

**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**  
**Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery**

December 3, 2004  
3:00-5:00  
G11, Boone Hall

**Attendees:** D. Barton, J. Beaghan, J. DeCamp, D. deLaski-Smith, H. Eiss, R. Fulkert, E. Hoffman, A. Hogan, K. Kustron, B. Leopard, P. Leighton, D. Loppnow, R. Lucas, D. Malone, C. McAnuff, D. Mielke, S. Nelson, L. Nybell, J. Palladino, D. Pearson, L. Rocklage, D. Silverman, J. Tracy, T. Venner

**Absent:** B. Lahidji, S. Menzel, W. Shell, K. Victor-Burke, C. Willis

**Guest(s):** D. Gaymer, M. Marz

The meeting was convened at 3:08 p.m.

**Agenda Items:**

- I. Review of Minutes:
  - a. November 19, 2004 – no suggested changes.
- II. Additional Agenda Items:
  - a. None
- III. Meeting Schedules
  - a. Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery meetings fall 2004 - review of meeting dates.
    - October 20, 2004; 6:00-8:00; University House (dinner)
    - November 19, 2004; 3:00-5:00; G11 Boone
    - December 3, 2004; 3:00-5:00; G11 Boone
  - b. Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery meetings winter 2004 - review of meeting dates.
    - ***January 14, 2005; 3:00-5:00 (note change from original date of January 7)***
    - ***February 4, 2005; 3:00-5:00***
    - ***March 11, 2005; 3:00-5:00***
    - ***April 1, 2005; 3:00-5:00***
    - ***May 6, 2005; 3:00-5:00***
- IV. Review of Materials Distributed:
  - a. Agenda Topics
  - b. Subcommittee Roster
  - c. Article: *Growing Up Digital; How the Web Changes Work, Education, and the Ways People Learn*
  - d. Article: *Andrological and Pedagogical Training Differences for Online Instructors*

- e. Article: *ALN Principles for Blended Environments*
- f. Article: *Thirty-two Trends Affecting Distance Education: An Informed Foundation for Strategic Planning*
- g. Articles sent to the Commission after the meeting: *The Changing Landscape and the New Academy*, and *New Models for Online Learning*

V. Topics of Discussion:

- a. The following points were brought up during the discussion “Introductory Remarks:”
  - The Provost began the meeting with a brief discussion of the Commission meeting schedule, and by noting the addition of William Shell to the Commission roster.
- b. The following points were brought up during the presentation “The Continuing Education Budget Process:”
  - D. Gaymer provided a quick run-through of the process to establish a budget. As a self-funded unit, Continuing Education doesn’t get a budget like the departments do; they build their own budget. Each regional site builds a budget, program by program, in credit hours and expenses. A forecast of expenses is built in detail, including what the instructional mix is expected to be, in addition to type of students. The budgets take grading stipend estimates, honoraria, etc. into consideration. The non-credit side of CE is handled the same way. The proposed budgets go to the Associate Vice President for Extended Programs, and then to the Budget Office.
  - D. Gaymer began the presentation with a description of CE revenue. Please refer to the handout provided at the meeting. The following points were made about particular slides:
  - Re: Slide 2 (“Tuition Assessment Flow”); Tuition belonging to each cost center is assigned there. Non-credit income comes in a variety of ways and into various types of accounts in CE. Tuition is audited and reconciled against registration.
  - Re: Slide 4 (“How Funds are Dispersed”); CE only collects tuition revenue, which comes through Accounting; some fees go to the General Fund (about 38% of the revenue). Some fees (for example, the general fee, technology fee, and student union fee) go to the specific programs that they support. Program fees associated with particular academic programs do not go to the departments housing those programs, but to the General Fund; this holds true for both CE and on-campus courses. Adding everything up, about \$.30 of each dollar (of graduate tuition and fees) goes to the General fund and other non-CE accounts.
    - These college program fees are another way that the university charges tuition, in light of a state tuition cap. All the 15 state-funded universities do this. Charges made to a select group of students are considered fees, while tuition is something charged to the majority. These fees go back to university operations and are fixed generally on the delivery of the program. Tuition is the same in CE as it is for on-campus. Federal or state financial aid is available to pay for fees as well as tuition, however students relying on third party reimbursement typically can’t get help on fees, and neither can EMU employees (though the university pays their tuition).
    - CE makes the distinction between in state and out of state tuition, but in-state is charged for on-line courses. Some APA programs are fixed rate, but usually out of state people pay out-of-state tuition for these courses. APA is not part of CE, but they are creating program fees now where they give a better deal to EMU students than to others. They also have

fewer out of state students. APA is part of the World College, and is funded by CE, along with at least one staff person in the the World College. Those are not supported by the General Fund, but by CE. Study abroad programs are totally ad hoc; there may be some benefit for examining this in the context of what the Commission is doing. There has been a move towards increasing study abroad.

- It was suggested that M. Marz provide some feedback on this at the next meeting.
- Re: Slide 7 (“Tuition Disbursement”); The 11% Administrative costs include Boone Hall overhead, salaries of administration people, funding of the World College and APA, etc.
- Re: Slide 9 (“Instructional Compensation”); There are different types of compensation, paid by load. The portion of the salary paid by CE remains in the department budget, and that money is recouped by the Provost’s office, then lecturer replacement money goes back to the department to hire a replacement lecturer. The University of Illinois website has some useful information on on-line structures; those Commission
  - Faculty Over Load refers to teaching above the normal load for the department. Faculty In Load is regular salary. CE differentiates full-time lecturers from adjuncts. Lecturer typical load is 15 credit hours per semester. A split appointment is where a lecturer teaches some of his or her load in CE and some in the department. An adjunct is part-time faculty and gets an adjunct rate to teach a course of \$1,000 per credit hour. The overload rate is \$50 per credit hour per student starting with the 26<sup>th</sup> student in a course. Faculty are also paid for advising, course development (primarily of on-line courses - \$1,000 per credit hour), and travel expenses to courses taught off-campus. Emeritus are paid at the faculty overload rate.
  - The same enrollment rates on campus are used at other sites. When it is necessary to cancel a required class at a regional site due to low enrollment, the students are contacted to make sure that they have a way of fulfilling that requirement.
  - With reference to these compensation items, we have talked about a minimum of 1200, but the question is how often and what are the conditions for exceeding the minimum? The AAUP contract lists some occasions – currently those only occur with full programs or on line. The department head makes that decision – they can’t pay different rates for on- and off-campus instruction, so they raise the off-campus compensation to match the on-campus. The instructional mix should be consistent; if there isn’t extensive over load in on-campus compensation, there shouldn’t be for off-campus. Over load exists in Traverse City, on-line can be over load or in load. With on-line courses, for a given semester the faculty member initially teaches at over load, and then works the course into their regular load. This is to prevent having a load shift in the event that the course gets cancelled. The mix on- and off-campus needs to match.
  - Grading stipends are unique to CE, and are paid out only on courses where over load payment is applicable. The pay is \$50 per student per credit hour beginning with the 26<sup>th</sup> student, up to 3 credit hours. This is because a lot of those instructors felt that there is additional work associated with the on-line, as opposed to face-to-face. This raises the

cap for the on-line to match the face-to-face. When an instructor teaches one of the large lecture hall classes in CAS, for example, it counts as 2 courses in their load, whereas over load in CE counts for 1/3 of 1 class. The grading stipend is aimed at making instructor compensation more equitable in these scenarios, but it was noted that it really doesn't accomplish this, particularly in spring and summer courses. All communication and evaluation is written (there is no in-class participation grading possible) and therefore requires more time to process. Some good information on on-line course administration can be found on the University of Illinois website; people on this subcommittee are encouraged to investigate this (this might be the site: <http://www.uiuc.edu/academics/courses.html>).

- A department's instructional mix of on- and off-campus courses should be the same as the overall university mix, so that instructional quality is preserved. This is also part of our accreditation.
- It should be remembered that this is the way it's done at EMU, but other places run their CE at almost 100% with adjuncts. EMU does it differently to ensure quality and also to differentiate ourselves from these other places. Our model is the centralized/decentralized, as opposed to totally decentralized.
- Re: Slide 10 ("Tuition Disbursement EMU-Livonia"); the catering line item is in and out. We charge a bit for facility use, but most revenue is used to pay for caterer.
- Re: Slide 12 ("CE Total Expense Budget FY2004-05"); fringe benefits are separated out. The \$4.5 million is just in salary, not including benefits. Most of honoraria are grading stipends and on-line course development. Operating expenses includes leases. Not all of the "other" category goes to honoraria, but the vast majority does.
  - With regard to benefits, if an instructor is teaching at in load rates, then we pay the full portion of their benefits. If they are teaching over load, it's a much lower amount. It's an actual budget cost.
- Re: Slide 13 ("CE Operating Summary"); this slide brings both revenue and expenses together. CE hopes to net about \$40,000.
  - With reference to the Masco line item, we are only seeing that portion that runs through CE.
  - With reference to the amount going back to the provost's office – it passes through that office on the way back to the university accounts, but it then goes to cover the budget shortfalls. The agreement with the budget office is to pay 1,500,000. If revenues were greater than what was budgeted, the division of Academic Affairs would be obliged to pay the 1,500,000, and pocket the difference. CE zeros out at the end of the year, starting out 1,500,000 in the hole at the beginning of the year.
- Re: Slide 14 ("CE Net Revenue Analysis"); this slide brings together credit hours, revenue, expenses, etc. all summarized together. New information on this slide is program fees, and other revenues.
  - The "Other Revenue" category is the catering pass-through cost.
  - The "Program Fees" category does not refer to college program fees, but to CE program fees. The distance education fee is a pass-through cost that students pay to take on-line courses. Program fees abroad are pass-through too.
  - "Distance Education" includes on-line and independent learning.

- c. The following points were brought up during the discussion “Comments After the Presentation:”
- The uses for the net revenue have evolved over time. Until two years ago, none of that university money went to the budget, but because of the budgeting problems, it was decided that part of the net should go towards balancing the budget. There was a period when net revenues from CE went entirely into Academic Affairs. The Provost’s office would then distribute a portion of this back to the colleges, and the deans would distribute to the departments. The provost’s office would keep a bit as well. As budgeting pressures have increased, the net has decreased, and none has gone back to the departments. It has gone instead to cover the university’s budget, as tuition revenue has gone down.
  - Money had been spent to expand CE; the Brighton location was funded from net revenues. Also, historically, the net revenues have not been as large as recently; closer to 2 or 3 hundred thousand dollars as opposed to the million and a half. CE likes to think that net revenues are in part due to their operations along the corporate models.
  - This year CE tried to plan for some initiatives and budgeted 260,000 (located in administrative costs) for new initiatives and new programs. The problem with moving everything to a general fund model is that costs have to be anticipated 18 months in advance for budgeting purposes.
  - There is margin on undergraduate courses, which forces CE to look more at graduate courses. It is a huge problem not being able to move undergraduate courses off campus. We are losing students to competitors because we can’t afford to offer courses at other locations, as the margin between actual instruction and facilities is not covered by tuition revenues.
    - An example of the danger of this CE model is that the COB would lose money by offering courses at the Ypsilanti campus.
    - Community colleges want EMU to offer courses close to them, but we can’t take advantage of this.
    - We maybe should look at a different model so we can offer undergraduate courses off-site. Some programs have strong graduate courses which could subsidize undergraduate ones.
  - What obligation do we have to the state to offer these money-losing programs? The subsidy from the state is to offer education for residents of the state. The state is paying for access. We have been on a per-student model until the last 2 years. We need to take into consideration that we may get back on that level again. It always has been on a per-student model. And as our enrollment goes down, we are hurt on the per-student model with a 2-year delay.
    - CE does utilize all of the university’s services, so they do benefit somewhat from the general fund. Admissions, Records and Registration, etc. are not separate for CE courses.
- d. The following points were brought up during the discussion “Concluding Remarks:”
- Appreciation for the open disclosure of the CE budget process was expressed, as it is very beneficial to the faculty to be included in this information.
  - The Commission was asked for ideas for topics for future meetings which would help us orient ourselves.
    - One suggestion was to present the history of the AAUP contract and why it says what it says, why it has evolved the way it has, and the evolution of the contract as it relates to CE.
    - Another suggestion was to present whole programs and what they are.

- A third suggestion was to present what our projections for the future are in terms of student distribution and demographics for the future, both overall, and in relationship to CE.
  - It is possible to obtain enrollment projection data. The Strategic Planning website has environmental demographics, and our own student body demographics, which can be updated.
- We should examine the concept of instructional delivery in its entirety, not just from the standpoint of Continuing Education.
  - Part of this is the platforms we are using to deliver instruction. WebCt and E-College are both used at EMU, and this redundancy should be looked at by the Online subcommittee. It probably doesn't make sense for this institution to have two platforms. We could save money here and use it elsewhere for other instructional benefits.
  - Using the same technology for off- and on-campus delivery should also be considered; smooth interaction, costs, benefits, and potential uses.
- One of the other systems is e-reserves. This might give us more benefit than WebCT. A lot of faculty use it in the same way as WebCT. Please e-mail provost with other ideas.
- The enrollment boom at community colleges and what it means for the public institutions should be assessed. This is shifting what is happening in higher education (the Cherry Report reinforces this).
- Subcommittee composition is not cast in stone. People were assigned their first or second choice wherever possible. If anyone has a strong preference, reassignment can be pursued.
  - Let's adjourn the Commission as whole, and have subcommittees caucus and get organized to begin to meet together.

VI. Home Work

- a. Please send any other topics for consideration at future meetings to D. Lopnow.

VII. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Akosua Slough  
Recording Secretary