University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
Thursday, June 2, 2011
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Student Engagement Group update
3. Planning for a letter to the provost: online learning
4. Issues for next year
5. E Books
6. Adjournment

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 10:36 a.m.

1. Approval of minutes from May 5, 2011 meeting
The minutes of the May 5, 2011 meeting were approved as written.

2. Student Engagement Group update

Martin-Morris gave an update on the small group meeting on issues of student engagement. They found that UW participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and decided to look at areas where UW was doing better or worse than other major Research-1 universities. UW is doing better than other R1s in asking students to do significant reading and writing outside of the class, but there are too many areas where it is doing worse. Some key areas include student-faculty interactions and student engagement with the institution and community. There are worse opportunities to speak, worse commutes, and fewer engagements with the campus community. There are plans to keep looking into this, and the small group will continue meeting in the Fall. Nana Lowell will look at data and trends, and Ed Taylor is being asked what initiatives are being put in place and how they're making a difference.

3. Review of letter to the provost: online learning

Carline presented a draft letter to the provost about online learning. The council suggested a number of additions and action items for the letter to contain. Carline was to send revisions out to the council for final approval, then send the letter to the provost.
[The letter is attached as Appendix A.]

4. Issues for next year (Susan Astley)
Vice Chair Susan Astley, the incoming Chair of the Faculty Senate, joined the council to discuss its previous work and upcoming plans. Topics included experiences with online courses and communication

between the council and Senate. Carline also projected a list of potential topics for next year, and was to ask for further input via email. **[Attached, Appendix B.]**

5. E Books

Tom Lewis said there are reinvestment funds for improving the student teaching and learning experience, and distributed a list **[Attached, Appendix C]** describing three initiatives: an eText pilot, an eLearning system pilot, and Tegrity lecture capture. Lewis further explained the initiatives:

- *eText Pilot*
  UW-IT is going to assess satisfaction and impact on student learning. At Indiana University, with courses that are going to use an eText, students pay a fee and can use the text as much as they want, print, and get software for annotation, which ends up saving students money. The hope is to have some pilots going on at UW in the Fall.
- *eLearning System Pilot*
  There are needs that Catalyst doesn't meet. Canvas is very elegant and simple. It's a for-profit company with an open source version that's powerful and feature-rich. UW-IT is in the technology exploration phase right now.
- *Tegrity Lecture capture*
  Tegrity is a browser-based capture system that can hook into room-based capture systems, but isn't necessarily hardware based. UW-IT is thinking about how to do a contract and looking to pilot in the Fall. The system could save a lot of money over using hardware lecture capture.

Lewis also mentioned an elegant webconferencing solution coming soon from Google, which will allow 50 people in a webconference, with 10 active participants and 40 watching. He said he would send out a call for council members interested in being involved with developing these initiatives.

6. Adjournment
The meeting ended at 12:00 p.m.

Minutes by Craig Bosman, Faculty Council Support Analyst. cbosman@uw.edu
Minutes approved by electronic vote, June 2011.

Present: **Faculty:** Carline (Chair), Martin-Morris, Nelson, Masuda, Wilkes, Salehi-Esfahani, Merati
Ex-Officio Reps: Awan, Corbett, Hornby
President's Designee*:* Taylor
Guests: Kalikoff, Lewis, Sugatan, Lowell, David Szatmary, Susan Astley, Evan Smith

Absent: **Faculty:** Olavarria, Kyes, Masuda, Elkhafaifi, Harrison, Yeh, Zierler
Ex-Officio Reps: Bradley

UW Medicine
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

23 June 2011

Interim President Phyllis Wise
University of Washington

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

Bibliography reviewed in preparation of this document

1) Appana S. A review of benefits and limitations of online learning in the context of the student, the instructor, and the tenured faculty. *International Journal on E-Learning* 7(1): 5-22 2008

2) Bartolic-Zlomislic S, Bates A. Investing in on-line learning: Potential benefits and limitations. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 24(3), 349-366 1999

3) Beeckman D et al. Pressure ulcers: E-learning to improve classification by nurses and nursing students. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 17 (13):1697-1707 2008

4) Bernard RM et al. How does distance education compare with classroom instruction? A meta-analysis of empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research* 74 (3): 379-439 2004

5) Cavanaugh J. Teaching online – A time comparison. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, Vol VIII, Num I, Spring 2005

6) Cavanaugh C. The effectiveness of interactive distance education technologies in K-12 learning: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications* 7 (1): 73-78, 2001

7) Clark RE. Media will never influence Learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 42 (2) 21-29, 1994

8) Clark RE. Reconsidering research on learning from media, *Review of Educational Research*, 53(4): 445-459, 1983

9) Cobb T. Cognitive efficiency: toward a revised theory of media. *Education Technology, Research and Development,* 45 (4), 21-35 1997

10) Cook DA, Beckman TJ, Thomas KG, Thompson WG. Adapting web-0based instruction to residents' knowledge improves learning efficiency: a randomized controlled trial. *J General Internal Medicine.* 23(7): 985-90, Jul 2008

11) Granger NA, et al. Use of web-based material to enhance anatomy instruction in the health sciences. *Anatomical Record Part B, New Anatomist*. Jul;289(4):127-7 2006

12) Hislop GW, Ellis HJC. A study of faculty effort in online teaching." *The Internet and Higher Education*. 7;1. 2004

13) Hugenholtz NIR, et at. Effectiveness of e-learning in continuing medical education for occupational physicians. *Occupational Medicine* 58 (5): 370-72 2008

14) Kerfoot BP, Fu Y, Baker H, Connelly D, Ritchey ML, Genega EM. Online spaced education generates transfer and improves long-term retention of diagnostic skill: a randomized control trial. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons* Sep:211(3):331-337 2010

15) Kozma R. Will media influence learning?: Reframing the debate. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 42(2), 7-19 1994

16) Lieblein E. Critical factors for successful delivery of online programs. *The Internet and Higher Education* 3 161-174 2000

17) McKenzie BK, Mims N, Bennett E, Waugh M. Needs, concerns and practices of online instruction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration* vol. III, num. III, winter 2000

18) Means B, et al. *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies* U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development Policy and Program Studies Service

19) Moore GT, Black SD, Briggs Style C, Mitchell R. The influence of the new pathway curriculum on Harvard medical students. *Academic Medicine*, 69, 983–989 1994

20) Neuhauser C. Learning style and effectiveness of online and face-to-face instruction. *American Journal of Distance education.* 16(2), 99-113

21) Olsen F. Phoenix rises. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(10), A29, 2002

22) O'Quinn L, Corry M. Factors that deter faculty from participating in distance education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration* 5(4) {online serial}

23) Pachnowski LM, Jurczyk JP. Perceptions of faculty on the effect of distance learning technology on faculty preparation time. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, Vol. VI, No. III, Fall 2003*

24) Phipps R, Merisotis J. *What's the difference? A review of contemporary research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher education* Washington, DC: Institute for Higher education Policy. 1999

25) Rampage TR. The "No Significant Difference" Phenomenon: A Literature Review http://spark.parkland.edu/rampage_pubs/1 2002

26) Russell TL The no significant Difference Phenomenon: A comparative Research Annotated Bibliography on Technology for Distance Education. IDECC, Montgomery, AL, 2001

27) Russell T. The No Significant Difference Phenomenon Website. URL http://teleeducation.nd.ca/nosignificantdifference/

28) Ruth S. e- Learning – A financial and strategic perspective. *Educause Quarterly. No* 1. 2006

29) Sausner R. Carving your slice of the virtual pie. *University Business. 6 (7)*

30) Schilling K et al. An interactive web-based curriculum on evidence-based medicine: Design and effectiveness. *Family Medicine*. 38 (2):126-32, 2006

31) Sitzmann T et al. The comparative effectiveness of web-based and classroom instruction: A meta-analysis. *Personal Psychology* 59:623-64, 2006

32) Spector MJ. Time demands in online learning *Distance Education.* Vol.26, No. 1, 5-27, May 2005

33) Tomei LA. The impact of online teaching on faculty load: computing the ideal class size for online courses. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education* 14(3), 531-541, 2006

34) Twigg CA. Improving Learning and Reducing Costs: New Models For Online Learning *Educause Review* 2003

We would like to recognize the contribution of Deven Hamilton to the literature review and presentation to the Council in preparation for the writing of this letter.

FCTL Topics for 2011-2012

Continued emphasis of the Council – topics under discussion that will be continued in the new academic year
Methods to improve the student learning experience, including a higher sense of ownership and investment in the learning process

Continued monitoring by the Council – topics discussed either at length or briefly in the Council needing continued attention
Faculty development for use of technology in teaching
Meeting the UW's increasing demand for providing courses in the face of decreasing resources
Inform state legislature on issues of technology and how technology is different at UW

Topics proposed by not discussed in 2010-2011
Necessary support for use of technology: methods to support faculty when technology fails
Standards for evaluating the quality of distance learning and use of technology in teaching, including student outcomes
Understanding the learner in the age of 'digital natives'; methods to appropriately engage them and utilize their skills
Ways to recognize and compensate instructional excellence.
Effect of Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) on instructional quality
Intellectual property, copy rights, etc with increasing use of technology.
Help create a meaningful accreditation process
Mobile applications and what students need on their mobile devices for teaching and learning

eText Pilot

The UW's strategy to adopt eTexts will provide students and faculty with a smooth transition to the coming era when e-readers and digital content will quickly become commonplace. It is important for UW to be on the cutting edge of this transition and provide attractive terms and prices to students as well as great selection and support to instructors as they look to adopt eTexts for the classroom.

UW-IT's Objectives for an eText Pilot are to:
- Substantially drive down the cost of digital educational resources for students;
- Enable access to high quality educational resources – in both digital and hardcopy formats;
- Offer new tools for teaching and learning (e.g., social annotation); and
- Shape the terms of eText models to advantage UW students and authors.

eLearning System Pilot

Lots of faculty use Catalyst for online course management, but UW-IT has found a more comprehensive and integrated eLearning system, with a wider feature set and an intuitive interface that allows faculty to accomplish tasks in far fewer steps. This new system, Canvas, has a comprehensive feature set, including integrated multimedia, learning outcomes, reporting, quiz banks, and calendars, that is currently unavailable in Catalyst. It also has innovative technologies that enable fast grading and student notifications via email, Facebook, or text message.

UW-IT's Objectives for a Canvas eLearning System Pilot are to:
- Improve the student learning experience, especially by supporting technologies that make it easier for faculty to deliver a wider range of learning materials to students in a variety of ways;
- Ensure that Canvas does not increase the instructional burden on already busy faculty;
- Gain experience with the underlying Canvas technologies to support campus wide implementation; and
- Plan for campus wide implementation.

Pilot Partners: We envision offering a ratio of 1 GA Instructional Consultant per every 5 courses or sections. These Instructional Consultants would focus on course integration and have enough technical skills to provide direct, in-person support as well as provide training of UW-IT student support staff in proper email and phone support.

Tegrity Lecture Capture

A host of colleges, schools, units, and departments already support and manage some sort of lecture capture system. Many of these systems require expensive hardware, do not scale widely, and cannot be used by individual faculty (or students) at home or in their office to record and capture. Since lecture capture helps increase student retention, satisfaction, and achievement, UW-IT would like to provide an innovative and scalable system, Tegrity, for all three UW campuses.

UW-IT's Objectives for a Tegrity Lecture Capture Rollout are to:
- Offer scalable lecture capture, without requiring classroom-based hardware/software;
- Allow students to view lectures on any device and use patented technologies to make study time more efficient; and
- Let faculty (and students) enjoy automated capture, in the classroom, in the office, or at home.