

Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery

Summary of Discussion

October 20, 2004

Critique, Comments and Suggestions about the Charge to the Commission and issues to be considered as we move forward with our work

Given the interest and concern about the Commission, it is important to create an internal data and communications strategy to share the work of the Commission – perhaps create a website.

Need to ensure that we maintain academic integrity/quality when delivering coursework in a non-traditional approach.

Instead of dividing into work groups immediately, we should first learn together about what is happening at EMU, national trends, and information about benchmark institutions (i.e. #2 on the October 20 list of issues in the Charge to the Commission). This will better prepare us and provide a context for future deliberations.

At least some of the Commission members should be involved in the task group that will look at funding models and budgets.

Recent rhetoric about continuing education seems to be somewhat polemic and adversarial. It is important to emphasize the many positives that continuing education has contributed to the institution. For example, Continuing Education is like EMU's Skunk Works in that it is the unit that does most to support innovation.

During our dialogue, it is important to have ground rules that respect both virtues and concerns that may be expressed about nontraditional instructional delivery and continuing education.

We should assess what students need and want. We need to determine who our students are and what they are gravitating to.

The Commission should involve more students.

Currently department DID and DED documents don't adequately include and recognize non-traditional instruction, on-line and innovative work through continuing education.

For several years, on-campus enrollment has been declining while SCH generated by departments through Continuing Education has increased steadily.