Meeting Synopsis:

1) Call to Order
2) Approval of Minutes from meeting on November 10, 2011
3) Reports from Catalyst
4) Center for Teaching and Learning update
5) Discussion of Academic Credit, Competency and Learning
6) Adjournment

1) Call to Order
Council Chair Jan Carline called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. As there was no quorum, the following content is unofficial notes.

2) Approval of Minutes from meeting on November 10, 2011
Due to the lack of quorum, notes during the last meeting do not require council approval.

3) Reports from Catalyst
Tom Lewis, Director of Academic & Collaborative Applications, highlighted technology top priorities across campus. To improve tools for faculty, Roberta Hopkins and Classroom Support Services are standardizing technology across campus. Additionally, UW IT is integrating online tools, seeking to expand technical support available at school or college level, file servers centralization, negotiating storage space at Amazon to decrease costs and additionally have capacity for HIPA data encryption standard. Efforts will also be taken to improve wireless access throughout campus. For students, three priorities are: centralization of course information on MyUW; the roll out of VIDA virtual desktop, providing students with a remote desktop, containing software pertinent to courses; and to enhance student use of mobile devices and laptops through research and best practices. Lewis described three initiatives by UW IT in detail: Canvas, Tegrity and eTexts.

Canvas
A pilot of the Canvas learning management system is currently being conducted to understand how well faculty and student needs are met, what type of support and internal infrastructure will be needed. Lewis noted that although there have been some bugs overall feedback has been very positive. Haideh Salehi-Esfahani, who is part of the pilot, experienced quick responses to questions, and Lewis added that most faculty haven’t required much assistance with the system. Main challenge with this pilot was mentioned to be the integration with different analytics. Lewis also informed of the potential of linking
this system with course evaluations, and high compatibility with other systems. Statistics and remaining procedures regarding research on this pilot were provided to the Council.

**Tegrity**
Lewis described the Tegrity lecture capture software rollout. This software is seen as very helpful both for the ability to disseminate lectures outside of class and also to provide students with the ability to get feedback on their presentations from their peers. Lewis provided a timeline and research plan for the rollout of this software to the Council.

**eTexts**
The University is investigating possibilities to save students money on textbooks. Lewis described that eTexts would not only address this concern, but would additionally enrich students’ ability to interact with texts and collaborate with other students. He described that his group is currently connecting with publishers who may serve as eText vendors, outlined objectives and a timeline for this project. Questions were raised by the council regarding student support for this initiative and ease of student adaptation to such platforms.

The Council had an open discussion on technology on campus. It was noted in past experience that after providing students with iPads and tablets for courses, students did not necessarily adapt technology quickly or utilize their benefits. Also mentioned was the current situation where students bear costs of such materials, and the potential for the University to “bundle” materials in order to save costs. It was recommended that the project take differential costs within textbooks into consideration, and students may choose courses based upon the price of course materials. Other suggestions were in the availability of materials after courses end, and Lewis responded that this may be an option, but would depend on the vendor selected. Council members also discussed accessibility of such books for people with physical disabilities and the ability and cost to print these books. Lewis emphasized that the eText pilot will have no cost to the University and no commitments to vendors will be made during this process.

**4) Center for Teaching and Learning Update**
Beth Kalikoff, Director for the Center for Teaching and Learning provided a progress report on the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). She noted that the Center for Instructional Development and Research no longer exists, but CTL overlap some of its functions, such as diminishing the gap between teaching and learning. Her staff decreased from 8 consultants to 3, and they are using “faculty learning community” models to disseminate best practices and provide mentoring for faculty. She mentioned some topics such as “Actively Engaging Students in Large Classes,” “Inclusive Teaching,” “Leading dynamic discussions” and “Use of social media in teaching and learning” to achieve instructional goals. She described this model and explained how faculty participation is incentivized. Additionally, she noted that individual consultations are still performed but focus is on faculty learning communities. She noted that international Teaching Assistants have been a big emphasis for CTL.

She is attempting to expand CTL’s services to support undergraduates who serve as teaching assistants, emphasizing the shift in teaching models and the role of such teaching assistants. Kalikoff discussed her
excitement for the remodel of the Odegaard Learning Commons, with new spaces to enhance teaching and learning. Kalikoff responded to concerns of availability of CIDR materials, which will continue to be available online, and noted her disappointment at the lack of a website for CTL.

5) Discussion of Academic Credit, Competency and Learning
Carline provided a quick report to the SEC regarding the Report on Teaching and Learning, and will be providing a more in depth presentation at the Faculty Senate today. He considered David Masuda’s presentation on Western Governors University (WGU) very helpful at last FCTL meeting. Elements of the basic model of competency based learning at WGU, may be interesting for the Council to explore. These elements are: defining what elements students need to do, understand or perform in order to be considered competent, developing a good measurement tool to fit the competency, and consideration of academic credit for such competencies.

David Szatmary noted the tension between learning model and cost, adding that WGU’s model is not necessarily inexpensive for students, as they pay ultimately twice for assessments. Questions were raised on how competency based learning may resonate with student learning objectives. Council members emphasized the difficulty in creating a 2 hour test to gauge true competency, noted importance of determining what benefits are incurred from physically taking a course. Concerns were expressed in the need of distinction between competency based learning and simply providing certification or degrees for experience.

Differences between the WGU “faculty” and other models were that professors are designers of assessments, rather than designers of courses within a traditional university model. Further discussion centered on students’ perceived value of degrees, whether it was the degree or the competency is higher valued. Carline thought it important for the Council to discuss potential students gains through competency based learning models, and will determine FCTL interest in further discussion of competency based learning.

6) Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 a.m. by Chair Carline.
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