

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

May 6, 2005  
10:00-12:00  
G11 Boone Hall

**Attendees:** J. DeCamp, D. deLaski-Smith, H. Eiss, R. Fulkert, D. Gaymer, E. Hoffman, A. Hogan, B. Lahidji, B. Leopard, P. Leighton, D. Loppnow, R. Lucas, C. McAnuff, D. Mielke, D. Pearson, L. Rocklage, W. Shell, D. Silverman, J. Tracy, T. Venner, K. Victor-Burke, C. Willis

**Absent:** D. Barton, K. Kustron, S. Menzel, S. Nelson, L. Nybell, J. Palladino,

**Guest(s):** D. Gaymer, S. Williams

The meeting was convened at 10:10 a.m. Commission members were informed of a family tragedy for S. Nelson; Commission condolences will be sent to her.

**Agenda Items:**

- I. Review of Minutes:
  - a. April 8, 2005
- 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 2005 - 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 8, 2005; 3:00-5:00
    - May 6, 2005; 10:00-12:00
    - *An additional summer meeting during the week of July 11 will be determined*
- IV. Review of Materials Distributed:
  - a. Agenda Topics
  - b. Minutes for the April 8, 2005 meeting
  - c. Reports/action items from the Innovations, and Organizational and Budget Models Subcommittees

## V. Topics of Discussion:

- a. The following points were brought up during the discussion: “**Organization and Budget Models** Subcommittee Budget-Actionable Items and Report:”
- This subcommittee focused on three areas, and were not sure how actionable any of these are (please refer to handout for details and the complete list of issues and recommendations):
    - Adapting a model for formalized revenue sharing – this may be budget-actionable.
    - Providing compensation for “windshield time” (no recommendation given, but this could be addressed by CE)
    - Developing a formula for compensating faculty for overload work (this should be taken to the table in the next round of contract negotiations).
  - In addition:
    - CE should not abandon proposed programs if they are not profitable to CE; the programs’ profitability for EMU as separate from CE should also be examined via the same mechanism. If programs deemed profitable for EMU but not for CE are adopted, CE should not be punished by having to run something that looks like it will not be profitable for it.
    - It is important that deans and department heads be held accountable to make sure that the faculty have sufficient input into the course/program development/delivery process, so it does not fall through.
    - We should attempt to balance what is reasonable profit for CE with equitable and reasonable compensation for faculty; we don’t want to put this arm of the institution out of business because we are busy giving away the profit. At the same time, we don’t want to lose CE’s flexibility. There needs to be an appropriate split between making a profit, compensating faculty, and providing incentive for innovation. Is there a way to figure out what is reasonable as a target profit? There should be discussion of that balance.
    - In investigating the different models of delivery, the Subcommittee became convinced that the EMU model is a good one, and it would be unwise to decentralize CE further. The subcommittee advocates keeping this model, but addressing some issues such as compensation, and keeping CE as an integral part of the university and Academic Affairs.
  - Reaction from Commission members:
    - CE is the R&D of the university; there is no other organized incentive program in the university for innovation. Also, it moves quickly and has a strong marketing arm.
    - Rather than restrict CE, have it be an open market for the faculty who are willing to do it.
    - We need to be careful to keep financial information in context; misinterpretation and misinformation can be very dangerous. One of the reasons this Commission was started is that we realize the financial things happening in CE are very complicated.
    - The Cherry Commission’s report stated that more people in Michigan should have a post-secondary-school education, regardless of delivery system, scheduling pattern, etc. We need to be responsive to what students need, and we have the problem of needing to grow enrollment.

We could generate more credit hours if we had people teaching in the evening and on weekends.

- The proposed revenue distribution model is similar to what used to take place in the late 90's, and does make sense for the departments which are committed to this kind of activity and want to be involved. It does require a different kind of commitment and investment, consideration of windshield time, development of online courses, etc.
- A big chunk of the opportunity money needs to go to CE because things surface every year that are not foreseen, and since Academic Affairs doesn't have that kind of money any longer, we need to keep it in CE. We've got to keep it somewhere or we won't be able to be responsive to these needs.
- CE should not become a profit center for paying people less to do more or less the same thing that they would be doing in other ways. Money needs to go back to deans and department heads, and also to faculty who are generating that money. This is something we can be working on now. We can apply this formula using the last 3 or 4 years' worth of data, and calculate the impact if this had been in place. CE could do this and bring it back for the Commission's review.

b. The following points were brought up during the discussion: "Off-Campus Classes Subcommittee Budget-Actionable Items and Report:"

- This group still has many questions. To begin with, the subcommittee is trying to determine if EMU should engage in off-campus classes at all, and if so, why. They invited Commission members to provide any thoughts they might have on this.
  - Not having the off-campus sites would dramatically reduce everything in terms of state appropriations, etc. Eliminating them would also fly in the face of what we should be doing with regard to the Cherry report's recommendations.
  - Some people see the issue as we need to take care of the main campus first, and the off-campus sites are too nice. That money would be better spent on campus. However, without the revenue generated from CE at these nice sites, there will not be enough money to do anything on campus.
  - There is some misinformation being distributed about the off-campus sites. Commission members should make sure that all financial and enrollment information is communicated in context and accurately, with regard to the off-campus sites.
- Secondly, should the off-campus centers be profit centers? How would you compare this to the rest of the institution?
- Also, when is overload really appropriate? If overload isn't used (or is only used minimally) on campus, why rely so heavily on it off campus?
- Current policies and procedures in the contract dictate that faculty cannot be assigned weekend, online, or off-campus duties as a condition of employment. Running full programs on overload reduces the union, and you can't staff these programs without being able to assign them. On top of that, faculty have first right of refusal, and we have pressure to increase overload pay. The result is we are running full programs off campus based on overload pay. In addition, there are people on campus who are not satisfied in terms of having office hours, etc. Some departments are very dependent on their off-

campus teaching. Should it be different? Do we need these different standards?

- There are benefits and disadvantages to everything. CE gets no credit for state aid; having diversified locations is a plus as far as state aid goes. The faculty are not near the top of the ranking to be rewarded for overload. How many faculty are impacted by that extra compensation and what exactly does that compensation consist of? In terms of enrollment, how many students are off-site, and how would that impact us? How have off-site locations affected our growth? The issues of competition and turf protection need to be mentioned as well; if we were not in a location in Brighton, there would be at least four other institutions who would be there (or already are).
- Is there benefit in investigating overtime as a concept? If “a course is a course,” then “overload should be overload.” We don’t bring it into consideration when the faculty are doing CE, but it is considered in terms of service, etc.
  - The department head has the choice to do this. It is written into the contract, referred to as something about “off-campus employment.” It becomes difficult to justify in terms of the faculty member’s commitment.
- There is a lack of workload definitions. We need institutional processes for this, which would help alleviate some of the associated tensions.
- Sometimes faculty have 4 overloads.
- If the same concept of limiting overload is applied to full-time lecturers, it might not be fair to limit their overload since they don’t have the obligations that faculty have outside of teaching.
- Why would there need to be an arbitrarily set number limit on overload courses?
- We should attempt to define overload as a concept whether people teach on or off campus. Currently the arrangements are all ad hoc.
- There are situations where a department will shelve the off-campus section to fill the on-campus one.
- There was disagreement with the concept that “a course is a course.” There are models which show that there is a significant difference between distance, online, and on-campus face-to-face courses. The direction the market is taking is lacking in innovation, and our students want innovation.
  - The concept that courses are the same regardless of delivery system is from the standpoint of the students as consumers.
- The struggle at EMU comes from courses being treated differently not because of their nature changing with delivery system, but because a different delivery system means a different administration and therefore different treatment from the instructional side.
- Overload can be used with the intention of saving the university money. In some departments with continued student growth but stagnant faculty growth, overload is chosen over hiring lecturers for that reason, and also because the faculty feel very responsible to the students, and teach overload despite not really wanting to. The Commission needs to examine this in terms of the departments not being able to pay anything more to have the number of instructors available teach the number of courses needed by students.
- Instructors are not doing overload for the money. The pay is a lot less than for regular courses, and they require a lot more work. There should not be an

assumption that people cannot teach overload and keep up with service and scholarly activities at the same time. Instructors who take on overload tend to be above average achievers, not underperformers. We're hired for quality time, not to punch a time clock.

- The bottom line is that enrollment is down. The instructor's role is that of making students excited about taking more courses in a discipline, to save that department.
- There are ways to deal with this dilemma. The contract is flexible enough to reward instructors for overload in terms of salary. There is a mindset that needs to be overcome.
- The institution needs to determine what brought us to this way of doing things, so we don't run our growth on overload.
- This subcommittee has brought up a matrix of important issues needing consideration: workload, the right to assign and who has the authority to do that, the way we compensate, should there be a limit on overload, etc.
- Actionable budget items for the upcoming budget year, and further issues brought up, included:
  - Conversations in upcoming budget sessions are urged not to advocate restricting CE. If anything, it should be expanded.
  - If the purpose of the Commission is re-engineering, we are being limited by past practices. We need to move forward.
  - Highlighting the dangers of running on overload is a good way to focus the discussion. A reasonable step would be to get a sufficient course base and then convert those courses over to being taught by full-time faculty. We need to get a mechanism to assign them. We stay on overload without the conversion, and this is the problem.
  - Sustainability is an issue.
  - This Commission has paralyzed us; we have lost several opportunities in debating institutional philosophy, and have lost ground in dynamic external opportunities.
  - There is no development money in CE; it is used to pay off institutional debts.
  - Another paralyzing issue is WebCT versus eCollege. Faculty will not develop courses because they don't know which platform will be chosen and they don't want to redo what they have already done.

c. The following points were brought up during the discussion: "On-Line and Distance Education Subcommittee Budget-Actionable Items and Report:"

- This Subcommittee has assigned areas of their topics. Their recommendations include the flexibility to allow instructors to do overload if they want to. The group will also endorse the e-learning standards that Faculty Council has recently moved to approve, and the subcommittee will include thoughts on what this means for the institution. The group will also address what is meant by hybrids, how to move forward, and how we as an institution deal with hybrids.
  - There is a hybrid model being constructed for faculty, which will be ready for winter semester offerings.

- d. The following points were brought up during the discussion: “**Innovation Subcommittee Budget-Actionable Items and Report:**”
- This Subcommittee began by stating that both faculty and students want and will support innovation in terms of the way we deliver instruction. The item proposed with primary budgetary implications is the proposal of an office of creative innovation to be housed within the Faculty Development Center. Maybe this can be funded out of money going back to Academic Affairs. This would be a creative think tank which faculty and lecturers who want to start thinking in an innovative way, could use as a starting point for their ideas. There would be a start group to process ideas, and a resource team to flesh out the concepts and see what can be done with them, so that by the time an idea gets to Faculty Council it would be strong pedagogically and technologically. This group would also house a listing of where creative things were being done, so ideas could piggyback off each other and spark further innovation. As part of the Faculty Development Center, it would be overseen by the Sr. Associate VP for Academic Affairs, which would reinforce any tie-ins to AQIP, Faculty Development, and Strategic Planning. Staffing could include a half-time doctoral student, and quarter-time staff support. In terms of the overall picture, there is a critical need at this time to have some sort of fostering and incentive for innovation, which is more administrative and process-oriented than the purview of the Faculty Development Center.
    - It is hoped that new faculty would bring innovative ways of teaching with them, and that the FDC would not be overrun with new faculty teaching in old ways.
      - Often those new faculty don’t know where to go to get new things done. Higher education also does not require training in terms of how to teach well, despite being content experts.
    - CE should be involved; they will be included in the resource groups.
- e. The following points were brought up during the discussion: “**On-Campus Classes Subcommittee Budget-Actionable Items and Report:**”
- This subcommittee has one of the most diverse memberships of all the subcommittees, which has been very helpful in looking at a wide range of issues.
  - There are a lot of problems on campus, and killing CE is not going to solve them. Short-term reactionary fixes need to be considered carefully before implementing.
  - The issues of equity and access were considered: what is the difference between on-campus and off-campus, who is getting paid and how much, what are the student and faculty perspectives. What became clear is that we don’t have the kind of data that CE has. We don’t have good budget models to help us determine if on-campus delivery is doing well.
  - Our recommendation is to hire an outside consultant to tell us how to gather data, and how to analyze it, rather than basing decisions on stories. This mirrors the way K-12 schools are going. An outside consultant should do a good survey of where our students are, and why they are enrolled in the ways they are.
  - We need to listen to each other. We don’t just have two ways of doing things, but a million. We need to start thinking about the multiversity. We need ultimately to have some group that begins to look more broadly at

instructional delivery and how to respect and understand our differences. We are trying to fit into one single model of innovation, delivery, etc.

- One criticism of CE is that it is killing our traditional programs. We could have a residential program geared to address that. We need to change the way we view our relationship with CE. How do we provide respect and tolerance for people who want something different?
- We need a shared vision. This recommendation parallels the center of innovation proposed by the Innovation Subcommittee, but on a broader level. We want to have a year where the entire campus focuses on innovation. We could bring in outside speakers, have forums, etc., and have the campus work together in a way it never has. We want to develop a new way of looking at institutional learning.
- Many of the surveys and data dealt with technology in teaching and in the classroom. This is not innovative. We need specific and targeted action on how we fix this, and an institutional strategy for addressing the technology issue.
  - With regard to data; we are getting there slowly but surely with reports from Banner. We built the systems for banner to mimic their design for the old ISIS system. The system we bought permits us to offer courses in various parts of the term, in line with our thoughts on how to be more innovative. The next steps would be where do we want to be, and can we tweak the system to accommodate the various different configurations we're talking about to accommodate our non-traditional population. We need to go beyond what we've found out and build support systems for books and registration and admissions, etc.
- We need leadership, because policy making is what are the directions and are we going in the same one. We need to have leaders that respond to the need for innovation. We need to think about what will make this a good institution for everyone.
- We need to make options for students to get through here in a reasonable amount of time; we need to not forget what students need.
- The key is to figure out what students need, implement it quickly, and offer it to them. Students are shopping for courses and programs that are cost-effective and available. If we can find a way to deliver what students need and on time we won't have an enrollment issue.
- In the context of budget challenges, we need to be able to plan out the full schedule of what we need a year ahead, so students can enroll a year in advance. We should be able to show our students when they can expect to see courses offered, and then the students have time to respond and we can respond to them. Right now it's too little information too late. This relates to on- and off-campus offerings. This would also make departments a lot more productive.
- It is important to accommodate students with scheduling, but once they get into the classroom, the instructor needs to have the technology and facilities to teach them
- We need to have a true classroom utilization study done, and utilize the space much more efficiently. Every piece of furniture bought should be done in consultation with faculty.
- In terms of equity, fees and costs are the same for taking a course in Brighton or in Pray-Harrold.

- The flip side of that is that people off campus are paying for the Rec center that they never use. Our fees reflect our values.
  - We hope that in 3-5 years there not be a classroom on campus that students are embarrassed to walk in to.
  - With reference to the survey done by the Innovation Subcommittee, the questions on my.emich did not ask for any identifier as far as who the students responding are.
    - We really need to invest in getting accurate information. While the sample size is probably big enough, we need to have a truly representative group.
    - The problem in getting the information asked for is the response rate.
  - We need to keep our differences in mind– different programs have different needs. We need information on the subsets within and between the colleges; we need to know what Geography and Geology wants versus Teacher Education, for example.
  - There are a multitude of surveys being given; people are being constantly barraged, and the response rate will continue to go down.
- f. The following points were brought up during the discussion: “Commission Timeline and Miscellaneous Observations:”
- The Commission will meet some time the week of July 11.
  - We need to send something to the faculty to communicate that the Commission is still meeting and formulating its report.
  - Some of the decisions will already be made before the report goes through.
  - The Enrollment Council projects zero growth in enrollment this coming fall. Our biggest issue is returning students. Part of the problem is due to finances. We’ve been checking with a lot of other institutions to assess what the market will bear in terms of tuition increases. We are doing different scenarios. We don’t even know if the state will cut us more. We are looking at strategic decisions, not across-the-board. We’re looking at 6.5 to 9% tuition increase. We’re still looking at problems. Some of the recommendations can be folded in (revenue sharing, for example). But others are quite costly – where can cuts be made to fund this?
  - At the same time we are going through budget reductions, we have to make sure we are not hurting any areas of growth and revenue.
  - In terms of the report, some parts will be able to go through and some not. If we did nothing else than educating the campus, the Commission it would be hugely successful
  - The full-year enrollment mechanism can be pursued; that is cost-neutral.
  - How about an adult learner day, analogous to departmental open house nights at CE centers?
  - We also have to be committed to being able to run the classes that are registered for this far is in advance.
  - For this to be meaningful, we need to take this information and make a balance of the budget costs. Know that this group has been looking at the future and we have some insight into being strategic.


VI. Home Work

- a. Commission members should let Akosua know their schedules for the week of July 11 – please send her an e-mail letting her know which dates that week are not possible.

VII. Adjournment

- b. Dr. Willis thanked everyone for their service on this Commission and to its tough work. He acknowledged that the university community is being asked to consider monumental changes, and remarked that no president wants to hear about lost opportunities, and he was somewhat shocked by some of what he had heard at the meeting. However, good things will come out of the Commission. The next round of negotiations depends on it.
- c. The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Akosua Slough  
Recording Secretary