

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery

December 16, 2005
3:00-5:00
G11 Boone Hall

Attendees: D. Barton, D. deLaski-Smith, R. Fulkert, D. Loppnow, R. Lucas, L. Nybell, D. Pearson, W. Shell, J. Tracy, B. Leopard, D. Mielke, L. Rocklage,

Absent: K. Kustron, P. Leighton, C. McAnuff, S. Nelson, D. Silverman, K. Victor-Burke, J. DeCamp, J. Fallon, D. Gaymer, B. Lahidji, J. Palladino, T. Venner, H. Eiss, E. Hoffman, A. Hogan, S. Menzel

Guest(s): D. Gaymer

Agenda Items:

- I. Review of Minutes:
 - a. November 11, 2005 - approved
- II. Additional Agenda Items:
 - a. None
- III. Meeting Schedules
 - a. Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery meetings fall 2005 - review of meeting dates.
 - September 30, 2005; 10:00-12:00; G11 Boone
 - November 11, 2005; 3:00-5:00; G11 Boone
 - December 16, 2005; 3:00-5:00; G11 Boone
- IV. Review of Materials Distributed:
 - a. Agenda Topics
 - b. Minutes for the November 11, 2005 meeting
 - c. Draft Final Report
- V. Topics of Discussion:
 - a. The Final Report – Final Editing and Distribution
 - The Provost opened the meeting by stating that this meeting's focus is the overall "packaging" of the report, and determining if there is anything else to add to it. The goal is to disseminate the report at the first of the year. Then it will be discussed in Faculty Council and in an array of other formats, and the hope is that it will stimulate conversation about any unresolved issues and the recommendations themselves.
 - Today's goal is to go through the report one more time to see what refinement can be suggested. If we can agree in principle that the report

captures the concepts we want to put out there, then the Provost will revise and distribute it.

- The Writing Team was congratulated on doing an excellent job with the report.
- In the context of the new procedures followed in determining the agendas at the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents (where the Provost meets with AAUP and Faculty Council leadership to decide together what the topics for the meeting will be), the Commission report covers a significant array of issues and topics such that at least pieces of it can be explored for presentation over the course of the next several meetings. The Commission report as a whole will be presented at the Board meeting in March. The January meeting will focus on on-line instruction, so as to educate the Board on what the concepts presented in the report are.
- It was noted that the student leadership group should see the report and be given the opportunity to provide feedback.
- The report is not being presented for acceptance by the Board, just for their information. The recommendations are the purview of Academic Affairs. However, if a policy change or an issue relating to collective bargaining were to be made as a result of a recommendation, that would need to be approved by the Board. The rest is for Academic Affairs to deliberate and act upon. The purpose of the Faculty Affairs Committee is to inform the Board about faculty and what their issues are, and the report brings out a lot of those issues.
- It is not likely that any of the Board members would ever have seen an on-line delivery system. Looking at this report without the online delivery context would prohibit them from understanding the report.

b. Off-Campus Classes/Programs Subcommittee Report

- An important issue for this group was the struggle with data. We need much better data about who is off-campus, in terms of students and faculty.
- Many subcommittees complained about the data.
- With reference to Recommendation #4 – it is clear that there are different roles and intentions for each of the off-campus sites. There should be a specific mission identified for each location: service goals, political goals, credit hour production goals. These things should be made more explicit, and should be documented and evaluated. Some off campus sites are struggling in terms of obtaining full range of university services. Off campus students should have the same services as on-campus; they are just as much EMU students.
- Planning for off-campus sites should be transparent. There should be a specific document for the plan, listing expenses for when we open that site. Studies should be done to make sure that we are utilizing existing sites before we open a new one.
- The issues of when overload is appropriate need to be gone into. We don't have to make recommendations, but this needs to be addressed in some form. Compensation for travel time needs to be addressed. The process of academic department participation needs to be continued, as does revenue sharing.
- In the context of fully utilizing the off-campus buildings, one of the other subcommittees recommended changing the names of courses so credit and non-credit can be distinguished. Our subcommittee notices that the Brighton center was not being used during the day.

- The Brighton center is made available for corporate rentals, and we don't have the same level of non-credit courses as we do in Livonia. This center is designed for non-traditional students; you serve people where they need it.
- Perhaps it can be framed in terms of thinking that these sites are not necessarily there to last the life of the institution. If the need for them disappears, then they can be dissolved. Livonia was very sparsely attended at the beginning, but it is burgeoning now. Perhaps we shouldn't sign long-term leases.
- This highlights the shortcomings of the data, where we are not able to see who our students are. Before we go forward with another site, we need to have written documents outlining the plan. We need an open and transparent process, given that there are so many investment needs on campus.
- Some more can be said about items number thirteen and fourteen. For example, some of the unresolved issues and unanswered questions can be captured; this might help make a determination. This subcommittee should send us something that we can incorporate.
- Agreement with transparency in the process was expressed. Academia does not move quickly. The CE has been on the leading edge, and they have been able to respond quickly to trends and opportunities. We should not put into place a process that impedes the ability to meet market demand. If we wait until everyone else has done it, it's too late. CE has the charge to stay on the leading edge. Let's not become victims of "paralysis by analysis."
- The other question about number thirteen is that on page 6, the Commission says that we are not dealing with study abroad, yet there is a recommendation concerning it. It was suggested that recommendation be either eliminated, or better-defined. Perhaps we can suggest that this undergo further scrutiny in a different venue. It was decided to leave the recommendation that this item be examined, as we have different programs abroad, and they should be looked at.
- The subcommittee was not able to identify documents that were made available to them that showed any sort of plan for the off-campus sites. If this quantity of money is being spent, there should be some sort of advisory committee overseeing it. This doesn't necessarily mean that the process will slow to a halt.
- It was mentioned that the CE advisory board lays this information out very clearly – more so, in fact, than in the academic departments.
- If the subcommittee could not get to that documentation, there is some sort of wall, as other people say they had access to them. The subcommittee stated that they asked many times for marketing studies.
- Perhaps these documents could be posted on a web site identifying the scope and mission of the site. There could be a format in which three or four key issues are addressed before any new sites get launched; we don't have a standard protocol for these sites. All the information about each site was probably not captured in a single document for each.
- In terms of programs, there is an extensive program plan that is written clearly and very well thought out. There is a six-step process that has been developed for program development, but not everyone understands how to utilize it.
- Some clarification was requested about the third paragraph on page 11, which begins with "The main findings..." It was explained that this refers to two EMUs: (1) the on-campus delivery model, where the faculty work

roughly from 8:00 to 5:00 and want to stay on campus, and the students follow the same pattern, and (2) the other EMU which consists of alternate hours and alternate locations. There are two mind sets on the campus and there needs to be some sort of mind meld between them. The wedge might be as simple as the parking issue, which unfortunately, is our reputation. If the two mind sets remain, there needs to be some articulation.

- This question might be resolved by looking at the issue not in terms of one EMU versus the other, but more in terms of whether a course of action fits the EMU vision. It was replied that this might happen with anything in this document, but the committee feels very strongly about the two EMUs.
- It is very important to clear up any confusion for students about this. There are stories about people being advised not to take courses off campus, as they will not count.
- The mental models being considered here are not the reality. Students take some combination of CE and regular offerings, and the regular offerings are themselves becoming less rigid. It harms us to produce this dichotomy between people who innovate and people who are “stuffy.” The Subcommittee asserted that no value judgments were made on the different models.
- There is actually a continuum of delivery methods. We are driving a wedge between faculty who teach completely, online and those who teach completely on campus.
- The fact that this dichotomy exists should not be swept under the rug. The number of faculty who have not been permitted to teach online courses speaks to this. There are obstacles to those who want to teach in non-traditional formats.
- Our students’ behavior seems to indicate that it’s a convenience factor.
- There is a subset on campus who say that things should be done “only the way they have always been done.” Another subset says that we should be doing things “only the way they are going to be.” There is a middle ground.
- This is more about our own faculty culture than about our students; there is some tension about whether we value nontraditional and traditional delivery equally. There are multiple identities at EMU, and no shared vision
- There are lots of issues that need to be addressed that are not related to faculty issues, and that lie outside of us and academics, such as parking.
- Another issues is that of advisors overriding what the department sets as a viable course. This situation should not exist, but it does and should be identified and addressed.
- There is a lack of consistency, in terms of there being two distinct roads when it comes to CE and regular course offerings. The subcommittee looked at the reality, and found animosity for CE on this campus in addition to support. Figuring out the CE issue is why this commission is part of the contract. The subcommittee looked at it from that perspective.
- It was observed that this report is based on anecdotal evidence, but reads as if it were based on careful analysis.
- Resistance to the things we are discussing may not persist, as the issues become more familiar to the various constituencies. The changes that will come about can be seen as healthy, though change can be startling. We have to fight the notion that these changes are not good. The bottom line is that these changes are very positive, and will take place over a small period of time, relative to the institution’s existence.

- The culture that has been allowed to promulgate around here is more traditionally focused. Our concern should be how to break that cultural atmosphere. You have to have a continuum, and look at that continuum in terms of resources, etc.
 - However, dichotomous discourse is detrimental to both sides of the dichotomy.
 - It's important to remember that all these programs are EMU programs, and these are all EMU students. No more information than that is necessary, but we do need to know how to hold on to them. More data are not needed; what is needed is more communication on how we do things. Whether they take courses here or there, they are still getting an EMU degree.
 - CE data are driven by what is offered where.
 - The history of CE might explain the tension of the dichotomy. CE was a separate unit and was not embraced by the academic units, who were not involved with it. That era created skepticism, and those who still resist it might not be in touch with where CE is now. It might not be a dichotomous point of view, but there are misconceptions. People don't understand how it's more sophisticated, in that there is an array of full programs, not a potpourri of unrelated offerings.
 - It seems that we've moved so fast that we can't keep up with our momentum. There is more buy-in and understanding as younger faculty come to campus.
 - Some of that conflict was necessary in order to arrive at where we are today.
 - In terms of wording, the introduction to the recommendations has a very hard edge. The rhetoric on page 12 refers to not being able to make valid recommendations, but then recommendations are made. There are formatting difficulties.
 - Issue titles could be removed. Ellen Hoffmann would need to be contacted in order to edit her contribution.
- c. Online and Distance Education Subcommittee Report
- Smaller pieces of data were included wherever possible, but there were some huge spreadsheets which could not be included.
 - It would be a good idea to add a copy of the eLearning standards to recommendation number one.
 - There are no faculty salaries allocated to the departments for spring/summer. On page 22 "The 10% salary..." make sure this is stated precisely.
 - Add to the sentence about overrides on page 23-24 that this actually helps students out. This affects the overall budget.
 - Our discussion is reinforcing the two-university dichotomy. Why are faculty being rewarded for overrides in online courses, and not for on-campus courses.
 - Every academic department gives compensation for this differently.
 - There are tangible limits to compensation for on-campus teaching that don't exist on line. There are some unique issues that would be good to talk about as well.
 - The emphasis in our committee was that it is all voluntary, and that has led to the success of our online program. EMU is the leader and we have been sought out as a model.
 - We should go through the appendices, and indicate the date and source of the data wherever it appears. Subcommittees please help indicate where the data come from.
 - Someone from the online group give us data sources.

- The lettering system is confusing; there is a hard page break which needs to be fixed.
 - 202 out of a total of ---- - percentage response. P. 4?
- d. Organization and Budget Models Subcommittee Report
- This section has bulleted points and clear breaks. The formatting needs to be consistent and readable.

VI. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Akosua Slough
Recording Secretary