1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Susan Astley at 2:31 pm. The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Report of the Chair. [Exhibit A]

Senate Chair Astley referred the senators to her written report. She reminded attendees of the logistics for being recognized to speak. She then presented several updates on issues discussed at the last meeting.

Astley appointed a task force, including Professor Giebel, to revise the resolution presented at the October Senate meeting. This resolution will be presented later in this meeting.

Professor Giebel had requested a report on the status of faculty retention offers. The information is in the process of being gathered. It will be presented to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) on December 5, 2011, with follow-up information coming to a subsequent meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Astley also provided some introductory comments about the report on online learning to be heard later on this agenda.

There were no questions to Astley about her report.

3. Report of the President – President Michael K. Young

In his remarks, President Young mentioned that he had been occupied with the state legislature’s special session that began this week. He commented on the various tradeoffs in management of state budget deficits and the potential impact on funding for higher education. He mentioned that proposed cuts to charity care and work-study would affect the University of Washington.

President Young also acknowledged several recent positive developments including the naming of two Rhodes Scholars who are students at the University of Washington and the election of Professor Dave Eaton to the Institute of Medicine.

There were no questions or comments in response to the President’s report.

4. Opportunities for Questions on Reports and Requests for Information.

   i. Approval of the October 10, 2011, SEC minutes.
   ii. Approval of the October 27, 2011, Faculty Senate minutes.
   iii. Senate Revision Cleanup Faculty Code Changes. [Exhibit B]

b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit C]

c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit D]

d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit E]

e. Report of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning. [Exhibit F]

f. Report to the UW Regents on Online Learning. [Exhibit G]

No questions were asked about reports from the Senate Executive Committee or Senate officers.
Senate Chair Astley invited Jan Carline to present a summary of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL) report on online learning. He provided background for the Council’s report and stated that the goal was to provide an evidence base for decision making about online learning. There are many kinds and varieties of online learning. The report recognizes the demand by students for increased flexibility and access. Online teaching may be stretching some faculty’s current expertise. Data on the quality of online learning is ‘murky’. High quality online learning is not detrimental to learning; what is central to high quality is the quality of interaction between students and faculty that is provided. This interaction influences satisfaction and learning outcomes. Specific instructional skills are needed to develop and implement online courses. It isn’t effective to just increase the number of students in a course without dealing with the increased need for interactions. Reduction of costs is achieved through decreased use of regular faculty (who design the course) with interactions provided by Teaching Assistants or less costly faculty. High quality online learning is likely to be as expensive as residential courses, if not more so. If we are going to be successful in meeting the demand for online learning there is a need for ongoing faculty development, technology support, and new compensation models.

Questions and discussion followed. What types of students are the best fit for online learning; how does student motivation influence outcomes? Data on student characteristics was not the focus of this report. The Council attempted to find literature on diverse learners; little or none was found. Do newer faculty already have the skills necessary for online teaching? Perhaps they are more comfortable with the idea of online teaching, but they are not necessarily more skilled. The diversity of software platforms used at UW is also a challenge. What about dropout/course completion rates? Completion at student’s own pace was associated with non-completion; it is best to have deadlines. One challenge is to identify who is actually completing the coursework, the registered student or someone else. Online cheating has been an issue for some faculty (e.g. exam questions and answers found posted online). Concerns about scholarly integrity, plagiarism and fabrication issues were raised by a faculty member with experience comparing this in her online v. residential courses; it was hypothesized that ethical behavior is mediated by face to face contact. It was noted that our online data is from a very limited historical duration. What about other outcomes associated with residential education? There is some literature that if the online connections among students are done well, meaningful relationships can develop (at course level, but not broader level). What is the bigger picture of the impact of online teaching on tenure track faculty? Would it lead to reduction of size of permanent faculty being replaced by adjunct faculty? What is the role of the faculty member in the course and within the university? What is the cost of translating a course from residential to online, initially and for ongoing maintenance and revision? This was not included in the costs in the literature reviewed.

A related issue is granting credit for life experience; is this issue addressed in the Faculty Code? One faculty member recommended the UW should not give credit for life experience. One faculty member who teaches in a masters’ program offered entirely online reported that students are connected then there were no more problem with cheating than with the residential program. He suggested that online teaching does take work; it is not better or worse, but different, and depends on students and faculty skills and preferences. What is the policy about who owns the course, the university or the faculty who designed it? Some other universities have done work on intellectual property issues and may be useful resources to us at the UW.

5. Consent Agenda.
Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit H]

Secretary of the Faculty Killien asked that this item be removed from the consent agenda so that additional nominees could be considered. Astley responded that this agenda item would be moved to unfinished business.
6. Memorial Resolution.

The memorial resolution was presented by Senate Vice Chair Jim Gregory and approved by a standing vote of the faculty.

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:

Associate Professor Emeritus Stella Hay Bevens of Nursing who died on November 16, 2011, after having served the University since 1955.

Professor Emeritus Benjamin Smyth Bryant of Forest Resources who died on November 14, 2011, after having served the University since 1949.

Professor T. Lloyd Fletcher of Surgery who died on October 15, 2011, after having served the University since 1948.

Senior Consultant Kenneth S. Kahn of Orthodontics who died in October, 2011 after having served the University since 1950.

Assistant Professor Emeritus Lee Anne McGonagle Malott of Laboratory Medicine who died on October 15, 2011, after having served the University since 1970.

Clinical Professor Lucien E. Morris of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine who died on November 15, 2011, after having served the University since 1954.

Affiliate Professor Donald C. Pierce of Restorative Dentistry who died on October 5, 2011, after having served the University since 1972.

Associate Professor Emeritus C. Edward Prince of Obstetrics and Gynecology who died on August 26, 2011, after having served the University since 1977.

Professor Emeritus Robert Richman of Philosophy who died on July 31, 2011, after having served the University since 1961.

Professor Emeritus Roy Sawhill of Civil & Environmental Engineering who died on September 16, 2011, after having served the University since 1956.

Lecturer Emeritus James Stoddard of Restorative Dentistry who died on October 7, 2011, after having served the University since 1965.

Clinical Associate J. Michael Thrall of Endodontics who died in November, 2011 after having served the University since 1970.

Professor Emeritus Walter Williams of Public Affairs who died on August 23, 2011, after having served the University since 1970.

7. Announcements

None.

8. Unfinished Business.

a. Nomination of members to faculty councils and committees. [Exhibit H]

Killien amended the list of nominees in the agenda to include the following additions:

Alexes Harris, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.
Rachel Chapman, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

Yoshimi Anzai, School of Medicine, as a member of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

John Slattery, School of Medicine, as a member of the Faculty Council on Research, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

The amendment passed; no other nominations were made. The amended list of nomination list was approved.

b. Class C Resolution. {Exhibit I}
Title: Resolution Concerning Repairing Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy.
Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

The resolution was introduced by the chair of the task force, Zoe Barsness. She described the process of the task force that resulted in the resolution under consideration including incorporating discussion from the prior Senate meeting and attempting to make the resolution as factually based as possible. There was no discussion and the resolution passed with a unanimous vote of the Senate.

Discussion: Provost Search Process

Astley mentioned she had described the process in her report [Exhibit A], and summarized her report for the group. She stated she was neither endorsing nor contesting the process, merely stating the facts as she understood them. She directed the discussion towards 1) a debate about the advantages/disadvantages of an open versus closed search process for final candidates, and 2) what is the impact of an open search on uncovering the best candidate?

During the open discussion that followed Astley’s comments, the following points were raised by members of the Senate:
- Someone who is reluctant to meet in public is not the best candidate.
- It is important to consider the checks and balances related to the number of candidates who refuse to have their names made public.
- What were the reasons given by candidates for not wishing to go public?
- Was the preferred candidate willing to go public? Astley said she couldn’t speak to this due to confidentiality constraints as a member of the search committee; she invited others to comment but no one did.
- What does a candidate have to lose by public naming of candidates? At what point does a candidate have the right to request ‘secrecy’ when applying for a position? For example, this is not typical for candidates for faculty positions.

Robert Wood, senator from UW Bothell, introduced from the floor the following resolution; it was seconded.

“WHEREAS, the recent search for Provost did not provide the tri-campus community with an opportunity to learn of the names of the finalists for the position nor to meet the finalists publicly before a ‘preferred candidate’ was identified; and

WHEREAS, this search process has violated the tradition of open Provost searches in a system of shared governance at the University; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate expresses its clear expectation that future searches for academic administrators will again include open public forums with finalists as a means of gathering broad faculty input before a decision is made.”
In the discussion of the motion that followed, President Young was invited to comment. He would generally favor a national search for Provost, but in this case an internal search seemed reasonable. He stated that his preference in the resulting provost search was for an open search process for final candidates; however, the search committee indicated that a number of candidates were uncomfortable with this policy for a search limited to internal candidates. Young voiced his understanding of this discomfort and indicated he was concerned about robustness of the candidate pool. He believed that foregoing the open announcement of final candidate names was a search committee recommendation. He acknowledged that he could have made the decision to limit the pool to those available for an open search. He also believed that the search committee had based their recommendations on extensive information about candidates. However, the president indicated that the Senate Executive Committee’s discussion and recommendation for a more open process was a powerful, and good, one. He indicated he would, in the future, consider the wishes of the Senate although an open process may result in a smaller and less strong set of candidates. However he indicated that the faculty will be here longer than he will and their wishes were important. He also indicated that his inquiry about past searches revealed that the tradition was not as the faculty imagine it to be, particularly when the candidates were entirely internal to the UW. He acknowledged that a second benefit of an open process may be the learning that takes place between the candidate(s) and the faculty; such interaction advances the candidate’s learning curve, benefits the University, and promotes the candidate’s ability to serve the University better.

President Young was asked if he would commit to an open process for upcoming searches, such as that for a new dean of the College of Arts and Sciences or other units. He responded that he generally favors open searches but was, in this instance, following the provost search committee’s recommendation. He observed that an open search can weaken the position and limit the effectiveness of a University leader if that person is continually a candidate for other positions. It was suggested to the president that if it was clear from the outset of a search that the final stage of process was open, then candidates would enter the search with this expectation. Young again reiterated that his decision with regard to the provost search was based on the recommendation of the search committee; although he emphasized that the final decision was his.

An amendment to the resolution, to change the word in the final sentence from “expectation” to “preference” was proposed. When the question was called it failed to achieve a 2/3 majority; debate on the amendment continued. The argument was presented that the resolution does not bind the action of the president, but that the stronger word, “expectation,” represents the sentiment feeling of the senate. When the amendment to the resolution was voted on, it failed.

Another amendment to the original resolution, to remove the second statement, was made and seconded. The rationale for the amendment was that the accuracy of the statement could not be verified. It was also argued that a closed search did not imply that shared governance had been violated. The question was called and the resolution, shown below as amended, passed by a large majority.

“WHEREAS, the recent search for Provost did not provide the tri-campus community with an opportunity to learn of the names of the finalists for the position nor to meet the finalists publicly before a ‘preferred candidate’ was identified; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate expresses its clear expectation that future searches for academic administrators will again include open public forums with finalists as a means of gathering broad faculty input before a decision is made.”

10. Good of the Order.
Professor Giebel commented on his prior request for data on recent retention offers and asked SCPB Chair, Gail Stygall, if retention data scheduled to be presented to SCPB on December 5 would be made immediately public. He described his recent meeting with Senate officers and Interim Provost Wadden on the matter where he understood that retention raises may not be “rare” and the majority are preemptive. He believes these retention raises may be a violation of EO64 and believes there is an abuse of the intent of the salary policy. He urged his fellow senators to “be alert” and await further information.
Senate Chair Astley encouraged all senators to familiarize themselves with history of salary policy (linked on agenda for this meeting and on Senate website). She commented that her recent meetings with Interim Provost Wadden and President Young indicated their interest in forming a joint administrative-faculty committee to relook at the salary policy. Senator Philipsen spoke to the importance of the salary policy to manage problems of compression and to provide continuously meritorious faculty with regular salary increases.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:28pm

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: Susan Astley, Chair of the Faculty Senate
Update on Class C Resolution “Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy”.

- A substitute Class C Resolution on “Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy” was introduced by Senator Giebel. Discussion ensued with members voicing both support and concern for the Resolution. Following discussion, a motion was approved to refer the Resolution to a committee. Committee members would be named by the Senate Chair and would include Professor Giebel. The committee’s charge was to bring a revised motion for action to the December 1, 2011 Senate meeting.
  - A committee of 7 Faculty Senators was established. Members include: Zoe Barsness, Chair, UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly; Christoph Giebel, Arts and Sciences; Mícheál Vaughan, Arts and Sciences; Kurt Johnson, Medicine; Helen Anderson, Law; and Lynne Manzo, Built Environments.

Online Learning at the UW.

- Faculty, students, and the Regents have expressed both interest and concern (eg., quality of instruction, faculty time, class size, cost, etc) regarding the substantial growth of online learning in higher education.
- A “Report to the UW Regents on Online Learning” was presented to the regents in February 2010 summarizing the current status and future of online learning at the UW (Exhibit E, November 2011 SEC minutes).
- In February, 2011, UW Today and the Seattle PI posted articles regarding UW’s initiative to double online enrollments.
- The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (chaired by Jan Carline) sent a brief report to Interim Provost Lidstrom in May, 2011 summarizing their year-long evidence-based review of the strengths and limitations of online learning. Their review (Exhibit D, November 2011 SEC minutes) was based on 34 peer-reviewed publications. Professor Carline shared the FCTL report with the SEC on November 14, 2011. Professor Carline will present the FCTL report to the Senate today.

UW Provost Search Update

- A UW Provost Search Advisory Committee was established in August, 2011 to identify and recommend internal candidates for the position. Members of the search advisory committee are posted on the Provost Search website. Eight of the 16 members are faculty, including the Chair of the Faculty Senate (12/16 are faculty when including Deans). The goal was to have a Provost named by January, 2012.
- The committee conducted a University-wide catalyst survey and held 15 public meetings across the three campuses to hear from faculty, staff, and students on the qualities they hoped to see in our new provost. Nominees were forwarded to the search committee via email and the Catalyst survey. All of those nominated who qualified (e.g., UW faculty from any of the three campuses) were given the opportunity to move forward in the process; most nominees did not want to proceed. The committee conducted extensive reviews of all candidates and conducted lengthy interviews with a subset. The field was narrowed and advice on how to assess candidates was shared with the President the week of November 7.
- One of the 15 public meetings conducted by the Search Committee included a brief presentation to the SEC at their October 10, 2011 meeting (Oct 10 SEC minutes). A Search Committee member discussed the status of and process for the Provost search. The goal was to narrow a list of candidates by the end of October 2011 with the hopes of naming a new Provost in January 2012. The SEC was informed the president was interested in having an open campus process for final candidates. At the November 14 SEC meeting, President Young informed the committee he would soon announce a new provost and that, contrary to expectations, the faculty and campus community would not have an opportunity to meet the finalists nor even learn their names before he makes his decision. The President explained that he had changed his mind. He said that he initially favored an open search, but that four out of the five finalists would not go forward if their names had to be made public. Senate Vice-Chair James Gregory posted a blog on the Senate website the following day (November 15) to alert University members of this surprise development, with the hopes the President might reconsider opening the final stage of the search. The President received an outpouring of messages from the faculty expressing the importance of an open process.
On November 17, 2011, President Young announced Dr. Ana Mari Cauce as his preferred candidate for UW Provost. As the penultimate step in the selection process, President Young agreed to set up opportunities for members of the University community to hear Dr. Cauce discuss her plans as our chief academic officer, to ask questions, and to share with him any feedback University members would like him to consider. This public process would take place prior to any formal confirmation of the appointment.

A few hours later on November 17, 2011, Senate Chair Susan Astley invited the Senate leadership (SCPB, SEC and Faculty Council Chairs) to meet with Dr. Cauce on November 21. Dr. Astley also sent an email to all senators and faculty encouraging them to attend the University-wide meeting with Dr. Cauce scheduled for November 28.
Senate Revision Cleanup Faculty Code Changes


Rationale:

Two election cycles have passed since the Faculty Code was revised to restructure the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee. This experience has indicated a need for two minor revisions to the code.

The current Code provides for special election to the Senate when a senator vacates office. This is perhaps too restrictive, as the case where the office goes unfilled due to, for example, failure of a college elected faculty council to hold elections is not clearly covered. Section 22-48 is therefore revised to permit special elections any time an elected senate position is vacant.

The current code provides for nomination of Faculty Council chairs to sit on the Senate Executive Committee but not for their election by the Senate! This oversight is corrected in Section 22-63.C.

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs also considered whether Senators should have alternates, and decided that on balance this was not needed. FCFA reviewed the current experience with nomination and election of senators, and nomination and election of SEC members, and found no need for additional changes.

Revised Code:

Section 22-63.C

C. At a regular Senate meeting prior to the end of the academic year, the Chair of the Senate, with the approval of the Executive Committee, shall publish in the agenda for that meeting the name of at least one eligible nominee for each at-large elected Executive Committee position. Additional nominations may be made from the floor. An electronic vote will follow within one week of that meeting. The nominee receiving the highest number of votes for a position is elected. In the event of a tie, any untied nominees are eliminated and electronic ballots shall be cast again.

Section 22-48

Section 22-48 Vacancies in the Senate

If an elected senator vacates a Senate position prior to the last regular Senate meeting of the term to which the senator was elected becomes vacant, the elected faculty council of the position’s school, college, or campus may conduct a special election to fill the remainder of the term for that position. The election shall conform to the principles in Section 22-47, Subsection C.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. Several Faculty Councils and committees are seeking additional members. These include the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, the Faculty Council on Facilities and Services, the Conciliation Board, and the Adjudication Panel. If you are interested in serving on a Council or in recommending a colleague for service, please contact the Secretary of the Faculty. The list of current council members, along with meeting minutes and schedules can be found on our website at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html.

2. At the request of the elected chairs of Schools/Colleges/ Campuses the Secretary of the Faculty is compiling unit-level procedures related to promotion and tenure; when received a summary of practices will be compiled and shared.

3. Nominations are currently being received for candidates for Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate for a term beginning in 2012. To make a nomination, contact Alex Bolton at bolt@uw.edu by December 2, 2011.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Gail Stygall, Professor, English

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting has completed its review of the Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) Final Report. The Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting provided the committee with both the Final Report sent to President Young and the supporting spreadsheets. SCPB developed a list of questions for the Interim Provost and the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting during its faculty-only (and students) meeting on October 24. The Interim Provost and the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting responded to those questions at the following meeting on October 31. Concerns from committee members included the reconstitution of the University Budget Committee (UBC) and the undifferentiated nature of the ABB tax and the supplement. SCPB was pleased with the transparency of the tuition distributions. The Interim Provost and the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting indicated that when UBC was reconstituted that the administrative handbook would include specifications for the Senate Chair (already a member), the SCPB Chair, and another member of SCPB. We were told to expect other specifications for other groups. On the issue of the undifferentiated nature of the supplement, we agreed that ABB was a work in progress and more discussion of this would be deferred to the future. SCPB will conduct another review of the IT recharge fees during this academic year.

On November 7, SCPB discussed last year’s SCPB proposals and principles for budgeting to the Provost and described and discussed possible changes. SCPB Chair Gail Stygall will bring a new draft to the next meeting for discussion. At the next meeting, we will also begin discussing tuition alternatives for the future.
Governor Gregoire has released her proposed supplemental budget for the current, 2011-2013, biennium. The information that has been provided to stakeholders is available at http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget12/highlights/master_packet.pdf

Her proposed budget reflects her obligation, and that of the State Legislature, to pass a budget that is balanced assuming biennial revenue as predicted by the state’s Economic and Revenue Forecast Council at their most recent quarterly meeting. Using rounded numbers, the current revenue forecast expects revenue of about $30.2 billion but the budget enacted during last winter’s legislative session spends about $31.7 billion. The governor’s proposed supplemental budget cuts about $1.7 billion.

In addition to the supplemental budget she has submitted a request for legislation that put to the voters in the state a referendum for a temporary increase in the state sales tax by an amount equivalent to ½ cent per dollar (the current state sales tax is 6.5 percent). If this tax increase is enacted the proceeds will be used to reduce the cuts in education by $411 million, the cuts to long-term care and developmental disability services by $42 million and the cuts to public safety by 41 million.

In summary, the “sort of, but not really, bottom line” for University of Washington is proposed cuts to the 2011-2013 operating appropriation of 17% if the sales tax proposal is NOT passed by the legislature and the voters. The higher education “highlights” as described in the governor’s documents are as follows:

Higher Education

Reductions
Reduce state support to colleges and universities - $160.1 million *
Cuts support to the six public colleges and universities, and 34 community and technical colleges in the second year of the biennium. Support is reduced by: 17 percent at the University of Washington, Washington State University and Western Washington University; 16 percent at Eastern Washington University, Central Washington University and The Evergreen State College; and 13 percent at the community and technical colleges.

Suspend State Work Study program - $8.1 million
Cuts state aid to 7,600 students at public and private colleges and universities beginning fall term 2012. Federally funded Work Study is not affected.

New Investment
Graduate more engineering students - $7.6 million
Supports the high-cost portion of the enrollment of additional engineering students at the University of Washington and Washington State University to meet industry demands. Capacity will be expanded at the universities to graduate 775 more engineering students.

* Indicates cuts the Governor proposes to prevent with new revenue.

Links to analyses of the governor’s budget proposal will be posted on the Faculty Senate blog as they become available. In addition, the UW’s Office of the Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting prepares and posts briefs that provide excellent analyses of significant proposals that could affect the University’s budget and can be found at http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/.
Dear Dr. Wise,

Members of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning recognize that the movement towards provision of more courses on-line is an important step to bringing the university’s programs in line with student preferences and needs. Students like on-line content and the ability to review lectures and notes, and are increasingly sophisticated in their use of electronic tools and expectations for their use in teaching and learning. The demands of family, work and other aspects of modern society limit the ability of many students to spend extended amounts of time on campus. Developing additional methods to meet students’ learning needs in alternative locations and times is appropriate tasks for the modern university and faculty. Movement towards on-line education may also be seen as a means to increase class enrollment without expansion of current resources. Members of the Council are concerned about the implications of these changes in course delivery for educational quality, faculty time and costs.

During this past year, the Council has held several discussions about this issue, and attempted to seek evidence about the use of on-line education around issues of quality of instruction, faculty time, class size and cost. This letter summarizes our discussions and concerns.

First, the Council recognizes that on-line learning can mean many different things, from fully on-line asynchronous learning where students can complete all course requirements on their own schedules to fully interactive synchronous learning that replicates the classroom in many locations. The choice of specific on-line methods for a course will depend both on the content and objectives of the course.

Educational quality

- There is no conclusive evidence that on-line education per se is better or worse than traditional methods of college learning. Some studies show increases in learning, particularly in declarative content. Other studies indicate that on-line activities used to augment more traditional learning can be effective and increase retention.
- As on-line tools have gotten more advanced, instructors now can provide interactions and experiences that previously were not available in the on-line format. The quality of the tool, the ability of the instructor to use the tool, and the appropriateness of the tools in meeting the needs of the students will determine its success.
- Maintaining actual and perceived quality in education requires interaction between faculty and students. Student satisfaction with on-line courses is related to the degree of perceived interaction with instructors.
- Methods that blend on-line learning with interactive learning result in better outcomes than totally asynchronous, independent methods.
- Other aspects of education, building community and collaboration within the class, are made more difficult as more is put online. It’s important to consider not just learning outcomes but also the educational experience, interaction, and campus community.

References: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 31

Faculty effort

- Time needed for development of on-line courses can be significant.
- Continuing maintenance of course content after initial implementation may also require significant faculty time.
Some studies have found that on-line courses require more time spent by faculty per student than in more traditional class formats, particularly activities requiring writing and on-line discussions.

Reductions in time commitment for faculty may be found in totally free-standing courses that do not include online interactions.

Moving towards a model of a community of learners, where the members of the class provide comment and direction to peers may reduce the level of faculty direction, and consequently time per student, in a course. This may be more appropriate for graduate study than undergraduate courses.

References 2, 12, 22, 23, 32, 33

Class size

The additional demands for interaction between students and instructors in teacher moderated on-line courses reduces the ideal class size compared with more traditional formats of teaching.

Larger class sizes may be possible if adjunct faculty and staff are used to moderate and provide most individual interaction with students in place of regular faculty.

Students may be sensitive to the substitution of less qualified instructors for regular faculty, and may become even more sensitive as planned tuition increases are imposed.

References 16, 17, 21, 28, 29, 33, 34

Costs of on-line education

Moving to on-line education takes time and effort. Development time must be taken into account, including time spent with the initial development of on-line course materials, ongoing maintenance or those materials, and adoption of new technologies.

All faculty members are not native users of on-line technology in teaching, and must be trained and supported in the use of these tools in order for quality of instruction to be maintained.

On-line education methods have increased the numbers of students enrolled in a class at other institutions with significant cost savings. These savings are realized primarily from the use of adjunct personnel to handle most day-to-day interactions with students. In this mode, costs are shifted to less expensive personnel without any claimed reduction in quality of instruction.

References 2, 16, 28, 29, 33, 34

Movement of appropriate instruction to on-line delivery is an important task for consideration by the university if it is to keep pace with student interests and competition within the environment of higher education. At the same time, we need to be aware that any good class, whether in person or online, will be more than simply a delivery system. We must continue to emphasize the worth of interactivity and engagement between students, faculty, and course content. There are many options for on-line learning, but our focus needs to be on the appropriate technology and setting in which students will best reach the learning goals of our programs.

We believe the move to increased on-line education is not an option, based on the interests and needs of our students, the rapid and continued maturation of educational technologies, and the growing body of literature that supports the strategic use of these technologies to enhance traditional educational practices. The University should attempt to become leader in quality education using these modalities while realizing that on-line education alone will probably not result in increased enrollment in our programs for less cost. Faculty will need support in mastery of on-line technology, the development of curriculum, and the maintenance of these programs. While adjunct staff may support or extend the work of faculty in on-line instruction, the teaching faculty of the university remain a major asset to its programs.

Consequently, members of the council request that the following actions be considered;

- The information we have reported in this letter be made available for future discussions of these issues with the Board of Regents, Board of Deans, and other administrative groups considering these issues. We also request that members of the Council be included in these discussions.
- Adequate technologic infrastructure to support on-line learning needs to be developed and implemented to insure the success of any educational offering.
- Support for the development of skills in use of technology and adaption of pedagogic methods to on-line learning should be provided to faculty.
- Any shift in educational responsibility from teaching faculty to temporary, adjunct, or lower paid instructors in implementation of on-line teaching should be monitored carefully for effects
educational quality, learning outcomes for those courses, as well as indirect effects on more traditional programs.

- Faculty compensation for new teaching responsibilities in on-line educational efforts, including development of materials and courses and the supervision of adjunct staff must be developed and implemented.
- Methods to recognize the scholarly contribution of faculty in these efforts must be developed and included in decisions about merit and promotion.
- Courses chosen for on-line education need to be chosen judiciously, with decisions based on the appropriateness of goals and objectives of the course for use of on-line technology.

Yours,

Jan D Carline, Professor
Chair, Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

CC:  JW Harrington, Chair of the Faculty Senate
     Susan Astley, Vice Chair of the Senate
     Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
     Kelly Trosvig, Interim Vice President and Vice Provost, UW Information Technology
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INTRODUCTION

Online learning has become a ubiquitous part of any discussion about the future of higher education. Provost Wise convened this working group to summarize the key issues surrounding online learning at the University of Washington. To do so, we have reviewed the extensive national literature on online learning; talked with leaders in the private sector and peer universities; and met with faculty and student leadership, through key Faculty Senate Councils (representing all three UW campuses) and ASUW.

What is online learning?

Online learning is a way of delivering most of the course content and instruction of a class using the Web. Though onsite, face-to-face classes at the UW and other institutions use educational technologies to enhance their classroom instruction, online learning courses are taught almost entirely online, and students seldom meet face-to-face with their instructors or their fellow students. Online learning includes a wide range of pedagogical techniques: websites and discussion boards; assigned readings accessible to students through the UW libraries’ electronic reserve system; audio or video recordings of class sessions that students can view and/or download; course management systems that accept and immediately grade student assignments submitted electronically; and, at times, virtual worlds in which students take on identities as avatars and interact with their classmates digitally.

Online learning in its various forms has been steadily increasing. Over twenty-five percent of all U.S. higher education students were taking at least one online course in the fall of 2008. Despite the recession, demand for online classes has grown, not decreased; according to the forthcoming Sloan Consortium report, online learning growth continues to outpace overall growth in higher education.

This growth, however, has not been evenly distributed across the higher education landscape. Community colleges have consistently produced a disproportionate share of online enrollments; over half of all online students are currently enrolled by institutions offering associate degrees. Moreover, while public institutions have increased their online offerings in recent years, there has been an even more significant
increase in attendance at for-profit online higher educational institutions. According to new research from the consulting firm Eduventures, for-profits' share of the online sector rose from 39 percent in 2008 to 42 percent in 2009, as the recession drove students back to college and severe budget cuts strained public universities.

Much attention has been paid to "open courseware" efforts from institutions such as MIT (through its OpenCourseWare project) and Carnegie Mellon (through its Open Learning Initiative). The Obama administration, numerous foundations (including the Hewlett, McDonnell, Mellon and Gates Foundations) and the National Science Foundation have all committed significant funding to open courseware initiatives. Indeed, the University of Washington was an early contributor to the open courseware movement; UWEO open courseware includes 13 free courses ranging from *Fluency with Information Technology* to *The American Civil War*.

Notably, however, neither MIT nor Carnegie Mellon offers an online degree program. MIT provides access to its syllabi and course materials, and CMU has developed eleven online courses, which are aimed at students who do not have access to high-quality instruction in these subjects at their home institutions. On the whole, open courseware expands the pool of resources available to instructors, but benefits primarily those institutions that could not otherwise develop such materials.

Fully online degree programs, which may integrate open courseware into its classes to enhance them, tend to succeed with very self-motivated, mature learners, and national growth has generally followed this pattern. Many public and for-profit institutions have successfully launched online degrees, especially master-level degrees, to working adults.

Such online programs and courses may expand access to students not otherwise able to enroll in residential programs, providing time flexibility for students with work and family responsibilities. They lessen the constraints on physical space and somewhat ameliorate the classroom shortage. Totally online courses provide a "green" alternative to driving to class, and may help institutions reach a more diverse population of students.
Online education may also appeal to a new generation of students who have familiarity with technology and offers a learning environment that can be accessed repeatedly rather than once in a live context.

**ONLINE LEARNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON**

Given these benefits, the University of Washington, through UW Educational Outreach (UWEO), has been a national leader in online learning, with 11 degree programs, 31 certificate programs, and more than 12,000 students in 2008. UWEO has been an early adopter of several technological innovations over the past twenty years, with design and technology platforms paralleling many of the most significant trends seen during this period. Today's UW online learning uses Web conferencing, voice-over PowerPoint presentations, Virtual Worlds, UWEO's current learning platform, the fully integrated open-source learning management system known as “Moodle” that integrates blogs and wikis, and various types of social media applications such as Twitter and Facebook.

UW has also taken a leadership role in a number of institutional and corporate partnerships (see Table 1) dealing with online learning. Partnerships encourage sharing of online resources and benchmarks (streamed videos, syllabi, course readers, course resources, best practices, etc.) in a consortial effort, help expand the market for online learning among the collaborators and mitigate risk by spreading the sometimes very expensive costs of program development among a number of institutions. With its partners, the UW has created the first joint online certificate programs in the country.
Table 1. University of Washington online partnerships and initiatives.

- **R1edu.** In 1999, the UW started and continues to manage R1edu, a collaboration between 34 major AAU Research Institutions who offer online learning programs. (See attached for list of members.) Initiatives include:
  - Short Courses on the Environment (UW/Wisconsin/Rutgers)
  - R1edu Award
  - Course Search

- **Actions, Solutions and Growth (ASG).** In 2005, the UW helped start ASG, a consortium of large prestigious public and for-profit institutions pursuing a variety of partnerships, especially with online learning. (See attached for list of members.) Initiatives include:
  - Biotechnology Project Management (UW/UCSD)
  - Decision making for Climate Change (UW/UBC/UCI/Northwestern)
  - Certificate Program in Web Intelligence (UBC and UC-Irvine)
  - Sustainability Institute (UW/UBC)

- **Prentice-Hall.** The UW has partnered with Pearson/Prentice Hall, the largest publisher in the world, on several online initiatives, including:
  - LAAP Grant ($1.5M) dealing with Web-based curricula
  - iPhone Applications Certificate

- **Other Project Partners:**
  - Department of Labor ($1.5M grant)  Apex
  - Boeing  Heritage University
  - Chulalongkorn University  Sloan Foundation
  - WUN

However, the University of Washington has not developed online versions of most of its courses for its matriculated undergraduate students. As a highly-ranked public research university with particularly heavy investments in high-cost instructional areas such as laboratory sciences, engineering, and medicine, as well as a commitment to growing the residential infrastructure with new dormitories and student union, UW attracts a more residential student population than that of most online degree programs. UW undergraduates are traditionally-aged (18-24), unlike the older, career-oriented, often fully employed students who drive online learning growth. In contrast, Capella University, a large online-only institution, refuses to admit students under 24 years of age to its courses, because in its view, students must be mature to be successful. Many of the community colleges who offer online learning also cater to a more mature population of working students.

For the future, the University of Washington will likely expand its number of online learning classes to supplement, but not replace, the existing onsite classes. These online courses will enable students to have more
flexible scheduling options and address the growing classroom shortage on campus. It will also cater to the UW students who can learn more effectively online and will attract at least a few UW students who could not otherwise attend the University of Washington because they find it hard to juggle family and work responsibilities. In an experiment with seven undergraduate online courses in Autumn, both the students and faculty involved expressed interest in expanded online UW offerings to add to their largely onsite degree programs (though students also express a desire to limit the number of such courses they take over the course of their career at UW).

These online classes and others will add capacity to the UW, which will continue to maximize its physical classroom facilities with onsite courses and offer hands-on courses that cannot be easily transformed into online classes. Given the projected student population at the University of Washington, now in discussion for the 2Y2D (Two Years, Two Decades) UW strategic plan, the majority of onsite courses, some of them already enhanced by different technologies, will be supplemented by these new online offerings.

The costs of online learning

Surprisingly, no one has done an analysis about the relative costs of online learning versus onsite education in a nonprofit institution. Advocates have naively expected faculty to teach thousands of students as a cost-savings measure, and detractors have cited the million-dollar-a-course development costs of a few high-end online learning projects. Such broad arguments, however, do not help evaluate online learning at UW.

Rather than quote either detractors or supporters of online learning, the UW recently developed a comparative budget about the relative costs of an online versus onsite class, which represents the first comparative cost analysis between onsite and online courses at a nonprofit institution, comparing costs and revenues for a typical state-funded class at the University of Washington with identical enrollment, tuition, and faculty teaching costs for each format. In the end, the costs of the online learning course were slightly higher. Though it had no classroom costs, the online class had higher course development, technology and staff
expenses than the onsite class. The UW has somewhat equalized the cost of online and onsite courses through the partnership model, mentioned above. A detailed budget follows at the end of this report.

THE FUTURE OF ONLINE LEARNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

We expect that UWEO will continue to lead in the development of innovative programs for its target audiences. We need to find the best combination of online and face-to-face learning for traditional, matriculated undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Washington.

Our goal will be to attain maximum pedagogical effectiveness at the lowest possible cost. We have to find the optimum balancing point between cost and instructional effectiveness for the University of Washington at this moment in its history. Striking this balance is not a new challenge. It is an ongoing one, requiring constant readjustment as budgets expand or shrink, our student body changes, and educational technology evolves. The current moment, however, is a particularly dramatic one.

How we strike this balance will depend very much on the strategic decisions we make, beginning with the "Two Years to Two Decades" (2Y2D) conversations now underway. The larger questions raised in connection with these discussions will define the kind of university we want to be and the kind of students we want to teach and graduate. In fact, the topic of online learning emerged independently in multiple focus group sessions of the 2Y2D group on teaching and learning. The cost analysis clarifies the financial impact of online learning. Though we may want to expand our online offerings, lower cost should not be the central reason. We should teach online because it represents the best learning platform for our students.

It is clear that online learning has a role in the future of the University. We see a multi-tiered strategy for online learning at the University of Washington. We expect some increase in the number of fully online courses for matriculated students. The College of Arts and Sciences, for example, has already invested in the development of several such courses. We will also focus on the growth of hybrid courses, which combine face-to-face instruction with Web-based tools and resources. Finally, we expect an evolution of online learning from the text-based descendents of correspondence courses to new customized forms of learning appropriate to our
core mission at UW – in the words of one faculty member, to shape “what teaching and learning will look like 20 years from now” and to be the leader for the “integration of technology in teaching.”
# APPENDIX: COST COMPARISON, ONLINE VS. ONSITE COURSE MODELS

Analysis and notes by David Szatmary, Vice Provost for Educational Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
<th>ONSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree or Certificate program</td>
<td>300-level class</td>
<td>300-level class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Student Headcount</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident students</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budgeted course enrollments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Credits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses budgeted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gross Revenue | 45,948 | 45,948 |
| Licensing Fee | 0 | 0 |

## TOTAL REVENUE & CONTRA REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
<th>ONSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty - Instruction</td>
<td>21,702</td>
<td>21,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty- Course Development</td>
<td>3,883</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Faculty - Course Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant - Course Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer for Course Development</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologist for Troubleshooting Technical Issues</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Trainer</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL SALARY EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
<th>ONSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Facilities Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Instructional Office Costs per Class</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Office Space Per Class</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Instructional Costs for Office</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs for Office</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office software for faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office software for staff</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Travel - Annual Allocation</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Management System</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server time for LMS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology for delivery</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>2,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Technology Charge for faculty</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Technology Recharge Rate for staff</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Library Needs</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Library Resources</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Proctors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>3,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Overhead</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>2,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NON-SALARY EXPENSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,546</td>
<td>15,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL GAIN/LOSS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>7,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. Assume that the class will be state-funded.
2. Assume that the class will be state-funded.
3. Represents the average class size for undergraduate courses at the UW - 35.5 students per class.
4. Assume that all students will take approximately a full load of classes, and tuition will be distributed equally among all classes. I also assume that 80% of the students will be residents and 20% will be nonresidents. Special mandatory fees have not been included in this calculation (e.g. student & activities fee, IMA fee and the building fee). I have used only operating fee revenue (2010-11) for these calculations.
5. Assume that all students will take approximately a full load of classes, and tuition will be distributed equally among all classes. I also assume that 80% of the students will be residents and 20% will be nonresidents. Special mandatory fees have not been included in this calculation (e.g. student & activities fee, IMA fee and the building fee). I have used only operating fee revenue (2010-11) for these calculations.
6. Some online classes generate license fees but most do not, so I have not included any revenues here.
7. Assume that a faculty member making $70K plus benefits will teach this course as part of a total teaching load of 4 classes per year. Obviously, this workload and salary will vary with the individual faculty member.
8. Generally, for the development of an online class, we have paid faculty one month's salary in additional pay. Also we assume that a faculty member will have to revise the class minimally during the next two years at $1000/year. We have finally assumed that this class will be taught once a year in the three-year period. We pay faculty for the development of these courses (unlike onsite courses in some cases) because the final class results in a product that has more identifiable intellectual property implications and could be licensed.
9. For an onsite class, some faculty may receive release time to develop classes. In many cases, faculty do not receive additional time or money to develop a new class for an onsite offering. In this case, we assume that a faculty member receives the equivalent of one month salary to develop a course. Faculty almost never receive additional release time to offer minor refinements to a course. As a result, I have conservatively estimated that the faculty development costs would be amortized over ten years with the class being offered once a year during this time period.
10. Assume that an instructional designer will help with the user-centered design and provide suggestions for course formats, exit requirements, interactivity tools, etc. The initial development will cost $14K and minor revisions will be made for $5K in each of the next two years. The total cost has been amortized over 3 years. In some cases, the course will need major revision sooner, especially in technical areas, and in other cases the course may last up to 5 years without a major revision. These salary figures include the cost of benefits. Assume that the class will be taught once a year.
11. Assume that a base level technologist at $60K/yr. will troubleshoot problems with the courses. Also, assume that each technologist can handle roughly 100 classes per year.
12. I have assumed that the program administration costs for these classes would include a mix of professional and classified staff. One FTE would cost approximately $60,000/year and could handle 70 classes.
I have assumed that the program administration costs for these classes would include a mix of professional and classified staff. One FTE would cost approximately $60,000/year and could handle 70 classes.

Online classes need a learning management system to be operated effectively and efficiently. Some of these systems cost a significant amount of money (e.g. Blackboard) while others operate as open source (e.g. Moodle) but require integration into the other administrative systems such as a student database. I have assumed that the UW would use an open source solution such as Moodle. This cost represents the trainer who will work with faculty to train them on the LMS systems. I have assumed that this trainer could work with 100 faculty per year and would make $60K plus benefits per year.

Based upon the rental costs for instructional space in downtown Seattle. This represents the cost for one room per quarter at full usage (8 a.m. to 10 p.m.), obviously a conservative number. With lower room utilization, the cost would increase. This number includes utilities.

On an annual basis, the cost of a cubicle for professional staff in UW Tower would be approximately $4,411. I have divided this number by the number of classes taught by a faculty member.

On an annual basis, the cost of a cubicle for professional staff in UW Tower would be approximately $4,411. I have divided this number by the number of classes taught by a faculty member.

This line includes office space for the program administrator, the instructional designer, the trainer and the technologist, assuming that the technologist deals with 100 classes, the program administrator deals with 70 classes, the train with 100 classes and the instructional designer deals with 10 courses annually.

This line includes office space for the program administrator.

It generally costs $3,726 to outfit an average faculty office, not including research start-up. We assume that the furniture, computer, file cabinets and other materials will last a total of 5 years and have amortized these costs across the number of courses taught during this time period.

It generally costs $3,726 to outfit an average faculty office, not including research start-up. We assume that the furniture, computer, file cabinets and other materials will last a total of 5 years and have amortized these costs across the number of courses taught during this time period.

It costs approximately the same ($3,726) to outfit a staff office as it does for a faculty office. I have amortized these costs over 5 years and over the number of activities that the instructional designer, the trainer, the technologist and the program administrator perform during this time period.

It costs approximately the same ($3,726) to outfit a staff office as it does for a faculty office. I have amortized these costs over 5 years and over the number of activities that the instructional designer, the trainer, the technologist and the program administrator perform during this time period.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of faculty and then divided by the number of courses offered annually.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of faculty and then divided by the number of courses offered annually.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of staff (program administrator, trainer instructional designer and technologist) and then divided by the number of activities performed annually.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of staff (program administrator) and then divided by the number of activities performed annually.

Assume that the average faculty member receives $1,000 in travel annually divided by the number of courses taught (4).

Assume that the average faculty member receives $1,000 in travel annually divided by the number of courses taught (4).

Though the online class can more efficiently distribute printed material (i.e. no xeroxes) and show videos online, it still needs to secure copyright clearance for at least some of its material. Other materials may be free due to their open source nature.

I have assumed that a faculty member will spend about $200 per course on such materials as xeroxes, films and other instructional aids. This includes copyright clearance.

Online classes need a learning management system to be operated effectively and efficiently. Some of these systems cost a significant amount of money (e.g. Blackboard) while others operate as open source (e.g. Moodle) but require integration into the other administrative systems such as a student database. I have assumed that the UW would use an open source solution such as Moodle. The costs represent an amortized expense of integration and then the ongoing technology costs of support.
33 This costs represents the per course cost of hosting a class on the server of a cost-effective vendor such as Moodle Rooms. It costs approximately $1.67 per student for this hosting, though the number decreases with an economy of scale.
34 This cost will vary widely by the type of technology that a faculty member chooses. For example, the faculty member may choose a print format with some minimal animations, which would incur little additional cost. Likewise, the use of open-source resources also would cost little more. However, if the faculty member chooses to videotape and then stream his/her own class or use Virtual Worlds (e.g. Second Life), the costs could be considerable. For example, the costs of an island and the build-out of that island in Second Life would have to be amortized over a specific number of courses, and the more courses in this format, the lower the cost until another island would be needed. For the purposes of this budget, I have been very conservative and estimated $1,000 per course for the cost of additional technology.
35 I have taken the total number of faculty headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of courses that faculty teach each year (4). Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.
36 I have taken the total number of faculty headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of courses that faculty teach each year (4). Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.
37 I have taken the total number of staff (4) headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of activities that each staff performs annually. Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.
38 I have taken the total number of staff (4) headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of activities that each staff performs annually. Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.
39 Online classes many times have special library needs because students cannot come physically to the library. At the UW we have a dedicated position in the library for all online classes that helps instructors and students identify and establish electronic material resources.
40 I have taken the total library costs for materials and staff and divided by the total number of headcount students and assumed that a student takes 6.93 classes per year (if we have 47,361 students and approximately 36,438 student FTE).
41 I have taken the total library costs for materials and staff and divided by the total number of headcount students and assumed that a student takes 6.93 classes per year (if we have 47,361 students and approximately 36,438 student FTE).
42 At this point, we do not have an inexpensive solution for exam verification. We only have such items as retinal verification, etc. As a result, we ask students to go to a pre-assigned physical site for identity verification for exams. Though the sites generally participate for free, we need an exam proctor coordinator who establishes and verifies sites and sometimes sends exams. This half-time employee can deal with approximately 700 classes per year.
43 Generally, the UW attributes 7.5% of total tuition revenues to student financial aid.
44 Generally, the UW attributes 7.5% of total tuition revenues to student financial aid.
45 This overhead represents general costs that cannot be easily applied to specific activities in an activities-based budgeting model. Such costs may include the President's and Provost's office, the human resources office, general administrative systems, emergency management, disability services, the office of planning and budgeting, the attorney general's office, etc. These costs would apply to both online and onsite classes.
46 This overhead represents general costs that cannot be easily applied to specific activities in an activities-based budgeting model. Such costs may include the President's and Provost's office, the human resources office, general administrative systems, emergency management, disability services, the office of planning and budgeting, the attorney general's office, etc. These costs would apply to both online and onsite classes.
UW Online Learning: Degrees, Certificates, Courses

**Distance learning degrees:** 11

- Master in Construction Engineering
- Master in Aeronautics & Astronautics Engineering
- Master in Aerospace Engineering
- Master in Mechanical Engineering
- Master of Nursing, Master of Science (from the UW School of Nursing)
- Extended Master in Public Health
- Extended Master of Clinical Health Services (from the MEDEX Northwest Physician Assistant Program)
- Master in Strategic Planning for Critical Infrastructures
- Master of Library and Information Science (dMLIS)
- Master in Applied Mathematics
- Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (BSEE) – UW Bothell

**Distance learning certificate programs:** 31

- Addiction and the Brain – on a contract basis only
- Advanced Research in Addiction and the Brain – on a contract basis only
- Biotechnology Project Management
- Brain Research in Education
- C++ Programming
- Construction Management
- Critical Infrastructures Protection
- Database Management
- Decision Making for Climate Change
- Editing
- E-Learning Design and Development
- Embedded and Real-Time Systems Programming
- Emergency Management
- Facility Management
- Geographic Information Systems
- Gerontology
- Guardianship (online + classroom combined)
- Heavy Construction Project Management
- Information Assurance & Cybersecurity
- Infrastructure Construction
- Marketing, Advanced Interactive (online + classroom combined)
- Medical Engineering: Biosensors and Biomaterials
- Oracle Applications Development (online + classroom combined)
- Paralegal Studies
- Project Management
- Psychological Trauma: Effective Treatment and Practice (online + classroom combined)
- School Library Professional
- SQL Server Specialist (Autumn-start; online + classroom combined)
- Sustainable Transportation (online)
- Urban Green Infrastructure
- Web Technology Solutions

- Distance learning undergraduate credit classes: 58 (some of these classes are listed in the Time Schedule)

- Online free courses (including mini courses): 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UW DL Enrollments</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009 (1st qtr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total UW DL</td>
<td>10865</td>
<td>9919</td>
<td>11892</td>
<td>11242</td>
<td>12369</td>
<td>2438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Member Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Conciliation Board

- Gordon Bradley, Forest Resources, College of the Environment, as a renewing member beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2014.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

- Bill Erdly, UW Bothell, as a new member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2012.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

- Carol Landis, Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems, School of Nursing, as a new member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2014.

- Alexes Harris, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

- Rachel Chapman, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

- Yoshimi Anzai, School of Medicine, as a member of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

- John Slattery, School of Medicine, as a member of the Faculty Council on Research, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.
For SUBSTITUTION at the December 1, 2011 UW Faculty Senate meeting:

Class C Resolution Concerning Repairing Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy

Prologue: This resolution is about the proper conduct of, and respect for, shared governance and the importance of a mutually agreed upon, effective and fair salary policy. Given the severity of the economic crisis, the current salary freeze is not at issue.

Whereas, in 1999-2000, after years of careful consultations and based on a broad faculty-administrative agreement consensus, a new faculty salary policy [see class A legislation at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/legislation/class_a/class_a99.pdf] was enacted in the Faculty Code [see Faculty Code 24-70 - 71 at http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#Sec2470] and through Executive Order (EO) 64 [see original EO 64 at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/eo64_original.pdf] that instituted annual minimum 2% merit increases as the highest priority in salary allocations, that ended an arbitrary salary system that had led to gross inequities over time, and in return for which the faculty agreed to a new policy of annual post-tenure peer reviews; and

Whereas, from Spring 2009 to the summer of 2010, the following events and developments occurred:


- May 3, 2010: at the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, the President and the Salary Working Group were asked for updates on negotiation their deliberations. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Chair, as a member of the Salary Working Group, indicated that deliberations were at an that there was some impasse. However, the President made no response to the invitation to update the SEC on the faculty salary policy deliberations, chose not to disclose to the SEC that an administrative initiative was afoot. [See 5/3/10 SEC meeting, points 4, 5 at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/sec_minutes/09-10/sec_050310.pdf.]

- A day later, on May 4, 2010: a year before the actual 2011-13 budget would even be known, President Emmert proposed EO 29’s extension through 2011-12. [See presidential letter and proposal of 5/4/10 at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/EO29_presltr.pdf.]

- May 20, 2010, a regular Senate meeting rejected EO 29’s extension as “unnecessary at this time” and called for later good-faith reconsideration of EO 29’s possible extension after the 2011-2013 biennial budget was better understood. [See minutes of 5/20/10 Senate meeting and full text of resolution at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/minutes/09-10/senate_052010.pdf.] Within days President Emmert later withdrew the proposed EO 29 extension.

- May 25, 2010, five days after the last regular Senate meeting of the academic year and just before the Memorial Day weekend, and despite the on-going work of the Salary Working Group, President Emmert suddenly introduced EO 64R (revised). He imposed a June 7 deadline for a Senate response, despite code provisions allowing the Senate up to 60 days, at the Senate’s discretion, for reviews of newly proposed EOs. [See presidential letter with proposal of 5/25/10 and EO 3, section 1 at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/EO64_presltr.pdf.] At one of the busiest times of the academic calendar, and over an extended weekend closure of campus business, the Senate had eight days to study the details and implications of EO 64R, consult with its faculty constituents, set up an extraordinary meeting, and come to a considered position. Compared with EO 64, EO 64R substantially weakened and undermined the existing salary policy in key provisions.
A June 3 special Senate meeting overwhelmingly voted that the Senate "sees no reason to enact a change to the faculty salary policy at this time, and strongly opposes EO 64R" while calling for continuing deliberations negotiations. [See minutes of 6/3/10 special Senate meeting and full text of resolution at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/senate_minutes/09-10/senate_060310.pdf.]

June 7, 2010: a letter by the Senate Chair and the Secretary of the Faculty to President Emmert explained the faculty's objections. [See letter at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/064_senate_response.pdf.]

June 21, 2010, i.e., a week after the end of the academic year, when the University tri-campus and the Senate could no longer be in full operation: after only minor revisions, President Emmert signed and enacted the unilaterally imposed EO 64R. [See letter at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/eo64final062110.pdf.]

June 22, 2010: in response, the Senate leadership stated it was "unfortunate that the president felt compelled to act before reaching a fuller consensus with the faculty on the need to revise the Salary Policy." [See correspondence at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues/eo64_transmittal.pdf.]

Whereas, the implementation of an executive order in the face of an explicit resolution of opposition by the Faculty Senate appears to be without precedent in the fifty-five years of shared governance at the University of Washington; and

Whereas, unilateralism of this sort has damaged shared governance and violates the spirit and long-standing practice of good-faith consultations; therefore

Be it resolved, that the Senate:

- expresses its regret that our new President must deal with fallout from actions taken by President Emmert in 2010;
- respectfully urges the new presidential administration to re-commit to long-established shared governance principles and traditions and to refrain from unilateral actions;
- reaffirms its opposition to certain provisions of the June 2010 revisions of EO 64, as revised in June 2010;
- and invites President Young to engage in good-faith consultations with the Senate to once again revise EO 64 in order to reestablish a sound and fair Faculty Salary Policy.

[also to be forwarded to the UW Board of Regents]

Submitted by:
Christoph Giebel, Faculty Senator
Arts and Sciences
October 27, 2011

Referred to Working Committee by Faculty Senate:
October 27, 2011

Submitted by Working Committee:
December 1, 2011

Approved by Faculty Senate
December 1, 2011
EO 64 and EO 64R Comparative Document

Footnote #2: Faculty Salary Policy

The fundamental purpose of the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy is to allow the University to recruit and retain the best faculty. To accomplish these two objectives, the faculty must have confidence that their continuing and productive contributions to the goals of their units and to the University's missions of teaching, research, and service will be rewarded throughout their careers. To compete for the best faculty, the University must be competitive with its peers. To retain the best faculty requires a similarly competitive approach. Therefore, the University places as one of its highest priorities rewarding faculty who perform to the highest standards and who continue to do so throughout their appointments at the University. This new policy is designed to provide for a predictable and continuing salary progression for meritorious faculty.

Salary funds must be used to attract, retain, and reward those faculty whose continuing performance is outstanding, while recognizing that disciplinary variations exist in the academic marketplace. Accordingly, the University’s Salary Policy must allow for differential allocations among units. This provides the necessary flexibility to address the market gaps that develop between UW units and their recognized peers, acknowledges existing and future differentials in unit performance and contribution, and also recognizes that differing funding sources and reward structures exist among schools and colleges. The policy must ensure that equity considerations and compression are also addressed as needed.

The University’s Salary Policy is founded upon the principle that individual salary decisions must be based on merit as assessed by a performance review conducted by faculty and administrative colleagues. Salary adjustments for performance and retention, as well as salary awards stemming from differential unit performance and marketplace gaps, are based upon a consultative process of faculty and administrative evaluation. Merit/performance evaluations are unit-based and reward the faculty for their contributions to local units as well as to the University’s goals.

This Policy is built on an expectation of meaningful deliberations between the administration and faculty. As such, the policy seeks to manifest shared governance that is at the core of the Faculty Code.

The Faculty Salary Policy is also founded on a clear understanding that the final decision on the University budget, including salaries, rests with the Board of Regents. Therefore, salary progression as envisioned in this policy, including the award of minimum equal-percentage merit salary increases for eligible faculty members, is conditioned on specific approval by the Board of Regents as part of the annual budget.

Allocation Procedure. Resources from both external and internal sources are used to fund faculty salaries. The Faculty Salary Policy anticipates new resources being made available from the Legislature, including legislative allocations for faculty salary increases and special legislative allocations for recruitment and retention, or through funds from tuition increases. Funds centrally recaptured from faculty turnover, grant, contract, and clinical funds available to individual units, and other internal resources which the Provost might identify are also used to support the plan.

Prior to the beginning of each biennium/fiscal year, the Provost will meet consult with the Board of Deans and Chancellors, the Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and the University Budget Committee to formulate a recommendation for a
salary distribution plan. After consultation with the above groups, the Provost shall, including providing an opportunity for input into the criteria to be considered in formulating the plan. If, in times of severe fiscal stress or of a declared financial emergency, the salary distribution plan to be recommended by the Provost includes a minimum equal-percentage salary increase less than a 2% regular merit increase, an explanation of the basis for the recommendation will be provided to the Board of Deans and Chancellors, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and the University Budget Committee, with an opportunity to provide comment and feedback, based on the best available information about the University's fiscal situation, before a final recommendation is forwarded. The Provost shall then make a recommendation to the President for faculty salary allocations. The President shall then make a budgetary recommendation to the Board of Regents, which will include any proposed faculty salary allocations for the biennium, and this decision shall be reported to the Faculty Senate and to the University community more broadly in fiscal year.

Allocation Categories. Consistent with the stated objectives, the first priority shall be to support regular merit and promotion awards to current faculty. Further, each biennium the minimum salaries by rank will be reviewed and, if adjusted, support will be provided to ensure those minimum levels are achieved. Other funds, as available, may be allotted among the following faculty salary adjustments:

1. Additional merit to all faculty;
2. Differential distributions by unit to correct salary gaps created by changing disciplinary markets or assessments of unit quality;
3. Recruitment and Retention;
4. System wide adjustments to raise the salaries of all meritorious faculty.

Merit Principle and Review. The University commits to support salary adjustments based on performance evaluations for those faculty deemed meritorious after a systematic review by faculty colleagues, department or unit head, Dean, and Provost. In order for these performance evaluations and merit salary recommendations to be meaningful, they must be done systematically and over an appropriate length of time to be able to make true quality assessments about performance and progress, considering the cumulative record of faculty.

All faculty shall be evaluated annually for merit and for progress towards reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, as appropriate. Subject to the conditions of this policy, a faculty member who is deemed to be meritorious in performance shall in the following academic year be awarded a regular the 2% or the minimum equal-percentage merit salary increase at the beginning of the following academic year that has been approved for that year according to the allocation procedures above. Higher levels of performance shall be recognized by higher levels of salary increases as permitted by available funding.

Any faculty member whose performance is not deemed meritorious shall be informed by the Chair/Dean of the reasons. If deemed meritorious in the next year's review, and subject to the conditions of this policy, the faculty member shall receive a regular the 2% merit increase at the beginning of the following academic year. receive the 2% or the minimum equal-percentage merit increase that has been approved for that year according to the allocation procedures above. A departmental advisory committee, appointed consistent with Section 24-55H of the Faculty Code, will consider the development needs of faculty members not receiving regular merit salary increases for two consecutive years.
Promotion. In addition to regular merit salary allocations, each faculty member who is promoted in rank shall be awarded a 7.5% promotion salary increase beginning on the date the promotion is effective.

Unit Adjustments. Additional salary funds may be allocated by the Provost to colleges and schools at any time during the biennium, after appropriate consultations with the Faculty Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Committee, to address differentials occurring in the academic labor markets and to reflect assessments of the quality, standing, and contributions of units to College, School, and University goals. Unless specifically allocated by the Provost for a particular unit or purpose, the Deans shall consult with their elected faculty councils before distributing any additional salary increase funds among their constituent units. The procedures of Section 24-55 of the Faculty Code will be followed in distributing funds allocated to adjust faculty salaries based on merit.

Retention Adjustments. With approval from the Provost, college-administered or University funds may be used to adjust faculty salaries as a means to retain faculty members at the University of Washington either at the time of merit reviews or at other times as necessary throughout the academic year. Assessments of a faculty member's quality and unit contribution are essential elements in decisions to make retention adjustments. Consultative processes to recommend retention adjustments shall be established at the unit level following the procedures set forth in Section 24-71 of the Faculty Code.

Funding Cautions. This Faculty Salary Policy is based upon an underlying principle that new funds from legislative appropriations are required to keep the salary system in equilibrium. Career advancement can be rewarded and the current level of faculty positions sustained only if new funds are provided. Without the infusion of new money from the Legislature into the salary base, career advancement can only be rewarded at the expense of the size of the University faculty. Without the influx of new money or in the event of decreased State support, a reevaluation of this Faculty Salary Policy may prove necessary.