

Appendix: Coded Responses from:

EMU the Presidential Commission on the Future of Instructional Delivery Survey

Summary of Open-ended questions

The following pages represent the open-ended responses from the survey conducted by the Subcommittee on Innovation. As part of the development of a report by the OnCampus Subcommittee, the members carefully reviewed the responses to get a sense of the issues faculty are raising in terms of campus needs and priorities. The responses often echoed the themes that the Subcommittee had discussed as well as those emerging from full Committee debate, and emphasized the need for careful review of strategies and values.

To assist with the reporting, we have included the coded responses to help other analyze comments and see the issues in the faculty members' own words. We believe that this supports our findings and recommendations, and provides a foundation to use for continuing campus conversations. The emphasis on facilities and technologies that appear uniformly throughout the responses indicates a desperate need for attention to these concerns. A shared vision for solving the problems and moving into the future are essential before there can be the kind of attention to instructional improvement needed for a 21st century institution of higher education.

Coding key:

On campus facilities

Alternative scheduling

Technology

Faculty development

Students

Online learning

Change issues

Faculty workload

UNDERLINE = other themes including reward systems and suggestions for changes

Note the high numbers requesting simple technology improvements to classrooms and standard maintenance in classrooms. Basic service needs are dominating the conversations about teaching. Innovation cannot be a focus in the absence of resolving these widespread concerns.

Question One: What do you perceive are the 3 most critical barriers to instructional delivery innovation?

Lack of funds to establish modern laboratories and other educational settings more consistent with experiential learning. This is especially true in disciplines in which the classroom lecture has been the traditional and primary mode of instruction. But, we are also witnessing an expanding abandonment of the use of experiential teaching in areas, such as undergraduate science, where it was formerly an important mode of instruction. This is not just instantiated by the erosion of labs and expansion of the number of non-lab science course, but in general instruction in the disciplines. Because of the high costs in time and money to set up experiential learning, our classes are increasingly becoming surveys of existing knowledge and less of explorations of the means and techniques of acquiring knowledge. This might be called "survey course creep," and is represented by increasing numbers of courses, even at higher levels, in which instruction about content is replacing instruction about process.

Lack of use and instruction on truly innovative electronic instructional techniques. The web, video, and other "new" methods are primarily used to transmit instruction of traditional design. We do not really have large amounts of innovation. We have traditional lectures and books on the internet; workbooks on websites; lectures on video; meetings via video conference. These are valuable in audience expansion, but they are not innovations. Enhancements of the educational process through the application of mastery-based techniques such as "programmed instruction," which is ideally suited to the computer/web environment, are largely absent in our educational environments--both classroom and electronic--which could sorely use more efficient and effective methods. There seems to be no effort to use of the power of computers or just employ empirically validated pedagogical techniques, educate our instructional staff on its benefits, or establish structures in which course management is regarded as highly as traditional in-class instruction. Insufficient local technical infrastructure. A large part of our potential audience for electronically transmitted instruction cannot avail themselves of it due to poor penetration of higher speed transmission systems and because of excessively high cost when higher speed modes are available due to monopolization of service. (In some areas not served by DSL, high-speed internet can only be obtained if the customer also buys an expensive package of entertainment content.) The increasing use of video and other high-bandwidth content in our internet-based courses handicaps the still large percentage of students who must use phone modems and creates a significant disincentive for people with slower speed system to take internet-based courses. Thus, the ability to innovate his crippled by the lack of an infrastructure capable of widespread transmission of only text and relatively low-resolution still graphics and compressed animation.

Wireless capability in classroom, projection limitations in classroom, and movable/comfortable chairs and workspace for students in the classroom.

Weak or no projectors in the classroom

University seems to want to save money by using e-college rather than to consider actual innovations that will result in better teaching and learning. Is the motivation to save money or to teach better??

University insisting on using the "academic year" model (fall and winter only). Faculty should be encouraged to volunteer for Plan C.

Traditional scheduling Faculty resistance to change from the norm without adequate motivating incentives
Institutional bureaucracy in terms of structuring the timetable schedule

Too many students in class	Financial restraints	Lack of knowledge on innovations
Too many service demands	Too many classes for the available prep time	Lack of equipment maintenance
Time, energy, motivation.		
time money		
Time to plan	Resources	Modeling
time to develop, should be considered part of load	technological and design support....	content expertise is why faculty are hired
SCH requirements	prevent team teaching	
time to develop new types of courses	the new Gen Ed has no technology requirement!!!!!!	Big mistake!!!!
The university has simply not been willing to invest money in this		
The time it would take me to reformat my class materials for PowerPoint or other media	Lack of enough "smart" classrooms	
The three barriers to instructional delivery innovation are (1) lack of human resources (technical assistance), (2) training (most of us are self taught, and the technologies (software) keep changing, and we find ourselves behind the learning curve once again, and (3) technological tools (we have media carts, but some of us could use a fully equipped lab setting). Another critical concern is security. A nuisance factor is the SPAM we get every day.		
The poor facilities in Pray-Harrold, where I teach all of my classes.	The lack of technology for use in classrooms.	time
the need for and lack of technology, maintenance of the technology and EQUIPMENT (drafting tables) needed to instruct and learn effectively, and budget!		
The most fundamental element of education is the immediacy of face-to-face contact and interaction between teacher and students and the guiding of student interactions by the teacher. There is a significant difference between "instruction" and "education" and this is directly evidence by the coupling of "delivery" with "instructional." An approach termed "instructional delivery" is particularly problematic because it assumes that a teacher delivers knowledge or instruction to the student who receives it (i.e. it is an example of the "banking concept of education" articulated by Paulo Freire). Etymologically, "train" and "educate" have different origins and different hermeneutic implications. The first indicates a dragging along behind and used to refer to animals; the latter, to rear or lead forth and seems more appropriate to humans		
technological support	technological instruction	Support for innovative delivery by faculty
Technical support to implement innovations.	Development constraints on time	and access to fully equipped classrooms & equipment. hesitancy among gatekeepers of technology to fully implement and support delivery innovations.
Technical assistance and access (e.g., computer cart w, internet access, dvd, speakers and power point, etc.)		
Teaching students that they have to have a laptop, or that all presentations should be computer based to possess merit; more and more seem to think so.		

<p>Students who are not prepared to be self-motivating to do online/distance assignments. Time to evolve classes utilizing new innovations Infrastructure</p>
<p>Students have not been held accountable for most basic things -spelling, plagiarism, being on time for class etc</p>
<p>Students' attitudes towards learning, such as lack of interest/</p>
<p>stolen equipment</p>
<p>Stagnant faculty Inadequate student support services(appropriate tutors)</p>
<p>space in Pray-Harrold (there is none), lack of technology in the classroom, heating/cooling problems (again in Pray-Harrold).</p>
<p>some classrooms are not equipped</p>
<p>small, dark, hot classrooms difficulty in obtaining equipment and the need to move it from classroom to classroom lack of equipment in the classroom</p>
<p>REsources Resources Knowledge</p>
<p>resources availability time to implement</p>
<p>Research, scholarly and service requirements</p>
<p>Release time and incentives for training and new course development Adequate training opportunities A final decision by the university about platform for online teaching</p>
<p>quality equipment Classroom quality--lights, desks, window shades Release time to develop integrated teaching plans involving new technology</p>
<p>Poorly equipped classrooms. Poor climate control.</p>
<p>Poorly equipped classrooms that are too small for student numbers. No accessibility to DVD / CD / Internet.</p>
<p>Poor Classroom facilities Classroom environmental issues (heat, cold, etc.) Training in new delivery systems</p>
<p>Poor arrangement of classroom relative to the position of the media cart. The mobile media cart.</p>
<p>Planning, direction by university leaders Faculty time for preparation Expense</p>
<p>Our building Marshall has all of the checked areas but not in all of th4e classrooms.</p>
<p>obsolete computer equipment</p>
<p>Not having group work areas or tables to gather around Not having a computer with internet connection readily available. Not having enough room in the class to do instruction that requires movement.</p>
<p>Not enough smart classrooms in my building. There are limited computers available on carts for faculty to use.</p>

<p>Not enough money for purchase of systems, resulting in inadequate number of systems available for use. If there are no systems to use, you cannot become adept at using them. Inadequate support, other than for online classes. Instruction in use of systems.</p>
<p>Not enough functional chairs in classrooms. Heat in classrooms > 80 or < 60. Outdated/unmaintained AV & computer equipment. If EMU (as opposed to an individual Department or faculty member) provides it, it will old and broken.</p>
<p>No VCR or computers in the classroom.</p>
<p>No mechanism for interdisciplinary courses. There are several topics that cover material in more than one department but the individual departments do not want to consider letting other faculty with knowledge on these topics teach courses. <u>We need to establish a SEPARATE mechanism for identifying interdisciplinary courses taught by individuals.</u></p>
<p>No computers or computer projections in the classrooms</p>
<p>Most administrators who evaluate teaching have neither designed nor ever taught an online course. It's frustrating to have a person who has never been on a driver's seat evaluate driving.</p>
<p>Money.</p>
<p>Money, development time, & training</p>
<p>Money Time to learn.</p>
<p>Money Instruction for faculty</p>
<p>money and access to older buildings like Qirk</p>
<p>Lack of wireless connections in all classroom buildings; Lack of flexibility in allowing for team-teaching -difficult to schedule and still get a full teaching load; Access to videos etc</p>
<p>Lack of wireless access in ALL buildings; Systemic barriers to team teaching; Systemic barriers to alternative formats</p>
<p>Lack of upkeep for what we have and fear of theft. Lack of comfort level with equipment by staff.</p>
<p>Lack of time for development, training, etc.</p>
<p>lack of technology in classrooms, library resources,</p>
<p>Lack of technology in all classrooms.</p>
<p>lack of technology (I teach in Quirk) lack of knowledge on how to use technology (on the part of both instructors and students)</p>
<p>Lack of technology</p>
<p>Lack of technical support/training Student obligations (work, family, commute)</p>
<p>lack of resources-technology inflexibility in class scheduling rigid thinking</p>

Lack of reliable computer projection facilities in most classrooms. <u>Keypads</u> for recording student responses (once computer facilities are available).
Lack of projection system in classrooms, especially in Pray-Harrold. Marshall should be the model. Lack of computer and projector in classrooms for the use of Powerpoint.
Lack of <u>planning time</u> ; lack of assistance with planning; <u>lack of communication of what is available</u> .
Lack of laptops and power point projector for all classrooms <u>Small space allocated for blackboards (I like blackboards, not white boards)</u> <u>Comfortable and decent chairs for the students to sit on. It's embarrassing how many of our classrooms in Mark Jefferson have horrid old wood stools with cracked seats and backs.</u> I'm mortified at the beginning of every semester but eventually the students stop complaining about the miserable chairs. I've brought this up many times, but the horrible old chairs never seem to disappear. Also in non-lab rooms, we have these horrible <u>little desk chairs</u> that no one over 125 pounds can sit in. Plus they have <u>tilted desk tops</u> , so the students' books and notebooks are always slipping off.
Lack of instructor or student technology skills <u>Interaction between students and instructors on-line (Live chats are slow, but do create a class "bond")</u> <u>Ability to incorporate audio/visual presentation material into the on-line environment -but this is improving</u>
Lack of instructor expertise
Lack of information on alternatives <u>Bureaucracy of determining equivalencies</u> <u>Lack of staff support outside of 8-5 M-F</u>
Lack of funds <u>Faculty stuck in rut</u> <u>Common syllabi</u>
Lack of flexibility in course meeting times because of scheduling problems in Pray-Harrold; Lack of computer access in classrooms.
Lack of equipment <u>Lack of training</u> <u>No access to web in most class rooms</u>
Lack of equipment
<u>-Lack of departmental issued Laptops</u> <u>-Limited electrical wiring</u> <u>-Lack of instructional support for integrating technologies</u>
Lack of contact with colleagues outside the department. <u>Mandated larger class sizes, not appropriate for optimal instruction in certain arts-related skills-based courses.</u> <u>Lack of equipment and funding.</u>
lack of classroom technology <u>lack of planning time heavy teaching load with 4 preps</u>
INTERNET CONNECTION WIRELESS COMMUNICATION HARDWARE SOFTWARE
<u>Intellectual Property permissions for digital images</u> <u>Digital Projectors in all the classrooms</u> <u>Wireless connections throughout</u>
<u>Inadequate time to focus on continuous improvement of instruction.</u> <u>Already receiving positive feedback from students about instructional techniques</u> <u>Lack of up-to-date audio visual and technological equipment</u>
<u>Inadequate supply of overhead projectors. The projectors are never cleaned. It is more difficult to get the materials to create <u>overheads</u>, because of SS&M cutbacks.</u>

I am unable to assess that at this moment because I am a new lecturer and haven't gotten my feet really wet, yet.
Heavy workload of professors Building conditions EMUs standing at the state level resulting in low funding and thus an inability to keep up with technology
Fixed chairs with side desks prevent collaborative learning opportunities (or at least make them very difficult). Lack of multimedia presentation capability IN EVERY CLASSROOM; makes us look particularly bad during candidate interviews.
Faculty workload, continuing education's duplicity in luring us into arrangements where they then renege on their end of the bargain, and lack of incentives
Faculty resistance to technology Student motivation Student perception of teaching and learning
Faculty not comfortable with technology, technology not easily available for use in the classroom, no time to learn how to use the technology that is available.
Faculty in my college are encouraged to engage more in service and research with little mention of teaching. As recent as 3/18/05, release time was offered by the dean of my college for developing a "research agenda." In addition, release time has been granted for specified areas of service. In the many years that I have been in this college, I have never seen release time offered to develop a "teaching agenda" -even though "excellence in teaching" is part of EMU's mission statement. In my academic unit, it is well understood that if you want tenure and promotion you better produce in scholarly activity and that teaching is a given. Since there is a limited amount of time and human energy, many professors, at least in my unit, put their time and efforts where it counts the most. In other words, the major barrier to instructional delivery innovation is the lip service given to it by many -faculty and administrators.
Faculty in a rut.
faculty development, enough equipment for all who want to use it for teaching, enough equipment to use as a tools for students in every classroom.
Faculty and administrators.
Facility problems (age and condition of some buildings such as Mark Jefferson, Strong and Pray-Harrold) and classrooms
facilities Our facilities are severely lacking, old, and not kept up. We cannot have a technology savvy university in old dilapidated facilities. I teach in Warner and its disgusting. The windows are either gone or the drapes falling off. The heat is unpredictable. There is no air conditioning for spring/summer instruction (making it impossibly uncomfortable to downright unhealthy). No ventilation so the wrestling smell comes into my classroom.
End users with slow or older computers have significant difficulty accessing Web Enhanced class materials such as chat rooms and even PowerPoint study guides due to java issues. Equipment in classrooms does not work properly (poor maintenance). Software that is supposedly on the computers isn't really there.
EMU has good support for innovation.

Difficulty of creating team-taught courses in the registration system and the department accounting system.
Current classrooms
Course development time, cost, quality of technical support
cost, experience using
Computer, Projector Class too small to accommodate enrolled students Application video's to illustrate real world applications
Comfortable class rooms multi media compatible Heat or air conditioning app for season.
Classrooms too small for my lower divisions class numbers Media limitations
Classroom setting, lack of technology, mgt. responsibilities
building condition, rooms/space, hardware
Availability Training in use Systematic instruction in methodologies which can enhance instruction.
At EMU, I perceive these barriers to be: 1. Small classroom sizes 2. Lack of technology friendly classrooms for all classes. 3. Seems like lack of funding for innovations?
adequate controls over quality and student performance in online courses (secure proctored testing sites) reliable, available equipment
Access to technology on a regular basis...in all classrooms, all the time. I have better classroom facilities off campus with smart classrooms (Brighton). The need to check-out the one projection unit held by the department and then wheel it from room to room is cumbersome and inefficient. I suspect that departments are hesitant to develop an extensive battery of on-line courses so long as the FTE generated by these courses is not retained by the department but directed to continuing education.
1-money 2-real desire to improve from the administration 3-willingness to listen to the faculty requests
1. Innovation and creativity is often stifled, discouraged, and not allowed if it is perceived to be outside the scope of the internal initiatives. For example, if a faculty member develops a relationship with an organization, that would like on-site delivery of an entire academic program at their institution, and which would have the critical mass of students to offer such programs, the faculty members and department are not allowed to pursue such an opportunity because it does not fit within the preconceived framework established by Continuing Education. 2. Procedures for use of online material and for payment royalties for use of the material by other faculty have not been put into place or are being ignored by Continuing Education. 3. Although the use of hybrid delivery methods (a combination of online and traditional classroom based delivery) has been increasing in higher education in the U.S., there are not any procedures in place to accommodate this delivery method, to assist faculty in developing courses suitable for this delivery method, or to advertise and explain this delivery method to students.
1. unreliable classroom equipment, and internet connectivity 2. slow processing of email thru emu website, this is critical when interacting on the web, where security requires answering to an email. Sometimes it takes up to one hour for an automatically generated email before it appears in my "emich" mail box and I can continue my online activities. However, if I use my yahoo/hotmail/gmail addresses, when I know there will be an email being sent, it seems to appear right away in my inbox, and it has never taken more than 5 minutes.

<p>1. there are only a few "smart classrooms" i.e., equipped with LCD projector, visual presenter, and laptop connections 2. logistics of team teaching stand in the way of innovation (e.g. which department gets credit hours, how does it affect faculty load) 3 inadequate support staff--smart classrooms have to work--when there is a problem mid-class, someone needs to be on call that can quickly resolve the problem (e.g. replace the lamp--get the network connection)</p>
<p>1. The parking situation on this campus. It is difficult to come and go at unusual times. It is difficulty to transport materials because I can't get close to the building to unload/park. (Consequently I do a lot of online communication from home and I still have a modem hook up there.) 2. Students' desire for passive learning (takes awhile to convince them active learning is best)</p>
<p>1. The classrooms in which I teach are not well designed for contemporary methods of information delivery (i.e., smart classrooms) 2. Time to give learn the newer instructional delivery options.</p>
<p>1. The artificial distinction between CE and "regular" instruction 2. Sill Hall and most of campus do not provide guaranteed computer/projector/internet access with lighting controls for classrooms. See EMULivonia! 3. Reliable ICT services for my.emich and EMU in general. ICT is a disaster and should be made to respond to needs of its customers and not be protected by campus politics.</p>
<p>1. The amount of committee work and other meetings squeeze everything else off the table. 2. The response time and barriers which emerge, from the institutional and administrative levels slow or halt new ideas in their tracks. 3. The difficulty in creating new courses and collaborations--because everyone and every resource is stretched to the breaking point.</p>
<p>1. Technology available in classrooms 2. Tables and chairs versus desks for methods classes 3. Enough room in classrooms to move around, set up different arrangements of furniture to support cooperative groups, etc.</p>
<p>1. Technological backwardness of administration. 2. Cost --money spent on president's home, stadium and bookless/journal-less library instead. 3. Inadequate support for faculty training and upkeep of equipment.</p>
<p>1. Personally lack of ability use anything other than overhead projector in Pray Harrold. The only classrooms with computers are the double section lecture halls, and they all have aging Powermac 8600s. 2. Dept Evaluation Documents & some personnel committees/dept heads/deans do not value innovation. Well thought out innovation still might not be successful and could potentially be punished during promotion/tenure. More generally, reluctance to interpret old DED to include new technology or innovation.</p>
<p>1. money 2. money 3. money</p>
<p>1. Money 2. Facilities 3. Time</p>
<p>1. Money 2. Attitude 3. Time</p>
<p>1. Limited access to technology hardware (ie. To use a student response program in my own classes, I had to purchase a projection system because I need to use it every day in class.) 2. Limited access to software applications 3. Limited tech support for use of technology in instructional settings</p>

1. length of time that it takes to get the "paperwork" / process taken care of; 2. in ability of some approval "stops" to see the vision and need for innovation; 3. favoritism shown to some faculty over others, not consistently / fairly implemented
1. lack of technology training available for part-time lecturers 2. lack of support for part-time lecturers to learn about and use instructional delivery innovation 3. inconsistent function of technology equipment in mediated classrooms
1. Lack of technology and internet wiring in buildings. 2. Space issues (for example, there aren't adequate options for those teaching classes where group work and per formative ensemble investigations are essential to instruction). We need large rooms with flexible furniture. 3. Faculty development seminars (not week long but short sessions) focusing on the "how to" of integrating technology in the classroom could be useful. [Much like that given for eres, content specific sessions with hands on experiential components might help those who are fearful/uncomfortable/or not confident in using the latest
technology.
1. Lack of ongoing support to maintain technical innovations. 2. For online teaching -how will the department benefit if main thrust is productivity. That is to say, are the traditional teaching activities at risk because of low enrollment. 3. What sort of university-wide commitment is there to this -when most of your resources go to salaries.
1. lack of adequately equipped and maintained on-campus classrooms. 2. lack of adequately equipped and maintained on-campus classrooms. 3. lack of adequately equipped and maintained on-campus classrooms.
1. Insufficient classroom facilities 2. Insufficient time (too many responsibilities, too many contact hours) 3. Insufficient training (& not enough time to attend what is offered)
1. Inadequate faculty preparation 2. Lack of creativity in considering possibilities
1. I need instruction in new delivery formats. 2. Time to revamp syllabus to include new formats. 3. instruction in how to locate new formats -very specific instructions-ex. here is where the projector is located and here is how you sign up for it, etc.
1. funding 2. willingness to take risks 3. wiliness to sustain innovations long enough to assess true value
1. Funding 2. Old buildings
1. faculty propensity to control total domain of the curriculum 2. inadequate & insufficient rooms with state-of-the-art instructional technology 3. administrative adherence to "normal school" orthodoxy around 12hr course load
1. Escaping the grasp of tradition 2. Educating instructors and students to use the new methods 3. Appropriate reinforcement of the innovation that you want to see
1. EMU needs to invest more in buildings (Pray Harrold) 2. Technology in classroom, internet access. 3.

<p>1. Departments that do not want to offer programs off campus. 2. Faculty and departments who do not believe that online (full or hybrid formats) can be as effective or more effective than simply face-to-face in a classroom on campus. 3. Many offices and departments across the university that do not support innovative formats, non-traditional scheduling and off-campus locations, and do not see that this is essentially the only way that we will grow enrollments, that this is the key to effectively serving our core student/customer base.</p>
<p>1. Classroom deficiencies in Pray-Harrold; 2. Unsanitary restrooms in Pray-Harrold, esp. by time night classes begin and end; 3. Excess committee meetings and assignments for regular faculty that detract from teaching and research time commitments.</p>
<p>1. Teaching in Pray Harrold and Mark Jefferson 2. Inadequate instructional technology 3. College level limitations on class size, class location, and scheduling</p>
<p>1. Lack of trust on the part of the administration that the faculty are teaching rigorous courses for the benefit of the students. 2. Lack of flexibility in the scheduling of classes offered on-campus; especially during summer we should be able to offer 3 week courses here for teachers who do not want to take classes during their whole break. 3. In the online environment, the structure of the course delivery system (e-College) forces a structure onto online courses that restricts innovation. I originally had my class developed as a web-based simulation, but when I had to move it to e-College it just became a series of weekly lessons and lost most of the qualities of simulation that had originally been built.</p>
<p>1. In my department (nursing), it is clearly untimely assignments from the Dept Head. I received my Winter 2005 assignment on December 29, 2004! So not much time to be innovative! The pre-planning for online, etc simply is something our department can't seem to cope with at all. 2. Resistance by Dept Head and faculty that online format is "the easy way out" and that faculty colleagues are 'getting away with something" 3. Poor outcome measures to document effectiveness of online/hybrid courses; and in particular, if a faculty is really poor at online format.</p>
<p>1. I need my computer set up so that I can do e-mail & internet, Microsoft word, excel, and publisher (or something comparative), and a printer. 2. I'd like to have a midi computer/piano keyboard with CD burner so that students will be able to practice more effectively on their own. 3. We need more classroom/office space.</p>
<p>1. Financial support 2. Technical support 3. Lack of equipment security</p>
<p>1. EMU budget 2. Inadequate classroom facilities. Our students don't fit in the classroom desks that are bolted to the floor. The acoustical quality in rooms without true ceilings is horrible and makes it difficult to hear lectures. 3. Proper compensation for alternative delivery systems.</p>
<p>1) Uneven licensing of software across campus (SPSS, different versions licensed which destroys data). Lack of "smart carts" in Pray-Harrold. Existing "smart carts" that don't work properly!</p>
<p>1) The way faculty workload is counted 2) Credits based on contact hours 3) Lack of difference in counting graduate and undergraduate courses for faculty workload (grad requires much more prep; the initial semester of setting up an online course, or even a course with eReserves and powerpoint presentations, requires much more time; it will later save time, but that first semester is "a killer" and daunting</p>

1) the rooms are too small for the numbers of students enrolled; 2) the environment is extremely institutional (rather than educational).
1) <u>Restricting the innovation/entrepreneurial functions of Academic Affairs to CE</u> 2) Limited technological resources (e.g., wired classrooms, wireless networks) 3) <u>Limited flexibility to move between different teaching formats</u>
1) money for equipment and renovation of buildings (esp. Pray-Harrold) 2) divergence in student access to technology (due to variation in their economic circumstances, access to campus, etc.) 3) lack of will of administration to give course releases for new course development or support for team-taught courses etc.
1) Lack of money and other resources 2) <u>Lack of clear standards for different types of instruction</u> (how do you make sure that online courses meet the same standards as others?) 3) Bureaucracy
1) Classrooms in disrepair . Desks broken and/or too small for plus-sized students.
1) Class room environment -heating, lighting. 2) Finances for classroom resources.
*Limited technology is the primary barrier for some methods of instructional delivery innovation. If we had computer projectors in all classrooms and if students had computers in all classrooms, this would be an amazing and beneficial. I teach in a computer lab at EMU; and although I very much appreciate having the technology available in this room, the quality of the computers and the printer is not the best. <u>In the current situation, students and I spend an inordinate amount of time "fixing" the computers and the printer --time that should be spent working on the computers.</u> *Limited time, of course, is a critical barrier to
instructional delivery innovation. <u>Taking the innovative approach requires more in and out of class time, which limits the breadth of information that can be covered in a semester.</u> *Limited motivation is the third critical barrier to instructional delivery innovation. This is an individual issue, and frankly, I'm not sure what would motivate people to be more motivated. What are the risks and rewards for the individual who is content in his/her set curriculum?
(1) No time for development (2) No time for development (3) No time for development
(1) Lack of willingness on the part of administration to support team-taught, truly <u>interdisciplinary courses</u> : despite the rhetoric suggesting interdisciplinary is favored, there are many structural barriers to accomplishing a team-taught course that could be easily overcome if there were more willingness to be open to creative solutions. (2) The structural mandate that <u>Spring/Summer non-traditional courses (i.e. those not taught in standard campus locations) be taught through Continuing Education</u> . This is a problem because developing innovative courses takes a lot of time and effort, but Continuing Ed pays much less than a standard Spring/Summer salary to faculty, creating a huge disincentive to develop these alternative format courses. (3) Lack of technology in classrooms. How can I have a web-enhanced course when I don't have access to any wired classrooms unless I make a reservation at Halle Library (which I can't have continuously throughout the semester)? While the web has tremendous things to offer for instruction, we currently have no facilities (at least none in Pray Harrold, where all my classes are scheduled) to make this practicable.
\$\$\$ Professors lack time to plan and implement new ideas . Theft of new equipment
The faculty person Consistent technology across classrooms

-Resistance by faculty, who do not understand changing needs of industry, our true customer. - "Anchoring" to traditional university campus, and classroom teaching setting. - Tenured faculty who refuse to innovate, improve, and learn.
money time collaboration
Digital projector, classroom size, projector screen

Question Two: How do you think innovation in instructional delivery should be encouraged/or rewarded?

with technology relevant to instruction (new computers, laptops, etc)
with money or release time paired with <u>recognition</u> . It should also be recognized as <u>part of scholarly/creative</u> activities (varying in quality and size of associated project.)
With monetary and person-power <u>support</u> for use of technology.
What will encourage me would be having a person/office that would be on the side of the faculty. I often feel that I am <u>fighting the "emu system"</u> when trying to implement new technology based instructional deliveries.
Using instructional technology in course delivery should be expected and <u>woven into teaching evaluations</u> on some level (students, faculty, and so forth)
<u>Use of software</u> and time to teach it to students for classroom application
University <u>laptops</u> for home use, honorariums (pay), <u>recognition and awards</u> .
Training, training, training
To stay competitive EMU needs to recognize that not all of today's students want to spend time in classrooms on central campus. The growth of regional centers both ours and our competitors speaks loudly to where students are willing to spend their tuition dollars.
To encourage, make it <u>easily accessible</u> . Perhaps have people who would volunteer to <u>help people</u> one-on-one rather than having workshops. Scheduling is always a problem trying to fit in another workshop, and some people who are very new to the whole thing may not want to go somewhere where they will stand out as being very behind the times. They might be willing to get one-on-one help, however.
Time to develop (faculty release time) <u>Equipment grants</u> and <u>TRAINING</u> that is required. Tech <u>support</u> staff partnerships --time and involvement, not necessarily money.
The same way everything else is <u>rewarded</u> .

-the availability of workshops for students on computer use -availability of equipment in the classroom or nearby so there is no need to try to travel in the PH elevators with it -online training for faculty workshops, demonstrations, easily available experts for faculty -awards or it symposiums

Teaching innovation award to faculty

Teaching awards with honorarium

Stipends, cash awards, in-kind cash (tuition course fee reimbursement, etc.)

Start up money is needed. I would love to incorporate innovative delivery but there are some many more pressing needs like more space/air conditioning/repaired classrooms.

Spring/Summer release to develop and prep for instruction.

Special awards within the colleges or even at university level

Sow how student retention, success follows instructional deliveries.

Some kind of recognition in meetings.

Simply by giving us the equipment we need to do our jobs. The lack of computers and projection equipment in classrooms is very obstructive.

Should be identified and share with colleagues.

seminars and presentations on alternative delivery systems information/evidence about enhanced or at least equal pedagogical effectiveness monetary incentives to faculty to develop alternative effective delivery systems

Risks should be rewarded

rewards should be intrinsic, not stupid prizes: smaller, more manageable class sizes reasonable teaching load for the discipline collaborations with colleagues, librarians and faculty dev. office (fund it!)

Rewarded? Until it is determined that innovative instructional delivery is superior to traditional classroom delivery we should not reward people who happen to use those techniques because they have access to the appropriate facilities.

Reward both departments and individuals relative to teaching load and FTE for the development of on-line/web based instruction. Release time for the development of innovative instructional techniques.

Require a certain amount of the course be held utilizing on-line methods to encourage the students to get used to the idea of web learning.
Release time.
Release time, stipends, <u>awards</u> , honors
release time, special university <u>award</u> (recognition)
Release time, recognition.
Release Time Merit Pay <u>Recognition</u> within university Weekend at the President's House with all expenses paid.
Release time Honorariums for course development Faculty workload evaluation/equivalencies for online (takes significantly more time to teach an online course if it is done correctly than to teach on campus course --students' expectations and demand for online instructors' time is significantly greater) All courses taught through CE should be paid at a minimum of 10% of faculty salary --the current pay structure is absolutely unacceptable and encourage faculty who are looking for a few extra dollars vs. attracting a wide variety of highly qualified faculty. Is a faculty member's teaching time worth less just because they teach through CE? The system, as it is now, discourages some truly talented faculty members from teaching using alternative delivery times and methods because there are no real incentives. <u>If alternative delivery courses continue to be run through CE rather than departments, something has to be done to streamline the administrative process for course approval</u> , PAF's, and faculty should be paid on time! Faculty workload evaluation/equivalencies for team taught classes (they take MORE TIME to coordinate than a class taught by one instructor on campus) Provide adequate support, both for training and ongoing throughout the year
Release time to plan with others to team teach or learn new technology
Release time to develop such innovations
release time to develop innovative delivery of course material; <u>openness to using and trying out diverse delivery; acknowledgement</u> in teaching
Release time or compensation for summer course development
release time for those who design these kind of courses
Release time for faculty to prepare Support for faculty to work in groups to develop and implement ideas
Release time for development and reduced load during the first one or two terms of the course.
Release time for course development; Flexibility in scheduling to allow for tram-taught courses and compressed courses
Release time Facilities which encourage such innovation be made available regularly
release time

<u>Recognition.</u>
<u>Recognition</u> of faculty who have invested time and money to become competent in technology. Seminars to aid the people who are shy about trying new techniques.
<u>Recognition</u> certificate. In other words something that one can put in a portfolio and/or on a resume.
<u>Recognition</u> and release time for development
<u>recognition & respect</u>
put into DED's <u>Tenured faculty who do not want to change their instructional methods have opportunity to punish newer faculty with different teaching methods.</u>
public <u>acknowledgment</u> some type of grant or other financial award make known and available to all the application for award
Provide time to develop innovations
Plan C
Permit departments to meet overall credit hour <u>generation target while structuring and scheduling classes as they see best serving the needs of the program and students.</u> Shift focus away from individual credit hour load uniformity to some maximum number with freedom of scheduling.
Perhaps release time of some sort to develop courses that utilize innovative instructional techniques. I know that some of this is already in place. Perhaps we're talking about greater access to this option.
Offer course release incentive for development of innovative instruction. Fund more/new study abroad courses and scholarships, even if the university has to subsidize new programs. Allow some team-taught courses to be counted as full load.
of course.
observations would have to be taken of the instructors and a scale would have to be created to deem what is innovative instruction
Not sure. I think it is encouraged already. The reward comes through in our instructional effectiveness ratings. Not all classes, of course, lend themselves to computer/video/DVD usage (which seems above what you are implying is "innovative.") <u>Innovation can take many forms and so we need to be careful with "rewarding" one mode of delivery over others.</u> Who defines and measures what is encouraged and how it is rewarded strikes me as problematic. I would like to see us continue offering teaching fellowship such as AS-L Fellows, Diversity Fellows, LGBT Curriculum Fellows. Designing/offering Advanced Seminars for former Fellows would be helpful excellent, too.
not sure
Not necessary just get the classrooms in good shape as they are in Marshall.

Money to start it.
mixed use of intrinsic rewards; significant increase/parity of per credit hour cont. ed. pay comparable to highest academic unit ; transportation accommodations if indicated; change of required 12 hr teaching load to reflect MAC/regional college/university average teaching load.
MEASURE FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF STUDENTS TAUGHT AND
QUALITY OF INSTURCTION, FACULTY AVAILABILTY AND RESPONSIVENESS TO STUDENTS.
Many of my colleagues in Pray Harrold would welcome the opportunity to be innovative if we simply had basic infrastructure to use. Beyond that, the E-fellows program is a good idea and could even be expanded or simply made more regular (or announced more regularly -wasn't it going to be 3 times a year??).
lower teaching load
Lightened teaching loads across the board would allow instructors more time to develop new methods. Barring that, release time.
It should be an element of Departmental Evaluation Document criteria
it is not realistic with the facilities most of us now have
Interactive teaching and testing students for retention
Instructional "delivery" is the wrong term. Instructors should be rewarded for team planning and team teaching through an additional half course credit. <u>Instructional improvement happens through the process of planning and the time and energy to reflect on one's practice with others "in-action" (i.e. in the midst of practice). The extent to which the university provides those resources is the extent to which you will see innovation here.</u>
Instruction and support available, as with online classes, 24/7. I really do not see why there should be a reward for using innovative technology. As educators, we should be excited about innovative teaching methods. Should we not? Perhaps if a reward is needed, those who use the technology should be the first considered for the use of "smart rooms."
innovation is reward in itself. no need for an extra reward
Innovation in teaching (but not in "instructional delivery") should be <u>rewarded</u> on the basis of the degree to which it promotes interaction and education, rather than delivery and instruction.
Innovation for innovation's sake is a waste of time and effort. <u>Focus on rewarding improvements, not changes.</u>
If a faculty member is willing to teach in a non-traditional manner (times of day, days of week, etc.) give them more contact credit for these classes. In other words, reduce the strict 12 credit hour load. Pay for what you get. Why would we want to extend our workday into the evening if we don't get paid to do so? The reality is that we have to be here all day most days to do our jobs. It is unreasonable to think that we will willingly take on evening classes without additional pay.

I use my own laptop for PowerPoint in all my courses, with CD, DVD & video materials, but need easy hookups to projectors and sound systems in classrooms. Too few rooms in the university are set up for what I do and yet the rooms that are I find very difficult to get. Why is that? Can you help me? I'm desperate for your help. Thank you.

I think that the innovation should be delivered at the departmental and/or college level. In a past life at another university, I participated in teams where faculty from a college created a web based capstone, which was feasible, which was not linked to coursework, but measured outcomes, and which addressed the accountability agenda. In the process of creating that capstone, clusters of faculty learned how to use multimedia technology for many purposes: communication, instructional innovation, and administrative

accountability. Since coming to Eastern, I have continued to try to innovate my courses, and I have found the labs in the library available, which is wonderful, but there is no technical assistance for faculty, and the systems are somewhat different from the computer in my office. Innovation has its own reward when it serves a diagnosed need and an authentic purpose. Time may be an issue if faculty need training in a new system. It seems unreasonable to ask people to carry a full course load, a heavy service demand, and to do research, then to ask them to become proficient in a new technology. Any innovation that requires faculty to spend an inordinate amount of time preparing templates, collating data, and problem solve the use and repair of the system will not encourage them to use it for instructional delivery or for other purposes.

I think that a stipend could be given for training, based on agreement that the instructor agrees to teach a class, using the technology. Additional money could also be paid per credit hour taught in distance learning or online.

I think people need to be paid for their work on time

I think as it is now --with student-nominated outstanding teacher awards. As mentioned above --this is tricky. I think instructors really have to motivate themselves. The departments should hire people who possess this motivation and follow-through.

i just think it should be done--students deserve the latest in technology-especially when they could be paying 1/2 the tuition at the community colleges

I honestly don't know how it should be rewarded, but I think it should be encouraged if it will help students to learn more effectively/faster.

I feel that we need to be much better educated on the different techniques that can be used in our classrooms. Perhaps if we are given some release time or financial bonus to be educated and then mentored throughout the semester on using these techniques. An example of this is the WAC program that I took part in, in 2003.

I don't -I think it is part of the job. I think it is part of professionalism and staying current in your field. Possible conference opportunities to get with professionals in your curriculum.

How about Physical Plant and the Provost's Office allocating a bit of money to make our classrooms more comfortable for the students. Nothing fancy, just some decent chairs and tables, and decent long tables, not the horrible little desk chairs. That's a start towards students having better performance. They need to be comfortable first.

Grants or support for ideas that would enhance the classroom such as personal response systems to improve the educational efforts.

Giving release time to develop a teaching agenda. This is especially important to new faculty who are often saddled with many different course preparations the first semester they are here.
Give money to individual colleges and let them decide how to spend it.
Give folks both the training and the time to learn how to use new ways. Encourage learning to teach as an essential aspect of university professionals.
Funds from the university or outside sources to support faculty/lecturer learning about and implementing innovation classroom teaching ideas.
Funding
free instruction on how to use
Faculty who attend workshops on instructional delivery should be paid a reasonable amount for their time.
Faculty want to do a good job--provide the opportunities and they will respond. At the end of the first semester in Marshall, 95% of the faculty were using the equipment in the smart classrooms. Workshops with released time are one way to encourage use of hybrid courses
Faculty paid leave to develop new courses, particularly interdisciplinary, collaborative efforts. More faculty load credit for team-taught courses. Fewer restrictions (lower numbers of students involved) for World College travel possibilities. Award Sabbatical and other research leaves for these purposes.
Faculty devopment funds
Faculty and instructors require substantial professional development support; <u>Reward</u> and compensation for going beyond traditional structures should be added to the pay -bonus for teaching outside of the normal scheduling pattern Pay on a per student basis beyond the minimal break even number for CE. University of Massachusetts, Amherst has enthusiastic support from faculty for online courses across disciplines and executive MBA courses because the pay structure is a significant incentive -as much as \$18,000 per course on line!!
Extra pay or credit for teaching off-site or outside of "normal" hours.
equal pay for online course work course prep time
Encouraged not rewarded. Educators should not be rewarded for utilizing delivery styles. This should be done to meet the learning styles of their students.
EFFECTIVE innovation is the issue. It is of no value unless it is effective. Effectiveness should be assessed through peer review, student evaluation and written self evaluation.
Does this really mean "instructional delivery"? or does this mean "technology in the classroom" question? Better equipment and teaching spaces on campus would encourage improved instructional delivery. How about "outdoor classrooms," seating such as rows of benches or all-weather, removable seating outside which allows classes to escape the airless, concrete boxes of Pray-Harrold.

<p>DO NOT replace existing formats with web-based courses. Interaction between faculty and students is vital to the university concept. To encourage innovation, faculty will need to teach fewer courses at a time, with fewer students. Multimedia presentations do not make up for a lack of faculty-student interaction. Research opportunities within the university are instructional opportunities for the students. Value faculty time spent training students in research methods and laboratory techniques.</p>
<p>Development of online courses and programs is a very time consuming process, which requires intellectual rigor and dedication. Course development fees and intellectual property rights are critical for this endeavor to be successful. Release time for course development may also be a way to encourage innovation. Perhaps creating an •Online Teaching Fellowship• similar to the Technology Fellowships and the •Writing Across the Curriculum Fellowship• may encourage faculty to embrace innovation.</p>
<p>Courses releases; Course development funds;</p>
<p>Course release time, professional development training, technical/development support staff, and/or money</p>
<p>Continue with the on-line training courses offered for instructors. Also, offer 3or4 day workshops over the spring/summer to improve our skill level.</p>
<p>Consider the value to the University of online courses where students provide the hardware and infrastructure in rating courses and programs.</p>
<p>Cash prizes</p>
<p>Campus support and funding</p>
<p>By the use of pay and release time for the significant effort required to create truly innovative instruction, coupled with funds and time for current faculty to take classes or apprenticeships to learn to create such content. Significant pedagogical support, perhaps in the form of groups of programmers and pedagogical experts (not under the ICT umbrella, but functionally and administratively separate) would have to funded and structures created to incentives the use of such a resource by the faculty. Significant effort would have to be expended to detach the idea of "instruction" from the currently dominant "lecture as performance model," and create an educational atmosphere in which "instructional management" and "training" have the same status in our university culture as traditional methods.</p>
<p>By <u>recognizing</u> those who do it. Give Outstanding Teaching Awards for outstanding teaching in these innovative delivery systems.</p>
<p>By allowing faculty to teach -since this is the number one criteria at the university</p>
<p>Bonuses or release time for faculty development "coupons" to get students to try on online course</p>
<p>Better parking.</p>
<p>Awards to Instructors who excel at this.</p>

<p>As part of load and as part of the faculty's professional duties. Plus, it would be nice <u>if CE would start encouraging real innovative teaching, rather than claiming that all of its non-traditional offerings equal innovation</u>, which is true only some of the time. My experiences with CE show it to be hostile to innovative teaching, hostile to academic rigor, and run by individuals who do not have any grasp of the scholarly literature on teaching.</p>
<p>10%base salary for course overloads and spring summer teaching</p>
<p>1. Tech support for use of technology 2. \$\$ to integrate technology in coursework 3. Faculty development opportunities for integrating technology</p>
<p>1. Summer faculty workshops with monetary incentive or decreased teaching load during the semester while taking an in-depth faculty workshop to prepare an innovative course approach</p>
<p>1. someone in the department to go to with questions and for help in using new delivery formats. Often I don't know what is available or possible so I don't know what questions to ask. 2. Professional development workshops with small stipends. Hands on training is necessary.</p>
<p>1. Released time for development 2. Money available for equipment, etc.</p>
<p>1. Money 2. Release time 3. Training opportunities</p>
<p>1. Have an <u>institutional level strategic commitment</u> to growth in programs offered off-campus and in innovative formats. Invest in that growth. 2. <u>Share some revenue with departments and schools that pursue this growth.</u></p>
<p>1. develop a technology training program specifically for and to meet the needs of part-time faculty members who live and/or work from a distance, but teach on-campus condensed weekend courses 2. improve maintenance and security for in-classroom technology</p>
<p>1. Classes which are not on-campus M-F days and M-Th evenings should be encouraged and departments/faculty should be rewarded. This is where the growth is and this is where our competition is killing us. 2. Talk to Cheryl Aubuchon and visit EMU-Livonia. They are customer focused, the facilities are excellent, and you can park! 3. Remove the onus of CE as "extra" work and encourage non-traditional delivery. 4. There is a dysfunctional yet dominant faculty perspective that I should work/park/walk only within a 100 meter radius on central campus during the day. These regular classes should be offered and supported, but history and the competition tell us that this is not where growth lies. 5. I (and my colleagues in the MS Quality program)have taught predominantly off-campus and as part of load, offering live classes, using interactive video, and the internet for 15 years. We have achieved success and served the students while battling EMU. Success has come in spite of the institution.</p>
<p>1. <u>Awards</u> from the colleges and/or schools which pay for course development-and encourage collaborative ventures without requiring the participants to moonlight to get things off the ground.</p>
<p>1. Release time</p>
<p>1. offer incentives, either financial or with release time to faculty who have ideas that could benefit more then their own courses; 2. encourage more team teaching within a department / program; 3. encourage more team teaching inter-departmentally, such as joint appointments of faculty.</p>

1. Absolutely should not be PAID for innovation! Recognition has been shown to be more important in motivational theory--perhaps an award with \$ could be given, but to pay is inappropriate. 2. Eliminate NOW, the 'per head' course limit payment--this is an atrocity! Some faculty are raping the university and the public to the detriment of others! 3. Publicize quarterly a newsletter that shows courses and faculty who are using innovative approaches.

1) provide instructional workload time for course development (i.e., 25% release in a semester to prepare a new online course for the next semester) 2) provide reduced workload the first time teaching a new course with these innovations relying on technology 3) arrange cross-campus work groups (in-person and online) to encourage sharing and collaboration among faculty who are conducting these types of innovations 4) Provide open demonstrations by faculty who have online courses set up -I've never actually seen what one looks like. Have the faculty person walk us through the actual course design and how it looks on screen, and provide background and answer questions of what it took to get to that spot. 5) I've been to a number of workshops on online teaching over the years, but have yet to "jump in". Maybe a mentor, or someone who could work one on one with me for the start up, afterwards I'm sure I'd be fine. 6)I'm also interested in the idea of electronic portfolios to demonstrate student outcomes for program assessment, and to support the student in their job search. Other schools around here are starting to use that approach, so our students will be "competing" with this. 7) The eFellow awards have been a major incentive for being able to purchase supplies and technology. I've spent a lot of my own money trying to "keep up" and stay up to date, and I'm reaching a limit now of how long I can self-fund this interest. Plus laptops, etc. all need to be replaced within a few years.

1) More technical support 2) More local control of curriculum (e.g., CE should not control ALL online courses) 3) Increased funding for departments

?

(1) There should be small grants to support the development of these courses (such as are currently offered to develop the 100% online courses). (2) There should be structures to enable courses to be taught as part of a regular load or in Spring/Summer for adequate pay. (3) There should be active acknowledgment of the value of such efforts that would help create a culture on campus that suggests these ideas are truly supported. This might include a small award for "best new course" or many other methods of publicizing to faculty what successes other professors have had, so that we can not only see models of successful courses but also have a sense of what kinds of work is possible AND supported at the administrative level.

supplying adequate technical equipment

-Make it part of every faculty contract. Either innovate or be removed, especially for those who are tenured.

Question Three: Please identify another College or University that currently has or is developing new methods for instructional delivery that Eastern Michigan University should use for a best practice model.

You should walk down the street into Estabrook elementary school and Ypsilanti high school -you will see a far more up to date technology infrastructure. You may also want to visit Washtenaw Community college. We are not talking about implementing best practice-we are talking about getting up to adequate practice.

Whatever the University of Phoenix does, do the opposite.
WCC for availability
Wayne State University
Washtenaw community college uses a testing center opened with long hours and proctors the test area -this way students can come in and take computer tests on days at convenient times --I usually listed 2 days to come in to the testing center and take the test.
Washtenaw community college
Washtenaw Community College
Walsh, University of Phoenix, Central Michigan University
Utah State University has an excellent way to communicate with their distance preceptors, offers them adjunct status title, even though they cannot pay them, the title enables the individual to feel more highly valued. They also use a "Prof/Tech" ranked person to do a lot of administration of program affiliation agreements instead of faculty freeing up faculty to do program academic delivery.
UofM Public Health UofM School of Information UofIndiana TLTC Faculty Fellows, Music courses Columbia New Media Center
Uof M MSU Wayne State
Unsure
University of Nebraska at Lincoln uses response systems and is networked in every classroom.
University of Phoenix
University of Notre Dame, where I used to teach 2000-2002.
University of New Hampshire MBA program;
University of Michigan has many classrooms that are set up for computer-based presentations and activities.
University of Cincinnati
University of Cincinnati
UCal at Berkeley.
U of NH MBA program
The University of Michigan

the technology in other, newer buildings is impressive. I wish we had similar facilities in Quirk.
The majority of FIDER accredited interior design programs require notebook computers--we need to catch up for our students to be competitive We don't have to look beyond our own campus--rennovate all classrooms so that function like the ones in Marshall: moveable furniture, podium with standardized controls for LCD projector and AV equipment (including visual presenter), electrical connections for notebook computers, and wireless network connections.
The EMU center in Brighton is set up so that teachers don't have to find or order or reserve equipment. Videos etc. can be brought to the classroom and put into the equipment that is already there-no need to plan so far in advance and then not be able to use equipment because someone else took it.
The Curry School of Education at Vanderbilt has made progress in this area. The STEM-TECH program in the Five College Area, U-Mass Massachusetts, has a reputation for innovation in teaching and learning.
SUNY-Buffalo Oregon State Univ
Some interdisciplinary models exist. www.goart.gu.se (Gvteborg Organ Art Center in Sweden) Joint Medical Professions Institutes at University of Texas/El Paso. www.mediterraneanstudies.org www.gustavus.edu/events/nobel/ www.britishshakespeare.ws/ Chautauqua
see University of Massachusetts, Amherst -there is enthusiastic support for innovative teaching beyond the traditional structure University of Maryland
Ohio University, Athens Ohio -Art auditorium as smart classroom
Ohio State University, Ball State University and University of Georgia for Physical Education Pedagogy.
note sure
Not aware of any specific University at this time
None
No matter how good the instructional delivery, if the students don't attend class because they are working to pay for the class or they are so tired they have a hard time keeping awake in class, they will be ineffective. The university should focus on raising funds for student scholarships. That will have more impact on the students than any fancy machines we have in class, no matter how much I and many of my colleagues like them. Secondly, students complain about parking. If they perceive it to be a problem it is a problem -so fix it. If they come to class frazzled because they have used up their nervous energy finding a parking space then their attention will waver in class. Thirdly, the students I speak to want more online courses and more evening classes. Finally, put the students first, not institutional goals as delineated and
measured by university officials. Whatever impacts the students on a daily basis should be of primary concern when money is allocated.
NO IDEA
MSU

most community colleges that I teach at have more technology available in the classrooms then Eastern does- Oakland Community Colege, Lansing Community College
Michigan State is using a lot of distance options throught their infrastructure and provides faculty with time so they can implement innovations
Many high schools & most universities are well ahead of EMU.
Look at California State Dominguez Hills internet programs.
Lawrence Technological University
Lawrence Tech University is very good at this.
Just look at Porter and Marshall Halls, on our own campus. That is what classroom comfort should be like. My Education students who come and take classes in Mark Jefferson are always amazed at the condition of our rooms. And MJ isn't their worst building. When I ask them what the worst building is, they, unequivocally answer 'Strong'. Then Pray-Harrold. MJ is down the list. And that's saying something about Strong and P-H because MJ is pretty bad.
Jackson Community College has VCR's mounted in each classroom. That was preferable to checking one out and hauling it through the Halls. I taught to 5 sites from a classroom at Southern Utah University. The class ran smoothly, as there was a tech person in the room to handle any problems with the system.
IUPUI
I'm not familiar with the research on this topic, however, I've taught at JCC. They use hybrid courses, and are open to various modes of delivery.
I'd have to look this up. I was impressed by a program that I recently heard about at a conference, but I don't have the name right at hand.
I have not done research in this area.
I have no idea; certainly not Pheonix (we are NOT Pheonix, nor should we want to be)
I don't know of any, as I am new to the arena of university teaching.
I do not benchmark other colleges at present.
I can't respond to this question.
How about Milan High School. Their new school has all the bells and tools needed to teach a class.
Grand Valley State University. Laptop cart for whole classroom use.
film department at U of M has all the latest Mac computers with double monitors and up-dated software for graphics and film

EVERY other institution I have been to in the State is cleaner and more modern than EMU. Even the best practices cannot overcome a filthy, dreary, dilapidated environment.
Even at Eastern, some classrooms are set up for easy access to using technology in the classroom. I took a tour of Marshall, and it was fabulous. This should be the norm in our classrooms rather than the exception except in classrooms that always have classes that simply never use technology. Having to drag a cart with me anytime I want to use something other than an overhead projector causes me to use technology much less frequently than I would if it was already in the classroom.
EMU is so far behind I couldn't begin to tell you where to start. Try WCC for a modest comparison.
EMU is a leader already
Don't know.
Don't know.
Don't know for sure, but Oakland Community College has some very effective technology in place in their Royal Oak campus and are very organized in delivering their procedures to new faculty.
don't know
Colorado College
COE/COT are better than other areas of the institution
Classrooms wired for student feedback during lecture/ group activities
Central Michigan University University of Michigan, Ann ARbor
Capella University is a leader in distance learning. Lawrence Technological University is a leader in hybrid learning.
California State University at Monterey Bay
Both Wayne State and Western have incorporated new technologies. Wayne state has all new facilities that allow for this type of instruction.
Baker College for online classes.
Arizona State University
1. Western Michigan University
?

western mich.; wayne state; central mich. grand valley; univ of mich. univ of pittsburg; nyu system; univ of cal system; brandeis; georgetown.
CCS

Question Four: In addition to the suggestions above, do you have any other instructional delivery ideas for the future at EMU?

One week intensive classes here on campus, not only in Traverse City, particularly in the summer or when students could plan ahead to take a 1 week vacation. Offer low-cost dorm/hostel accommodation. Encourage it as a family vacation in Ypsi/Ann Arbor with activities for kids and families (that don't cost a lot). Anything where daycare can be offered and included, would make any class more attractive to graduate students and facilitate their participation. Offer daycare during the class times for evening and Saturday classes. Promote EMU as a family-friendly campus, bring your kids along. (People do now, but the kids are sitting out in the halls or running around with no supervision). Have activities going on, non-credit concurrent things going on for spouses or other family members, come make a day of it. Bring grandma, bring grandpa, there's something for everyone -and the student can then focus on their studies. Folks wouldn't mind driving far with these types of services. We really need something for low-cost overnight stays. Folks with long commutes would be happy to stay overnight and then get back early in the morning, especially in the winter with snow and ice. It wouldn't need to be fancy just clean, comfortable and safe. Are there any dorm rooms extra that could be used for this purpose? Trips for credit to other locations within the US. A number of our students haven't traveled, and something with a learning focus, that again could be "family friendly", might be a hit. It might also be more do-able for some folks rather than the international programs, but could still be an eye-opener. A one credit class going to New York City, or a two credit class going to San Francisco, visiting and observing different schools, educators, health care systems, social service agencies, etc. Just a few ideas. It could even be a type of career course to observe different types of jobs in different locations. I just saw a story about a company that sets up vacations at a high cost for someone to be an architect for a week, and shadow them to see what that career would be like. That could be done here locally too, but adding a bit of travel to it that could still be considered within financial aid educational expenses might be even more appealing.

Yes, provide faculty with the support, such as Florida Central U., so faculty have some assistance when developing alternative instructional methods.

we should be building technology in the curriculum...just like writing across the curriculum...technology across the curriculum faculty and students alike should learn how to use it appropriately to enhance their learning as well as use for presentation and product

We need to maximize flexibility for meeting students needs and completely open wide the 24/7 discussion for scheduling. There are people working midnight hours and taking courses from different time zones -China and India! The traditional semester system at EMU is seriously outdated. As a faculty, I recognize it is difficult to change but there is a serious need to restructure our idea of the traditional timetable -I'm speaking to myself as much as sharing my thoughts with you. I have worked with compressed formats where two -20 hour weekends for a 3 credit graduate course worked extremely well. (Bowling Green State University, Executive Master of Organizational Development). Students travel nationally from different parts of the country to take two 3 credit courses in one semester. There is usually about 3-4 weekends between the weekend classes. It uses a cohort system. There is also a four hour per day for two weeks to complete two courses. I think there should be creative brainstorming to examine scheduling for very late night courses 10pm to 2:00am as well as very early courses 5:00am-8:00am. If we work with a 24/7 schedule, the number of classroom spaces can become more flexible and we maximize the physical resources further. However, "shift differential" pay should recognize the extra hardship of working outside of a 'normal' day.

updated classrooms

There is actually a lot of faculty interest in technology if stuff was provided, people would use it.

Survey students Allow more opportunities for flexible scheduling off/on campus
Sure, but this is something that would be better suited for a conversation. I'd be happy to attend a meeting/think tank/discussion session on this topic. I can be best reached at cgallaghe1@emich.edu. Regards, Clare Sansburn
smaller classrooms
see above
<u>Rewards</u> for instructors/faculty getting instruction in new formats.
Put money into the campus classrooms & labs. We have very nice, expensive off-campus facilities which are little used compared to our main academic buildings, and thus students get the impression that their education is not the University's real priority.
<u>Organizational, the COE needs to be structured so that technology (EDMT) is not organized as a separate "program" with teacher education. If the implementation of technology, as a part of an integrated curriculum, is an outcome we are striving to develop in future teachers, I do not know how this can be done when it is presented to teachers as a discrete item in their preparation. As it is currently constructed, this is the approach being utilized. Consequently, those in other program areas approach innovations in the utilization of technology in teaching as something the EDMT folks do and is therefore not their responsibility.</u>
Online teaching seems to be a growing area so we need to strengthen our community of online faculty and develop larger and more diverse learning communities among the faculty who are teaching online. Each faculty member still has to do a lot of learning on their own about how to develop a good online course.
Not yet.
Not right now. Thank-you for doing this!
not at this time
No. Our computer labs lack adequate computer technology and printers. Otherwise, I am so glad to see you addressing this important issue. Our lack of technology in the classroom makes the university look prehistoric.
no.
no
no
Move to more hybrid / blended course offerings; continue to support faculty in professional development; DUMP WebCT and only use 1 course management system.
More hybrid courses; compressed courses; more alternate time scheduling; better access to technology
More flexibility of teaching on campus without coming under domain of Cont. Ed.
MAKE INSTRUCTION AVAILABLE ANYWHERE, ANYTIME.

Look systematically at how we currently deliver all of our programs. Look at ways we can substitute online and short/intensive face-to-face experiences for some of the scheduling that requires students to come to campus two or three times per week for a class. More truly "hybrid" instructional and scheduling formats that recognize the work, family and economic demands or limitations that most of our students live with.
Limit class size to 20
Less administrators, more money to educational facilities
Just try to create a campus with buildings where the students can be comfortably warm (not freezing with their caps and gloves on, or roasting -we tend to have the extremes in Mark Jefferson), comfortably seated, and in rooms that are adequate for the class size. I've had overcrowded rooms in previous semesters.
Just a note to say that I have made numerous overheads this term, no doubt costing the department considerably. This seemed silly to me, since my notes were in Powerpoint and could have been shown without making overheads, if I had had a computer and projector in the classroom so I could use my computer disk with my Powerpoint file.
It may be very beneficial to require faculty who have NOT taught online to attend a brief seminar on pedagogical and technological issues involved on this type of course delivery.
integrate technology in every class and not teach it as a separate class. Teach the appropriate use in every class as a tool.
I would love for us to have a serious dialogue about HOW we might practically design and implement team taught classes. There are a lot of pragmatic and "load issues" that need to be ironed out but the notion presents wonderful possibilities for ourselves, our students, and our university. A related suggestion is to examine issues of load. I'd like to see us in line with other institutions and reduce the expectations from four courses to three courses per semester. That can enable focus on our teaching and innovative course design/implementation. It will also allow us to more actively pursue research agendas which oftentimes get dissemination in our classes and expand the content of our courses.
I would enjoy seeing teams of Education faculty teaching online but attached to and working in school districts so that students could have corresponding field experiences; current teachers could become involved in the preparation of new teachers while expanding their own skills or knowledge of theory and research.
I think you covered all those familiar to me.
I think this project is a definite, positive step in the right direction.
I think EMU must focus on getting the basics (chairs, temperature regulation, noise control, lighting, etc.) to a uniform, acceptable level before putting resources into high-tech improvements of uncertain value. It's comical to speak of "web-enhanced wireless multi-media classrooms" when the reality is that most of EMU's classrooms are too loud, too hot/cold, and filled with broken chairs.
I love WebCT. I hope in the future we can teach complete on-line courses using WebCT. It is much easier than eCollege.
I currently teach practice based clinicals at hospitalinnovation implemented is partnering with students to

design the clinical as we go along.
I am very concerned about the CE Department's involvement in online formatting. I'm not convinced that they are financially prudent and/or ethical in accomplishing their goals of more online courses; forsaking quality education for quantity and/or financial income to their department solely.
I am especially encouraged by the possibility of web/classroom hybrids. I can how the web is good for delivery but don't want to give up face-to-face interactions with students.
I am concerned that we focus too much on delivery method without focusing enough on the outcomes that we want to see happen from the results of our instruction. We seem to be searching for the match method and we need to agree on what should result from whatever type of instruction that we do.
How do they fit in with EMUs past and future mission. How do we distinguish ourselves from area schools?
Go back to certain allowed times for classes. Now students have too many opportunities to overlap classes and/or take classes elsewhere. They leave my classes early to drive to Schoolcraft or WCC. We should make efforts to keep them here on campus.
Get higher quality students who are better prepared to begin working at the college level. Have remedial, online courses to bring poorly-prepared students up to speed BEFORE they arrive on campus. These courses should require mastery learning, not grades-students would repeat the course until they master basic math and writing skills. Put quality learning first and foremost. Train our teachers to expect more of HS students so that when we recruit them, they are adequately prepared to begin collegelevel work.
Flexibility is the key in today's market. More online courses, more weekend courses, more classes at satellite campuses, more winter break classes and more spring and summer classes of all kinds. The student body is changing and the world of education is changing. Access to education must become easier and more convenient, especially for a university such as EMU which is about seven rungs down on the totem pole of higher education and just above community colleges. For that reason also, we must keep fees as low as possible. If students cannot afford to come to EMU then all the machines in the world will be ineffective.
Fix the temperature in Pray Harrold.
Everyone should have the opportunity to learn "Blackboard" or a similar program. Classes on Saturday to learn new technologies fully with pay or food in a atmosphere of "Thanks for coming on your own time to learn this."
Establish interdisciplinary courses across the curriculum, to be integrated into Gen Ed, and program requirements, as well as electives.
Encourage Hybrids; Improve classroom scheduling. Instead of new construction, look at space optimization.
Encourage hybrid classes (provide a notebook or released time the first semester)--hybrid courses are one way to move both faculty and students toward more innovative teaching and learning
easy Internet access

develop more ph.d. programs that are administered by central administration's cont. ed., primarily online
and self-supporting and not requiring departmental/school input.
Create and use video scenarios and case studies similar to what is on the "In Time" Website for looking into other teachers classes as teaching prompts and discussion(or even looking into professors classes for faculty professional development).
create a position for an individual or group of individuals to visit, investigate and assess appropriate businesses, institutions and industries. The task would be to learn the latest developments in instructional delivery ideas and methods involving the creation/production of their products and ideas. Another part of their task would be to follow closely journals, magazines, newspapers, radio and TV for more ideas and methods and report new developments to the appropriate departments.
Content experts do not always make good teachers. If professors do not have a teaching degree, they may/should be encouraged to attend teaching seminars.
Consider forming an ALTERNATE CALENDAR COMMITTEE. The current calendar and on into the next five years is still tied to the agrarian based idea that students need to spend the months of May through August "on the farm." One of the reasons the University of Phoenix is successful is that the programs are tailored to the students' needs not to what the faculty "wants." It is a dog eat dog out there and to not recognize the emerging patterns in the delivery of higher education is like the ostrich putting her head in the sand. Evolution relegates to extinction those organisms that are unable to adapt to changing environmental conditions.
Computer refresh in the labs should be started again.
Capital improvements for Pray-Harrod, the largest classroom building on campus (and for Mark Jefferson too) are desperately needed.
Bring people to campus who have implemented great ideas already at other institutions, and have them share their ideas with our faculty and lecturers.
Better, functioning OV projectors, power point capacity.
AS stated above, the Writing Across the Curriculum helped me to develop a much better way of getting my students to write and enjoy it. Their conference and the mentoring that went on was a wonderful way to help me deliver the course material.
As faculty members develop course with different instructional delivery time frames, each course should be evaluated case by case for how it fits with in load/over load decisions. As it is now, it seems that the rules for determining whether a course can be taught as part of load are too limiting.
Allow more experimentation --team taught classes; compressed classes; etc

Adoption and support of initiatives such as SCORM, would go a long way to facilitate and standardize individual faculty instructional efforts using technology. The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a strategy sponsored by the government, industry, and academic leaders to facilitate instructional content development and delivery using current and emerging technologies. Specifically, its Sharable Content Object Reference Model (SCORM) project focuses on next-generation open architecture for online learning, including standards for run-time communication, course structure, and content meta-data. <http://www.adlnet.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=scormabt>

A classroom within 5 degrees of 'room temperature' that allows me to show a webpage or powerpoint.

1. End the CE ghetto. A class is a class. 2. Severely limit CE overload sections. We have no credibility when faculty (especially leaders in AAUP and Faculty Council!!) are teaching 5-10 overload sections a year through CE. 3. Support/reward/recognize successful innovations in non-traditional delivery. Continue to reward departments with lecturer replacement dollars when faculty are teaching non-traditional courses are part of load. 4. Maintain the relationship with e-College. ICT cannot be trusted with supporting internet courses. 5. The library has done a good job through internet access to electronic reserves and electronic databases. Support and expand. 6. Support staff on campus must be made to realize that off-campus students cannot come during bankers' hours to fill out forms. Continue to make business transactions via the web better and more available. 7. After 15 years of uphill battles, I am gratified that the Task Force has been formed. Do not hesitate to contact me. Walter Tucker

1. Fund the **faculty development office!** They should have more than just one person there (used to be three). They need more computer equipment. 2. Builtin support for **faculty collaboration** on teaching (i.e. funding, perhaps through the fac dev office) 3. funding for collaboration between librarians and other fac on first-year courses so that all students emerge able use the library, cite their sources and manage the basics of information tools. 4. Do an anonymous test of faculty by discipline to see what percentage are still incapable of basic computing skills. I bet it is unacceptably high, especially in the COE. Shame them or require them to get remedial training. How can they teach if they don't even know how to manage email attachments?