strategy, with its quality issues." Szatmary said, "Arnie [Berger] brought up a practical strategy issue. I could take the FCEO view to the provost."

Berger said, "We need an overarching strategic plan." Erdly said, "Ultimately, the Distance Learning tag issue goes towards the strategic level. We need to decide what changes are desirable, and possible. We have to be able, as a council, to ensure quality." Eberhardt said, "It's the question of vision." Erdly concurred: "Yes, hopefully we'll get to a vision statement this academic year." Szatmary said, "With regard to the HEC Board conversation, we're working with them on a survey to see what skill sets industry wants. We want *you* to see if we're getting this right." Wilkes said to all council members: "Send me anything you want to be placed on the Website [that he set up for the council]."

Erdly noted that a guest presenter on intellectual property will be invited to the next FCEO meeting.

Next meeting

The next FCEO meeting is set for Monday, April 4, 2005, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder