

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery

April 8, 2005
2:30-4:30
G11 Boone Hall

Attendees: D. Barton, J. DeCamp, D. deLaski-Smith, H. Eiss, R. Fulkert, A. Hogan, B. Lahidji, B. Leopard, P. Leighton, D. Loppnow, R. Lucas, D. Malone, C. McAnuff, S. Menzel, D. Mielke, L. Nybell, D. Pearson, L. Rocklage

Absent: E. Hoffman, K. Kustron, S. Nelson, J. Palladino, W. Shell, D. Silverman, J. Tracy, T. Venner, K. Victor-Burke C. Willis

Guest(s): D. Gaymer

The meeting was convened at 2:37 p.m.

Agenda Items:

- I. Review of Minutes:
 - a. March 11, 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 *****NOTE TIME CHANGE*******
- IV. Review of Materials Distributed:
 - a. Agenda Topics
 - b. Minutes for the March 11, 2003 meeting
 - c. Commission Final Report Outline Draft
- V. Topics of Discussion:

- a. The following points were brought up during the discussion: “Final Report Process and Organization:”
- The meeting began with a review of the report template prepared by the Provost as a response to Commission members’ requests for some direction as far as final report format.
 - This is only intended as a guideline; subcommittees will address parts of this outline in varying degrees, depending on relevance. More headings may need to be added.
 - As originally envisioned, the process for creating the final report included having a meeting composed of one representative from each subcommittee to discuss the issues and agree on how the draft will be written. At least one subcommittee has begun the final writing process.
 - The report will contain action recommendations, both far-reaching (strategic directions), or more immediate.
 - It was pointed out that some of the strategic efforts brought up by subcommittees are running on parallel tracks, and it was asked if the Commission’s report would be part of EMU’s strategic planning process. Some of the recommendations would impact academics, and some might well relate to strategic planning, Faculty Council, deans and department heads. The report is supposed to suggest to the campus community which issues relating to instructional delivery need to be addressed. Also, in the context of collective bargaining, we might just be identifying unresolved issues. There are multiple uses of the report that can be envisioned, including policy implications.
 - It was noted that any recommendations that require funding where there is none are of concern, and should be included in Academic Affairs strategic planning.
 - However, as it is a presidential commission, there is the potential for positive budgetary impact and increase of revenue stream.
 - The Organization and Budget Models subcommittee also provided some information on a distribution mechanism for increased revenue.
 - The revenues were always in Academic Affairs and would have been up to the Provost to distribute. Relieving Academic Affairs of this budgetary discretion led to resentment against Continuing Education.
 - It is hoped that the Commission outlines a series of initiatives that are more creative in terms of instruction and thinking outside the box. It is difficult to initiate change in higher education. Some of the recommendations have the potential to impact the student services area.
 - If there are rewards for putting in grants, and that money goes back into the departments, it is possible to move to a more self-sufficient model.
 - At least one subgroup didn’t focus on national trends, and dealt more with the complaints about the current model, looking internally rather than externally. This section of the report can be eliminated if it isn’t needed; it should only be used wherever applicable.
 - Literature can be listed under national trends in the appendices.
 - It is really challenging to find this sort of information on a website. To get more info we would have needed to do surveys, etc. It may be difficult to find this on line because EMU is at the forefront of this sort of investigation.

- Continuing Education has contracted with a company called Eduventures to do a study on models and budgets at other institutions. It might be possible to fold this into the report.
 - Remember that this template is just a guide to help subcommittees form individual reports. “National Trends” could become part of “Description and Analysis of Current EMU practices,” as a comparison tool.
- b. The following points were brought up during the subcommittee reports:
 - The On-Line/Distance Education Subcommittee has not met since the last full Commission meeting.
 - The Innovation Subcommittee has begun a final outline and has assigned pieces for drafting and sharing. They should soon have some summary data analysis from the survey to include.
 - The On-Campus Delivery Subcommittee has identified the tasks that need to be done.
 - The Off-Campus Subcommittee has not met since the last full Commission meeting.
 - The Organization and Budget Models Subcommittee are corresponding by e-mail to move closer to resolution.
 - There were no additional items that subcommittee members felt should be brought up for discussion by the Commission as a whole.
- c. The following points were brought up during the discussion “Commission Process and Timeline:”
 - The Commission timeline ending in May was envisioned with the intent of having a report to submit to the Board of Regents at their June meeting. However, it was decided that having a final draft subcommittee report by the meeting on May 6 was not feasible.
 - It was suggested that the Commission adopt a two-tier approach to the report: the first draft would focus on things that are immediately actionable, particularly things that may have to be built into the budget for the Board to approve in June. Even a heads-up could be raised at the cabinet level, then built into the budget.
 - Ideally the report would be done by the latter part of May, be in the forefront shortly after the arrival of the new president, have it to Faculty Council at their fall meeting, and impact budget-building for the new fiscal year. Any revenue distribution may be able to be implemented in the coming fiscal year, for example (in consultation with Continuing Education).
 - Delaying the final report might be advantageous as it gives more time to get survey information. However, late findings might negate findings released earlier.
 - It was agreed that Subcommittees will come with either a draft or actionable items by the May 6 meeting date, when the meeting will be at 10:00 a.m. The whole Commission should see the report as a whole. Delaying by a month means that action on the report is delayed a year.
 - Subcommittees should meet between now and then and with the revised outline in mind, bring as much as they can to the May 6th meeting.
 - Most important is to identify issues and questions that might have budget-building implications for next year, and if you have a proposal, bring it forward for deliberation at the Cabinet level.

- o Even if the draft is not done, at least lift out the issues that can be brought before the Board.
- d. The following points were brought up during the discussion “Final Thoughts on Revenue:”
- The Budget Subcommittee is within the bounds of the faculty contract with their recommendation for compensation.
 - The problem with shifting money around within net revenues, is that this is done at the discretion of the Provost; but if it is beyond the net revenues, then it comes from somewhere else.
 - It will be a matter of how existing resources are distributed. A convincing argument for the Cabinet will hinge on by demonstrating that an action will increase revenue elsewhere.
 - Assuming that all the more positive assumptions for next fiscal year start to fall into place, and that the division can handle all the budget reductions it must absorb; if we can hold sacrosanct the difference in budget contributions between fiscal years, that can be used for extra items. However, that assumes that other things are relatively even, including Continuing Education’s ability to maintain that revenue.
 - The Cabinet has been responsive to budget-generating ideas. There is a general trend to an openness to try new things.

VI. Home Work

- a. Subcommittees should meet between now and then and with the revised outline in mind, bring as much as you can. Most important is to identify issues and questions that might have budget-building implications for next year, and if you have a proposal, bring it forward for deliberation at the Cabinet level. Even if the draft is not done, at least lift out the issues that can be brought before the Board.

VII. Adjournment

- b. The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Akosua Slough
Recording Secretary