

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery
Subcommittee on Off-Campus Programs

December 9, 2004
Boone Hall

Attendees: B. Lahidji, D. Malone, T. Venner, L. Nybell
Absent: R. Fulkert, S. Menzel
Guests: None

The meeting was convened about 10:15 am.

Agenda items:

- I. Approval of the minutes: (not applicable)
- II. Additional agenda items: None
- III. Meeting schedules
 - a. Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery meeting dates.
 - October 20, 2004, 6:00-8:00 University House
 - November 19, 2004, 3:00-5:00 G11 Boone
 - December 3, 2004, 3:00-5:00, G11 Boone
 - **January 14, 2005: 3:00-5:00**
 - **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**
 - b. Subcommittee on off-campus classes
(Future meeting schedule not established)
- IV. Review of materials distributed: (none)
- V. Topics of Discussion

The committee members presented conducted a general discussion of experiences, possibilities and concerns with off-campus programming at EMU. Among the points that emerged were the following:

1. The possibilities and limits of current budget structures. Bob Lahidji suggested that off-campus programming allows the University at least potentially to expand the program in counties of the region where population is growing. This comment was followed by a brief discussion of how the present funding and budgeting structure for off-campus programs sometimes limits the development of off-campus programs in response to such possibilities. Dawn Malone gave examples of programs that are “too expensive” to take off-campus under the current model. In doctoral programs, for example, faculty received increased workload credit, which makes the program too costly for the current CE model, where the “unit of concern” is the individual program. There was discussion of a widely shared concern about the flow of the “profits” from CE programs out of Academic Affairs. This concern surfaced strongly in AAUP contract negotiations.

2. Possibilities and limitations of the concept of “profit” in CE. Lynn Nybell suggested that the way in which the University is analyzing the “profitability” of CE programs is misleading, as the cost of the research, development and accreditation of courses and programs continues to be borne by the departments. It was noted that at the November Commission meeting, Dan Gaymer made a similar (though somewhat narrower) point in relationship to CE’s use of University facilities and infrastructure.

On the other hand, Bob Lahidji noted that the business-oriented approach of CE was generally seen to be helpful in driving innovation. Lynn also suggested that innovation is generally driven by faculty. In Social Work, for example, faculty made the decision to launch an evening and weekend graduate program in order to reach out to potential students who did not have access to graduate education. However, the way that such activities are reported—as “CE”—underwrites the view that all growth and innovation is occurring outside of “traditional departments.”

Dawn Malone argued that most departments were much less oriented to innovation and “boundary spanning.” She gave examples of ways in which CE is substantively involved in promoting innovative programs. Tom Venner suggested that for most departments CE provided a model of discovery and implementation. One alternative is to have a mini-CE model implemented in every unit. That would integrate CE with traditional education. It was noted that many department don’t have and don’t cultivate such capacities.

3. Examples and possibilities of success. While there was no focused discussion of this topic, examples arose in the course of discussion. “Parsons property” was mentioned as an example of innovative collaboration between departments and CE. The engineering management program was another. Other excellent possibilities exist to develop and extend the University’s mission with high quality programs, for example in areas like art history.

4. Possibilities and concerns about academic integrity of off-campus programs. Committee members also discussed EMU’s vision of off-campus programming as being conducted in association with Departments, unlike programs that have relied heavily or exclusively on part time faculty with less concern about academic integrity.

VI. Homework

It was suggested the committee members have the opportunity to review any evaluative data that has been developed about off-campus programming. Dawn Malone agreed to assemble available information.

VII. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Nybell, Social Work

Recorder