The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach met at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, October 10, 2000. Chair Roger Simpson presided.

Approval of minutes
The minutes for June 2, 2000 were approved as corrected.

Introduction of new and returning FCEO members
New and returning FCEO members introduced themselves. They briefly spoke to their reasons for wishing to serve on the council.

Council comments on experience with Distance Learning
New FCEO members DeYoung, Daniali and Jenkins all teach Distance Learning courses, as does Simpson, and all agree with Zoller that Distance Learning, as meritorious as it unquestionably is in certain disciplines and for certain kinds of students (by far the largest number of DL students hold baccalaureate or master’s degrees and are well-embarked on their professional careers) it cannot replace or supplant face-to-face, on-campus learning in which students interact with one another as well as with faculty, and receive hands-on, direct instruction that is irreplaceable, most especially in laboratory settings but also in upper-campus settings. In Daniali’s words, “Distance Learning has lots of potential and many limitations.”

Yet, as Treser observed, the notion that students can obtain a baccalaureate degree without ever stepping onto campus is a very strong issue to many faculty on both sides of the argument. The fact is that many faculty believe on-campus residence classes are not indispensable in certain disciplines. It is no less a fact that a great many faculty have an inchoate knowledge at best of Distance Learning and the issues surrounding it. Daniali said what is beginning to happen, and what will happen with increasing frequency, is the combined use of Distance Learning and on-campus pedagogy in the same class. “It depends on what we want to teach,” he said, adding that “there’s a lot of flexibility possible without compromise of quality.” Buck likewise noted a movement towards the use of components in regular courses that would also be used in Distance Learning courses. DeYoung offered the caveat that “if you lack a set of controls, you can have a difficult situation such as students never coming to campus [when they should be doing so].” Treser said all Distance Learning courses should be required to go through the Curriculum Committee as must all regular courses. Without this process, departments could govern their Distance Learning programs in whatever capricious ways they wished to.

Buck said that, with respect to residency requirements, it has become more and more difficult to define what it means to be a “resident.” And this, he stressed, is related to the question: What kind of experience do we want our undergraduate students to have? He said what is needed are broad-based models from the University community as to what is wanted and needed for an undergraduate experience.

Simpson said that he, FCAS chair Doug Wadden, and Faculty Senate chair Mary Coney, will meet with President McCormick to find out what his interests are with respect to Distance Learning, and in what direction he hopes Distance Learning will go at UW.

Simpson said he has been impressed with the sheer amount of time required to teach Distance Learning; this same impression has been made forcibly on the others who have taught DL. Equally impressive is the cost of resources and technology needed for Distance Learning instruction. As Jenkins noted, there are no central resources or technology made available by the University for DL instruction; it seems the
Administration wants individual departments and units to “do it on their own.” This was the sense Simpson had at the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting on October 9th. DeYoung observed that, even when facilities are made available for Distance Learning, they are often pronouncedly “ad hoc.”

Szatmary (Vice Provost, UW Educational Outreach) said Distance Learning includes all sorts of media (online, web-streaming, television) and is growing significantly at UW, where upwards of 7,000 students are enrolled in DL courses. He said the physical separation of students and instructors in DL courses, while regrettable in many disciplines and circumstances, is not a hindrance to effective interaction in other disciplines and circumstances. Certainly, for people already involved with careers and families, and for students who are not able to come directly to campus, DL courses are an indisputable advantage.

**Voting rights for representatives on faculty councils – Roger Simpson**

On voting rights for faculty council representatives, the Senate Executive Committee decided as follows:

- Librarians: It is left to the discretion of the council.
- Research: They do have voting rights.
- GPSS: They do not have voting rights.
- Retired: It is left to the discretion of the council.
- Professional Staff: They do not have voting rights.
- Administrative: They do not have voting rights.

The council voted unanimously to accord voting rights to ALUW representative Nancy Huling.

**Report on joint task force for FCEO and FCAS: committee structure; hearing plans; timetable; expectations – Roger Simpson**

Reviewing the background of the proposed Distance Learning legislation that did not go forward to the Senate Executive Committee in the 1999-2000 academic year, Simpson said 1999-2000 Faculty Senate Chair Gerry Philipsen asked FCEO to scrutinize the proposed legislation and make whatever recommendations it deemed appropriate.

The proposed legislation suggested removing the “C” designation on transcripts: the “C” designation refers to Distance Learning and extension classes. The proposed legislation also raised the possibility of removing the residence requirement for undergraduate students.

It quickly became clear to the council that the proposed legislation was about much more than “housekeeping,” in which guise it appeared to be presented. Neither FCEO nor the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) could ratify the legislation. The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (FCIQ) did express positive interest in the legislation as proposed; but that could not override the negative responses of FCAS and FCEO, the council with primary responsibility for proffering a recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee.

Simpson said he and FCAS chair Doug Wadden are forming a task force to reopen this process, and by Winter Quarter will offer a recommendation to SEC. The task force will be comprised of Simpson, Wadden, three members each from FCEO and FCAS, Divisional Dean for Arts and Humanities Michael Halleran, and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education George Bridges.

Simpson described the task force as an “information-gathering agency.” It will hold two to three “hearings” over three rounds, to which experts and other concerned people will be invited. Those invited will both address and be questioned by the task force. (Simpson said FCEO can propose speakers for the hearings.) After the rounds are completed the task force will propose possible legislation.
Buck said the council’s original goal was to enable and encourage widely-based discussions of these issues: to get people to think about them who had, or who had not, done so before, or who had done so unsubstantially. He wanted to re-emphasize this goal; to encourage inclusiveness, so that as many faculty as possible, in every sector of the University, have an opportunity to participate in this discussion. Simpson said the “dialogue process” will definitely be open, with full notification to faculty about the time, place, and purpose of the hearings. He said faculty, students, staff, and anyone else who is interested will be welcome to voice their opinions at the hearings, in addition to the specially invited guests.

Treser, echoing other council members, said, “It will all keep coming back to the question of quality.”

Simpson said that, based on the council’s concerns, a crucial question to be asked of the task force will be: Do we want to endorse a program in which a student has never been face to face with his or her instructor? (With respect to one aspect of this question, DeYoung observed that, in using interactive video for instruction, she is not literally in the same room with her students, but for the most part she feels as if she were. (Interactive video only works properly, however, she insisted, when students and their instructor have all met in person at least once.) E-mail communication, she added, is entirely another matter. Szatmary said an accompanying question is: What exactly do you need for a qualitative UW undergraduate education? When, for instance, is face-to-face interaction essential, and not to be compromised?

Daniali said the video “chat room” he conducts works very well. And he said it is important to remember that students are much more comfortable with the digitized revolution – with computers and the new technologies, including those used in Distance Learning – than faculty are, and adapt more readily to these uses in pedagogy than do their instructors. Some compromise in face-to-face instruction is going to be necessary from now on, he suggested, though that need not mean the discontinuation of on-campus, face-to-face classes in undergraduate education. Simpson said compromise will be inherent in the very characteristics of particular pedagogical methods in higher education.

Simpson said he will report back to the council on the discussions and proceedings of the task force, and apprise the council of dates, times, and locations of all hearings on Distance Learning.

Teleconference demonstration
Zoller said he can arrange for someone of his acquaintance who has good experience with teleconferencing to give a demonstration for the council. The council will be informed of details on this demonstration as they become available.

Next meeting
The next FCEO meeting is set for Tuesday, November 7, 2000, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.
Brian Taylor, Recorder
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