

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

February 4, 2005  
3:00-5:00  
G11, Boone Hall

**Attendees:** D. deLaski-Smith, H. Eiss, R. Fulkert, A. Hogan, K. Kustron, B. Leopard, D. Loppnow, R. Lucas, D. Malone, C. McAnuff, S. Menzel, D. Mielke, L. Nybell, J. Palladino, D. Pearson, L. Rocklage, W. Shell, D. Silverman, J. Tracy, T. Venner, K. Victor-Burke,

**Absent:** D. Barton, J. Beaghan, J. DeCamp, E. Hoffman, B. Lahidji, P. Leighton, S. Nelson, C. Willis

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

The meeting was convened at 3:00 p.m.

**Agenda Items:**

I. Review of Minutes:

- a. December 3, 2005
- b. January 14, 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 1, 2005; 3:00-5:00***
  - ***May 6, 2005; 3:00-5:00***

IV. Review of Materials Distributed:

- a. Agenda Topics
- b. Rank of Michigan Community College Transfers Enrolled at Eastern Michigan University, Fall 2004
- c. Excerpts from the EMU-AAUP Faculty Contract, relating to Continuing Education
- d. Class Schedule Distribution Analysis, Fall 2004

- e. Subcommittee Progress Report worksheet
- f. Suggestions/Feedback worksheet
- g. Presentation handouts:
  - a. History and Evolution of Off-Campus Programs (D. Malone and J. Tracy)
  - b. Program Plan Priority (K. Cullen)

V. Topics of Discussion:

- a. The following points were brought up during the presentation “History and Evolution of Off-Campus Programs:”
  - J. Tracy and D. Malone began the presentation by passing out samples of marketing publications, as they are really important to the program.
  - The history of off-campus programs was next presented; please see their handout for details.
  - With reference to the history of these programs, EMU was offering courses in Flint as an extension center. We’ve been offering a full program there since 1953, indicative of a trend of opening doors through becoming service centers to the community. EMU was the center for community education. In the 1970s we received Mott funding, and became a regional center for the eastern seaboard. We need to be aware of this movement, and the foundation money which helped shape that philosophy.
  - The Department of Leadership and Counseling was one of the first to move to the off-campus sites with full programs in the mid 1990s, as a result of examining the movement and competition that were taking place in the market for their discipline. This was in direct response to the market – students were shopping for “product.” Brand name has become less of an issue in terms of students making decisions of where to do their coursework and where to get their degrees from.
  - The Budget and Organizational Models Subcommittee had a whole conversation about off-campus programs. The predominate model is a centralized/decentralized one, where the delivery model is centralized. The product is totally developed in terms of what is going off campus, who is going to deliver it, etc. In the decentralized model, the marketing function takes place out of CE. In terms of packaging, CE professionals know how and what people are “buying.” In terms of faculty services – we need to offer the same support on campus as off, such as advising, and other support systems, so that these programs are as comparable to those offered on campus as possible. The interplay with CE helps provide for student needs and to shape the program.
  - Students are able to work with financial aid to make sure that they are getting it if they need it. There are reporting structures for financial aid.
  - Sometimes the system works very well, and sometimes not. It was important to give the history of these programs to clear up any misconceptions based on the past, and we have to stress that the support systems are better than they were.
  - In response to a question that was asked about whether when courses offered off-campus are considered in-load, it was stated that it is all considered in-load. Office hours can be off campus. This provides a good example of the disconnect between the people designing these programs and the people delivering and taking them. Trying to help people feel connected was assisted by a rotational schedule; the faculty made the strategic decision to move full programs into every off-campus center and do a two-year rotation in each of them. In the hiring process of the Educational Leadership faculty, it is made very clear that a person will be teaching off campus, because that is where the market is for our future. This is not part of the contract and people cannot be made to do it, but they don’t

need to be made to do it We have very reasonable areas of delivery. The Counseling faculty are not nearly as receptive. The Educational Leadership faculty have more of a philosophy of delivering services to constituencies. There are smaller offerings for counseling off-campus, but they were able to develop a product that is deliverable off-campus, and maintain the quality.

- Undergraduate off-campus programs are labeled a “bachelor completion program,” and are usually done in partnership with a community college. Five of seven sites offer this – articulation agreements and contracts are essential to making this work. Advising for this kind of program is more difficult than anything else.
- To establish best practices a process was developed by looking at many different benchmarks, such as accreditation groups, etc.
- Idea generation is the most important part of the process. These ideas are not well received if they come from CE. As an example of demand from the community: Lansing called and asked for an early childhood education program to be offered in Brighton, and they would bring state money to Livingston county if we could partner with them. The demand is there and courses have been full ever since inception. Ideas coming from faculty are a little more difficult to act upon. Sometimes faculty bring ideas for courses that are not doing very well on campus, and therefore do not do well off campus (market research is done).
- This process has been honed in, and department heads have a lot to do with how effective, well-received, and streamlined it is. This model has been quite successful when the pieces all fall into place
- The College of Business started this. CE funds a line for three years for six courses, and then can get four more. If the line was successful after three years, the line would be added to that department’s budget. We have had five of these be successful so far.
- We kept running into situations where there was a disconnect between faculty expertise and course demands – money was there, but not in the right bucket. There were huge demands with no resources to meet them. CE has resources if there is demand.
- One of the dilemmas there is filling regular faculty spaces with someone funded by CE. Nursing has one regular line and one CE. The deans have to negotiate for different circumstances – it’s how the deans argue for the position and make the argument for the position.
- It’s important to make the distinction that CE does not have faculty lines; departments have faculty lines, CE has funding. It’s a capacity, not a particular person. It is the leadership and how they carry it through that makes all the difference.
- With reference to the question whether compensation for time spent in travel to these locations and whether it is financial or in credit hour production, the response was that there is no policy on this. It is hoped that the Commission will consider this, and the Off-Campus Subcommittee has brought it up
- Faculty would prefer that these courses be considered hybrid, but they are fully CE. This raised the question of how hybrid is defined, in terms of percentage of on-line versus face-to-face. Instead of hybrid, web-enhanced is a better term to use, and the percentage question has not been answered yet. There is going to be a course offered with reduced contact, as opposed to a course with full contact. That’s as far as it has gotten.
- We sometimes walk away from offerings due to a course not meeting capacity or mission. This is hard to accept sometimes.

- There are institutions similar to EMU who use the philosophy just described to a point, but when they find a demand for something for which they don't have expertise at the moment, but there is expertise in the community, they have the understanding with their faculty that they can hire adjuncts just for those courses. They feel the same way we do about academic integrity, etc, but they do this differently.
- Ways to integrate this would be beneficial.
- K Cullen described her job, which is building program plans and working with academic departments, and getting it all down on paper so CE can look at it.
- Discussions about purpose and rationale have been done as a full faculty, or as a full program then brought to the full faculty.
- In market feasibility studies, usually 10% of the people who express interest in a course can be counted on to participate. You have to have a way to reach your target. You market programs by telling students how they are going to complete the program. Before they launch a program they have to know all of this.
- In response to being asked which motivations play a role in program selection, one of the student Commission members noted flexibility as being very important. It was also speculated that these two representatives can't speak for all students at EMU, and it was noted that the Commission needs a lot more student input.
- The financial plan is a projection, a guideline, to see if a course is viable.
- The rollout is a plan of study, a schedule of courses that gets students through in a certain amount of time.
- The process length for creating programs is very variable, as departments work very differently and at very different speeds. It is a very fluid process and looks very different, depending on the faculty it concerns. Having gone through program review assisted the department because much of the groundwork was done. There is a desire that every program will have a program plan in place so the trends can be examined and evaluated, in all the criteria on which the program was based. This would create a reality check on an annual basis. Cost of marketing, and the recruitment process could also be monitored.
- An example of the cooperation of CE is that in the Special Education department, the process was interrupted due to eight faculty members retiring at once. The department was allowed to stop until they got more faculty on board to be part of that moving forward. The department appreciated this very much and the acceptance level of CE changed within the department.
- It is important to remember that the ultimate experience is about the student. Trying to keep departments and faculty happy contributes to that.
- There was a question about meshing an annual review schedule with the schedule of rolling out a unit. The answer was that once a unit is rolled out, it gets examined after a cohort goes through, as it remains in place until those students complete it whether it fails or not.
- It was suggested that tracking completion and enrollment rates would be interesting (do students tend to enroll every semester, two out of the four, etc.). The results might not be what we expect. Enrollment trends are considered, but this is a new process, so there is no history yet. Every center has a student tracking database, and students who don't enroll in a given semester are contacted, and trends are examined.
- There is only an advisory group to the EMU-Detroit center, because the issues in Detroit are somewhat unique, and the mission there is to be a service entity. This was a decision based not on credit hour generation, but on how EMU can service

the community there. In order to ensure this, the advisory board includes active EMU alumni, representatives from the religious community, the Northwest Activity Center, the Detroit Public Schools, and EMU on-campus faculty. They get together three or four times a year to outline what they can do.

- In the spirit of having feedback and guidance from the local area, it would be good to have advising in all remote locations. That would be difficult only in Livonia because of not having as strong a sense of community there. The person in that position is EMU's representation to that community, and is how we are spreading EMU.
- It is important to remember that departments have advisory boards on campus, and include representatives from off-campus sites for some of that inclusion and relationships.
- Advising is an issue for fully on-line programs. We don't have the budget to get input from an advisory board. We have to have money to provide the value of those people. It was suggested that this be built into the program plan as a cost of delivery.
- In answer to the question about what our presence at Washtenaw Community College is, we now have a liaison office through Enrollment Services to help ease transfer. That's the only one where we have a staffed office. CE provides unofficial advising for all students who would like to transfer in. However, Washtenaw Community College courses are offered at the Eagle Crest. We don't use sites at Washtenaw because, if students can drive there, they can drive to EMU. An example was given of a course at Washtenaw with cross-registration for EMU students. The course ended up being all EMU students, because parking was easier there. This experiment was not repeated. This happens at some of the other off-campus sites, but is carefully monitored. New off-campus sections are not opened up until all the on-campus sections are full.
- It is important to try to avoid the illusion of that we are finding new populations, when we are really just shifting the same population because of convenience.
- There are some data that show clearly that students would not be taking those courses if they were not available in that format or at those locations. If we don't offer it where they need it, they will go to another institution, not to EMU.
- We offer programs, not courses. We don't market courses and recruit for courses. Overall institutional numbers are increasing.
- The College of Business looked at this specifically, and found a Saturday morning cohort that takes courses almost exclusively within that timeframe. You get a cohort mentality that students are there for that program, not just for that course. Doing "splattering" of courses would be very worrisome. This is a source of tension with the faculty because the faculty might want to test a course, but then get told they can't because it won't work.
- Convenience is driving students' decisions.
- There is a population of students from other universities home for the summer who want to take courses here, which shouldn't be ignored. We run ads for students, but we don't get the interest.
- We are not friendly to them due to difficulty in processing, registering, etc.
- We need to focus the marketing towards population sharing. Program directors are sending students out of sequence.
- In some programs it has been difficult to graduate students into on-campus courses, but great strides in enrollment have been made. We do need to work on Enrollment Services so that if students want to, they can get in.

- Enrollment Services data would indicate a much greater demand for spring and summer evening courses than you would think. One of our sister institutions is offering a program where if a student takes six credits or more, and buys ten meals per week on a meal ticket, they get free housing for the summer. It has been very successful. We can do more creative things and more things that are responsive to student needs and student demands on campus than we are now doing. Currently we are scheduled along more traditional lines, and even evening courses are primarily in programs which are exclusively offered in the evening.
- b. The following points were brought up during the presentation “Examining the Data:”
  - The Community Colleges handout is not entirely correct.
  - These data are just a start. There are so many different variables and ways of interpreting data, but we should not get too preoccupied with details. We are not tracking every student, but looking at scheduling patterns.
  - In looking at the *Class Schedule Distribution Analysis*, it was explained that these findings do not represent any sort of planning at a divisional level, and do not follow any traditional scheduling patterns. It’s hard to know the reason for this distribution, whether it is student-driven, represents convenience for faculty, or has a pedagogical rationale.
  - Is there anything in writing that outlines how courses are to be scheduled? Historically there has been, but the guidelines do not reflect this behavior.
  - Will the database lend itself to do a capacity utilization run? There has been some discussion about doing centralized classroom scheduling. Most universities do – more than half of the fifteen Michigan universities schedule courses centrally.
  - It would be helpful to see the scheduling broken down by college, and even by discipline, to look at creative scheduling. Also, we have gotten away from set times on scheduling, and that courses don’t roll into each other smoothly. This may reflect student demand, but it also creates difficulty for students with overlapping schedules. This is happening more and more.
  - The Innovations Subcommittee will be doing a survey of faculty and lecturers and students, asking questions like what format they want classes in, when they want to take classes, etc. The faculty are being asked about barriers to innovation, and what sorts of innovation they have seen on other campuses. It was suggested that this survey note whether responding students are graduate or undergraduate.
  - With reference to the subcommittee progress report form; there is overlap and possibly gaps between the subcommittees’ focuses based on their going in whatever direction their discussions are taking them. Please prepare and share with entire commission. There can be collaboration. Send out as word document.
  - The Provost welcomes any critique about how commission is progressing – use the form provided anonymously, if desired.
  - The next meeting will focus on subcommittee reports. We will provide hard copies and ask you to provide an oral report on what you have done. We’ll talk about what might go into a final report, and how we will discuss and digest the work of the subcommittees, and what we will present to the campus community.
  - We have now completed the “orientation” phase of the Commission’s work.
  - If subcommittees have identified other issues for the entire Commission to hear about, they should let us know. Otherwise we need to focus on what is going on in each of the subgroups.
  - There was a request that people look at the Online and Distance Education Subcommittee survey be studied before the Commission reconvenes. Also, there was a suggestion that the subcommittees post their documents as soon as they can.

VI. Home Work

- a. Subcommittees please prepare to report at the next meeting.

VII. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,



Akosua Slough  
Recording Secretary