

# JOINT PRESIDENTIAL – ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF CMU’S OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

## PRELIMINARY REPORT

The Joint Presidential – Academic Senate Task Force on Off-Campus Programs was established by the Senate on September 26, 2006. It was composed of 15 members, some elected by the Senate and some appointed by the President, with a **charge** to “*gather relevant information about the current status of CMU’s ProfEd unit and today’s distance learning market and make recommendations for changes that will promote growth, economic viability and quality in CMU’s off-campus programs.*” Further information on the membership and charge is given in Appendix A.

CMU is committed to off-campus programs as demonstrated by its **mission statement**, adopted by the Board of Trustees: “*Through its off-campus delivery service, ProfEd, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult learners.*” This commitment also forms a component of the CMU 2010 strategic plan (Priority 4, Strategy 1). The University has had a unit dedicated to delivering off-campus programming for over 35 years. A large percentage of students served are older, working adults and/or members of disadvantaged populations for which traditional higher education is not an option.

CMU’s off-campus programming offers several advantages to the University. It produces significant additional revenue plus it provides opportunities to explore new curricula and new delivery methods. Those that participate in ProfEd programs are exposed to views, cultures, types of learners, and instructional methodologies not common on campus. As a practical matter, including ProfEd students in enrollment numbers is advantageous in terms of seeking state and other forms of support and in increasing diversity in the CMU community. Off-campus and non-traditional programming is the fastest growing segment in higher education and therefore important for the University’s future.

The creation of a Task Force with the above charge was precipitated by recent declines in ProfEd enrollments. This is due in large part to increasingly strong competition from other programs. Continued enrollment declines and subsequent loss of income would have significant budgetary implications given that ProfEd currently contributes about \$4 million a year toward balancing CMU’s general fund budget. Therefore, keeping the current structure for ProfEd is not an option. An educational consulting firm, Eduventures, was contracted last year to consider this problem and made several suggestions. Consideration of the issues by the Task Force would provide an independent assessment from an internal perspective.

The Task Force was convened and formally charged by President Rao on October 27, 2006. It met once or twice a week through November. Each meeting focused on a particular topic, posed as one or more general questions. These were:

- Should CMU consider converting ProfEd into a unit that is associated with, but independent and largely separated from, CMU?
- Who does CMU intend to serve and what does it wish to accomplish through its off-campus programming?
- Where should off-campus operations be located in CMU's organizational structure?
- What incentives are needed to encourage increased participation by on-campus units in off-campus programming?
- What changes, if any, should be made in course delivery formats used for off-campus programming?

Each discussion was guided by a set of more specific questions related to the topic of the overarching question. Detailed notes on the discussions are given in Appendix B.

The Task Force was aware of the concurrent search underway for a new Vice President and Executive Director/ProfEd. Obviously, the new hire should have input on any new directions proposed for the off-campus programming unit. Consequently, the Task Force agreed that its role was to identify the concerns and/or questions the campus community would like the new VP/Executive Director to address and/or consider, particularly ones related to fostering a closer relationship between ProfEd and on-campus departments and colleges. The recommendations given below should be viewed with this perspective. Some general areas of potential concern include communication channels, organizational structure, personnel, and curricular development.

The recommendations of the Task Force are given below. They are organized into the five general topics of discussion listed above. Each recommendation is followed by a brief rationale. More information on the reasons for recommendations can be found in the meeting notes given in the Appendix.

## **Recommendations**

**TOPIC 1:** Should CMU consider converting ProfEd into a unit that is associated with, but independent and largely separated from, CMU?

### **1.A. CMU should not further consider the separate legal entity model for off-campus programming.**

Rationale: Eduventures suggested creating a separate legal entity for off-campus programming called CMU Worldwide. There are significant disadvantages to this approach, including potential loss of control over quality of programs and revenue returned to campus, potential difficulties in transcribing and transferring credits, creating brand name confusion, less access to diverse populations by on-campus faculty, and less ability to have combined on-campus and off-campus programs. As a practical matter, legal considerations might reduce most of the potential advantages of separation.

- 1.B. **Rather than further separation of ProfEd from the campus, CMU should work to integrate on- and off-campus programming.**
- a. **There should not be separate admission standards for on-campus and off-campus programs.**
  - b. **Departments and colleges should set the admission standards and curricula for programs they see as viable, whether on- or off-campus. Any student admitted to the CMU program could enroll in on- or off-campus courses.**
  - c. **On-campus and off-campus SCH, enrollments, graduates, etc. should be combined in reports of unit productivity, although the on-campus and off-campus components of the data may be distinguished for compelling reasons.**

Rationale: The learning outcomes of off-campus and on-campus versions of the same program must be the same to satisfy HLC accreditation requirements. On-campus and off-campus courses should be interchangeable in their program applicability. This minimizes the difficulties of catering to separate markets for on- and off-campus students. From the student perspective, this gives a seamless portrait of academic offerings. (Note that interchangeable does not mean exactly equivalent at a micro-level, such as each instructor covering the same thing in the same way; there may be differences in off-campus and on-campus versions of the same program in such areas as delivery formats and assignments taking into account different backgrounds and maturity levels of students.)

**TOPIC 2:** Who does CMU intend to serve and what does it wish to accomplish through its off-campus programming?

- 2.A **There should be no age restrictions on off-campus service targets; CMU’s programming should serve adolescent through senior learners, as needed.**

Rationale: The fastest growing demographic group seeking higher education is working professionals of non-traditional age.<sup>1</sup> There is also a growing demand for college courses available to high school students and courses for retirees.

- 2.B. **As far as possible, CMU should educate all students that can take advantage of our program and course offerings, irrespective of geographic location.**

Rationale: CMU wishes to be more known nationally and internationally. Modern technology makes it possible to compete for students and offer programs irrespective of geography. CMU has unique expertise in and a history of educating non-traditional and off-campus students.

- 2.C. **CMU should not try to have all courses in the CMU catalog available off-campus. The focus should be mainly on making programs available, with the market driving what off-campus programs are offered.**

Rationale: What courses and programs are offered, whether on or off campus, should be determined by need. Need will be largely reflected in student demand.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eduventures report for Central Michigan University – ProfEd entitled “Post Secondary Market Overview” and dated October 16, 2006.

**2.D. CMU’s total off-campus programming should produce a positive net income for the University.**

Rationale: Some programs may be less profitable than others, or even lose money, but CMU cannot afford to subsidize overall off-campus programming merely for the purpose of having an off-campus presence, offering a service, or gaining visibility in different geographical regions. Off-campus and non-traditional student enrollments may be important in helping CMU avoid financial difficulties in times of declining on-campus students.<sup>2</sup>

**2.E. The current financial model of ProfEd needs revision.**

Rationale: The financial model is critical for the success and profitability of off-campus programming. Presently there are problems with how individuals, departments and colleges are rewarded and with the fact that profits do not specifically support academic programming but only general budgetary needs.

**2.F. CMU should survey on-campus faculty members and adjunct faculty to learn (1) what rewards they desire for participating in CMU’s off-campus programs, (2) what barriers they see to their participation and (3) what benefits there are in participation at present.**

Rationale: There is a need to develop a stable pool of adjunct faculty and greater involvement of on-campus faculty for teaching CMU’s off-campus courses. There is growing competition from other operations for adjunct faculty. At the same time, increased participation in off-campus programming by regular faculty is desired.

**TOPIC 3: Where should off-campus operations be located in CMU’s organizational structure?**

**3.A. There needs to be a separate unit dedicated to the delivery of off-campus operations.**

Rationale: ProfEd’s internal service units duplicate many on-campus ones, such as it having its own accounting and admissions offices. This is, however, desirable because most of these student services and administrative operations would be very difficult to integrate into the analogous units on-campus. Examples are financial aid, facilities management, and library services.

**3.B. The unit responsible for off campus programs should be in the Academic Affairs Division.**

- a. Within the division, it should be at the college level with its senior officer reporting directly to the Provost in the same manner as a dean.**
- b. The title for the director should be revised.<sup>3</sup>**
- c. The name of CMU’s off campus programs unit should be changed from ProfEd to CMU Off-Campus Programs.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Michigan high school graduation numbers are predicted to experience a significant decline starting in the 2007-08 year (<http://www.wiche.edu/policy/Knocking/1988-2018/profiles/mi.pdf>).

<sup>3</sup> It is recognized that the current title is Vice President and Executive Director, and this was how it was advertised in the recent search which culminated in the hire of Merodie Hancock .

Rationale:

- a. Given its focus, ProfEd should not be a unit whose director reports directly to the President, nor is it appropriate to have it in any of the other organizational units: Governmental Relations and Public Affairs, Finance and Administrative Services, or Development and Alumni Relations.
- b. The leader of the off-campus programs unit should be at the same level as the deans but the title “Dean” as well as the title “Vice President” sends the wrong message. The unit director does have an academic role, but that role does not include responsibility for academic programs as for a dean, and the financial management role is more significant. The title “Vice President” suggests a direct report to the President – a higher level than the deans. Because the unit director must exercise and direct both academic and service functions, an assistant(s) with specialized expertise will likely be needed.
- c. The name “ProfEd” is too close to “profit” and inadvertently sends the wrong message about the unit’s function. There are advantages in having CMU in the name.

**TOPIC 4:** What incentives are needed to produce increased participation in off-campus programming?

**4.A. ProfEd’s present system of financial incentives needs modification. A system that provides incentives to academic programs (one such example is the current ProfEd venture program<sup>4</sup>) should be developed.**

Rationale: Presently the financial return to departments is not standardized. In most cases the return is too small to motivate a department to actively seek to offer courses off-campus, with an exception being the venture program model.

**4.B. On-campus faculty need to be better informed regarding how to be involved with ProfEd.**

Rationale: The present procedure for offering ProfEd courses to on-campus faculty discourages their participation with ProfEd. Presently one must subscribe to the offering list and the available courses are announced well before on-campus responsibilities have been set. On campus faculty need some way to express interest in a course and then have input into possible offering times and locations.

**4.C. Problems with the present organizational structure of the MSA Program and its relationships to ProfEd and on-campus departments need to be addressed.**

Rationale: Currently there are differences between the structure of the MSA program compared to other on-campus academic units. Similarly, there are differences in the way resources are allocated to the MSA program by ProfEd compared to other on-campus academic units. Recommendations for changes to these differences and inequities have been made to the Provost by the MSA Director, but the decisions on implementation are presently on hold.

---

<sup>4</sup> Under ProfEd’s venture program incentive, the unit offering the program gets 60% of the revenue, from which it must pay its expenses (e.g., faculty salaries), and ProfEd receives 40% of the revenue to cover its expenses. The unit and ProfEd jointly develop a detailed chart of which unit is responsible for which activity. With a successful off-campus program, a department can use the revenue to fund GA’s, etc. In the case of the successful MPA program, one goal is to have 50% of courses taught by regular faculty, which encourages on-campus faculty involvement with ProfEd.

4.D. **The following areas of difficulty will need to be addressed:**

- a. **ProfEd SCH production and revenue are not attached to the course designator as they are for on-campus courses.**
- b. **Salary and workload policies need to be revised and made more consistent.**

Rationale: There should be no differences between how revenue from on-campus and off-campus offerings are handled, although there could be charges for ProfEd services. Presently there are differences between what is paid for teaching a ProfEd course, teaching a summer course and for “buying out” a course. There are differences in how teaching for ProfEd is handled and compensated when it is in-load versus when it is out-of-load, and there are differences when teaching out-of-load versus when teaching overload.

**TOPIC 5:** What changes, if any, should be made in course delivery formats used for off-campus programming?

The answer to this question involves details beyond the purview of the Task Force. Some recommendations have been made, but many of the Task Force’s findings for this topic are relevant observations. The observations are listed first, followed by the recommendations. Appendix C summarizes the information the Task Force had about the delivery formats being used on-and-off campus.

**Observations**

- **Some formats may not be practical for certain types of courses. Practicality is essentially determined by the amount of resources needed to implementing a given format.**
- **The effectiveness of a given format depends critically on the discipline, the type of course, and the student audience.**
- **Students prefer both face to face interaction and convenience. Non-traditional formats, like on-line, offer convenience. Students make pragmatic decisions to enroll in courses with specific formats based on personal issues. One personal factor for students, as well as for instructors, is their attitude toward a particular format.**
- **Assuring high quality is the fundamental factor that should be considered in course and program development and offerings.**
- **Some policies on delivery formats are necessary to assure course quality.**
- **CMU’s current mix of delivery formats of its off-campus offerings makes it less competitive than other providers.**

**Recommendations**

5.A. **Information should be compiled on the delivery formats in use on campus in order to see if the mix is appropriate.**

Rationale: The Task Force discussions revealed there is a belief based on personal observations that the present mix of delivery formats needs modification, but data on what is actually occurring was lacking.

**5.B. Policies governing delivery formats should be in place to assure the quality of courses and programs.**

Rationale: Having policies in place precludes compromising academic integrity for increased efficiency, profitability, student preference, and other factors. An example of such a compromise would be meeting the required number of hours but in such a compressed format that reflection time and homework are eliminated.

**5.C. Responsibility for deciding on course format should be at the department and college level. Implementation of format changes must proceed through the prescribed curricular process.**

Rationale: If the learning outcomes for courses/programs are the same for all versions – and they should be – the delivery format is immaterial and there is no reason to restrict formats either on- or off-campus. We recognize that changes need to be consistent with the Curricular Authority Document. Although there have been persistent comments that the present curricular process is too slow to address changes in the marketplace and does not encourage rapid innovation and change, the curricular process can function efficiently and in a timely manner when necessary and if course and program documents are prepared well and are championed through the process.

**5.D. The expertise from both on-campus and ProfEd resources should be made available for development, refinement, marketing, and assessment of both on- and off-campus programs and courses.**

Rationale: Many of the considerations that go into whether or not to offer courses or programs off campus, and once offered to run them economically (e.g., with sufficient enrollments), apply to on-campus courses and programs as well.

**APPENDIX A: Academic Senate Charge to the Task Force and Membership  
Background information provided the Senate**

**APPENDIX B: Notes of the meetings of the Task Force**

**APPENDIX C: Summary of information available on course formats**



**PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON CMU'S OFF CAMPUS PROGRAMS**

**Charge to the Task Force**

The Task Force will gather relevant information about the current status of CMU's ProfEd unit and today's distance learning market and make recommendations for changes that will promote growth, economic viability and quality in CMU's off-campus programs. In particular, the Task Force will consider:

- The reports and recommendations for ProfEd prepared by the consulting firm Eduventures in 2005-06.
- The most current Board of Visitors Report.
- Ways by which CMU can be competitive in the distance learning marketplace.
- Changes that can be made so that on-campus faculty and CMU departments have more motivation to participate in ProfEd programming.

The task force will present its recommendations to the President and the Academic Senate by November 30, 2006.

**Task Force Membership**

	Member	Dept.	College
<b>From the Academic Senate</b>			
Academic Senate Chairperson:	Brad Swartz	CDO	HP
Three members elected by the Senate*:	Roger Coles	RPL	EHS
	Michael Kennedy	HS	HP
	Rick Sykes	BCA	CFA
<b>From Academic Colleges*</b>			
Two members elected by the Senate:	Donna Ericksen	MTH	S&T
	Rick Kurtz	PSC	HSBS
Two members appointed by the President from the Colleges of Business Administration; Communication and Fine Arts; Education and Human Services; Health Professions; Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences; and Science and Technology	Kevin Love	MGT	BA
	Gary Shapiro		HSBS
From the College of Graduate Studies:	Peter Ross	MSA Director (CGS)	
<b>From the Administration</b>			
Three members appointed by the President, one of which shall be the Dean of EHS:	Gail Scukanec		CGS
	Karen Adams		EHS
	Wayne Osborn	Office of Research	
<b>From ProfEd:</b>			
The Director of ProfEd:	Dan Stephens		
One member appointed by the President	Albert Zainea		
<b>From the Faculty Association</b>			
One member appointed by the President of the Faculty Association	Stephen Wagner	PSY	HSBS

\*Preference was for faculty that (1) would ensure representation of all colleges and (2) be from departments/ programs with significant ProfEd offerings. In 2005-2006 the largest SCH productions – over 900 – were in **MSA**; ACC, ECO, **MGT**; IPC (CDA), JRN; CED, HEV, **EAD** (EL), **EDU** (TEPD); **CDO**, **DHA/HSC**; ENG, HST, PHL/REL, **PSC**, **PSY**, SOC/ANT; CPS, GEO/ESC, IET, **MTH/STA**, TEC. The doctoral **DHA** and **Ed.D in EL** programs should be represented. Bold type indicates representation on the task force.

Approved by the Academic Senate 9-26-06

### **Basic parameters for the study**

- CMU has had a unit dedicated to offering off-campus programming for 35 years and has earned a national reputation in higher education for this activity.
- A commitment to off-campus programs is expressed in CMU's mission statement, adopted by the Board of Trustees: *"Through its Off-Campus Programs, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult populations."* This commitment is part of CMU 2010: Priority 4, Strategy 1.
- A large percentage of ProfEd's students are older, working adults and/or members of disadvantaged populations for which traditional higher education is not an option.
- A growing percentage of learners in higher education are working professionals of non-traditional age who are seeking credible academic programs such as those offered by CMU's ProfEd.
- ProfEd provides advantages to CMU:
  - It provides an opportunity to explore new curricula and new delivery methods (Note: the MSA is a good example of the type of interdisciplinary program now being developed by many competitors).
  - Participation in ProfEd programs exposes some members of the faculty to other views, cultures, types of learners, and instructional methodologies.
  - As a practical matter, including ProfEd students in enrollment numbers is advantageous in terms of seeking state and other forms of support and in increasing diversity in the CMU community.
- ProfEd enrollments have been declining, in part due to increasingly strong competition from other programs.
  - Continuing education and on-line learning are presently the growth areas of higher education, but CMU has lagged somewhat in developing such programs.
  - Accreditation and financial aid standards are loosening, increasing the numbers of competitors.
- ProfEd's enrollment declines have significant budgetary implications:
  - Presently, CMU's general operations budget depends on the income from ProfEd (roughly \$4 million a year).
  - Loss of this income would necessitate the cutting of roughly 80 on-campus positions, including faculty positions.
- CMU's accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission, recommended in CMU's last review that the institution move toward less budgetary dependence on ProfEd and Auxiliary Services enterprises (mainly residence halls). Such income should allow for additional activities, not be fundamental to operations.
- An outside consulting firm concluded that, because enrollments are declining, CMU must take some action quickly. They offered the possibility that ProfEd be separated from CMU and operated as an independent, but associated, entity.

**APPENDIX B**

**Notes of the meetings of the Task Force**

# PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

## Meeting Notes - October 27, 2006

Present: Adams, Coles, Ericksen, Kennedy, Love, Osborn, Ross, Stephens, Swartz, Wagner, Zainea. Virtually present via speaker phone: Kurtz. Absent: Scukanec, Shapiro, Sykes.

Guest: Rao

1. President Rao convened the Task Force at 1:05 p.m.
  - a. Rao thanked the Task Force members for agreeing to serve. He noted that the work will be somewhat intense, but he hopes it will be stimulating.
  - b. He noted members were provided the charge and background information approved by the Academic Senate.
  - c. He provided some observations, as direction to the committee:
    - CMU is committed to off-campus programming.
    - ProfEd is an asset, but it is underutilized.
    - We should focus on the future, not on the past.
    - We might consider how we would design an off-campus program if starting from scratch.
    - What would we like ProfEd to be in 5 to 10 years?
    - The State of Michigan wants to double the college-educated population and CMU should be a participant.
    - Think about who we are serving through ProfEd as well as our desires. The needs of more mature, working adults may not mesh well with an on-campus, three days a week for 15 weeks format.
    - Consider the academic issues more than financial specifics.
    - What incentives are needed to stimulate departments, as well as individual faculty, to actively participate in expanding ProfEd programming?
    - A group led by Jonas Cook (included Adams, Stephens) studied duplicated services (ProfEd is essentially a mini-university with its own accounts receivable, registrar, etc.).
    - Our MSA is a model degree program for off-campus programs, but to outsiders (1) the concentration areas are not known and (2) it doesn't have the MBA cachet. Professional Science Masters (M.S.) degrees is another area at which CMU has been looking.
  - d. Rao asked for questions. In response to the question of what the Task Force is to produce in the relatively short time until November 30, Rao responded:
    - A report on recommendations for the immediate future of ProfEd. In particular, recommendations about expanding undergraduate and degree completion programs. November 30 may not be set in stone.
    - Help educate and inform the campus community that ProfEd is at a turning point. It is presently in a "downward spiral" and the loss of the income it generates would cost about 100 on-campus positions (with effects on on-campus programming). The campus at large must understand its importance (academically, as well as financially) and determine how to best utilize ProfEd..
  - e. Rao left at 1:30.

2. Academic Senate Chairperson Swartz also expressed appreciation to those who had agreed to serve. He noted he has been involved with ProfEd as part of the Prior Learning Assessment Team (which evaluates learning experiences for college credit). He made two observations supplementing Rao's comments
  - a. The report is for not only the President but also for the Senate. The Senate will need some time to consider it.
  - b. From his experience, an important issue that must be addressed if one is to have more on-campus faculty involvement is that of intellectual property ownership. Specifically, if a faculty member prepares course materials for ProfEd, does ProfEd have ownership and, therefore, the right to decide how, when and by whom the course will be offered?
  
3. Osborn asked each Task Force member to introduce him or herself, giving present position at the university and past or present involvement with ProfEd. Interestingly, almost all had ProfEd experience. Besides Stephens and Zainea from ProfEd, Ross the MSA director, and those who have taught for ProfEd, the Task Force has
  - a. Kurtz, who directs the off-campus MPA program,
  - b. Adams, who oversees a college (EHS) with significant ProfEd offerings,
  - c. Kennedy, who directs the DHA program which has an on-line component.
  
4. Committee Formalities
  - a. Given the short timeline, it was agreed to meet at least once a week.
  - b. With such a large committee, full attendance at every meeting is impossible. Osborn will keep and distribute "meeting notes." These are not to be construed as formal minutes.
  - c. After discussion, the following meetings were established:
 

Friday, November 3	1:00 – 3:00 p.m.	President's Conference Room, UC
Friday, November 10	1:00 – 3:00 p.m.	(Room to be determined)
Monday, November 13	3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	(Room to be determined)
Wednesday, November 15	1:00 – 3:00 p.m.	(Room to be determined)
Monday, November 20	3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	(Room to be determined)
Monday, November 27	3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	(Room to be determined)
  - d. As a "Senate Committee" we can hold hearings, that is invite others if their expertise or points of view are needed.
  - e. The Task Force's work is not confidential. Feel free to share the topics of our discussions with others across campus and seek their opinions on the issues we are addressing.
  
5. Osborn gave background on how the Task Force came to be.
  - a. Last spring there was a study of possible future directions of ProfEd by the consulting firm Eduventures. One possibility presented was to spin ProfEd off from CMU as a separate and independent, but associated, organization. A summary of this option was presented to the Board of Trustees. In conversations with other Presidents, including one where the off-campus operation had indeed been separated, Rao began to question the wisdom of this option.
  - b. In August Rao met with Osborn, Swartz and a few other faculty members to discuss the best way to get the on-campus community involved in the discussions. A joint Presidential-Senate Task Force was suggested, as the Senate is the most appropriate body for faculty contributions to discussions of academic and broad policy issues.
  - c. The Task Force composition and charge was developed in consultations between Swartz, Rao and Osborn. Rao desired faculty members on the Task Force that had some experience with ProfEd; the Senate desired representation from all colleges.
  - d. The November 30 time line was partly set so that the Board of Trustees can be updated at their December meeting (the BOT changes composition in January; the present Board understands the need for ProfEd changes, but new BOT members would need to be educated on the issues).

6. Stephens and Osborn met earlier in the week to discuss how the Task Force should proceed.
  - a. The basic issue is that ProfEd is at a turning point. From a business perspective, you can't cost cut your way to profitability; fundamental changes must be made.
  - b. They agreed the real issues must be put on the table and discussed so that they can be addressed. What are the real issues? Members mentioned a few (the notes are poor at this point)
    - Intellectual property issue
    - Where the SCH credit and revenue goes
    - The basic structure – where should ProfEd reside within the Academic Division
  - c. A few specific questions were developed for contemplation by the committee. Such questions will be starting points for our discussions on what changes are needed.
    - If starting fresh, what features would we want CMU's off-campus program to have? (a Rao question)
    - There are many Michigan schools that make most of their offerings available to non-traditional students, so why can't/shouldn't CMU do this?
    - What incentives are needed to stimulate departments and individual faculty to actively participate in expanding ProfEd programming? (a Rao question)
    - How can ProfEd help CMU address the coming decline in Michigan high school graduation rates in the next 3 to 5 years?
    - ProfEd is an academic unit, so how can its revenue be used to address academic needs (not just general budget balancing)?
  
7. It was agreed to spend each meeting discussing just one or two key questions. **Task Force members are to forward to Osborn what they see are the most important questions to be addressed.** He will compile and organize the questions into sets for discussion.

NEXT MEETING: FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2006 1- 3 p.m. President's Conference Room, UC

HOMEWORK: Send Osborn your "important questions" by Wednesday, 11/1 at 5:30 pm

## PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

### Meeting Notes - November 3, 2006 President's Conference Room, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Present: Adams, Coles, Kennedy, Kurtz, Love, Osborn, Ross, Stephens, Swartz, Wagner, Zainea. Absent: Ericksen, Scukanec, Shapiro, Sykes.

1. The locations for the upcoming meetings of the task force were announced:

Friday, 11/10	1 – 3 pm	Foust 255
Monday, 11/13	3 – 5 pm	Lake Huron Room, UC
Wednesday, 11/15	1 – 3 pm	President's Conference Room, UC
Monday, 11/20	3 – 5 pm	President's Conference Room, UC
Monday, 11/27	3 – 5 pm	Maroon Room, UC
  
2. The Task Force began its work by considering one of the models for the future of CMU's off-campus programs presented by the consultant, that of CMU Worldwide. In this model ProfEd would become an organization that is associated with, but independent and largely separated from CMU.
  - a. It was noted that this is just one model in a continuum. The more extreme cases of the sale of ProfEd to another entity or its merger with a well-resourced partner were previously judged impracticable and are not to be further considered.
  - b. On the other end of the continuum is maintaining ProfEd as part of CMU, but this does not mean keeping the present structure. Rather, a wide variety of changes could be considered.
  
3. Background
  - a. Questions had been raised about ProfEd becoming a separate entity, modeled on the University of Phoenix. CMU's Board of Trustees asked for a study focusing on:
    - Could it be done?
    - Should it be done?
    - How would the entity be structured?
    - What would be the advantages, disadvantages and possible pitfalls?
  - b. Some factors
    - The idea is that an associated entity could capitalize on the CMU name and its accreditation while being able to quickly develop programs in response to market.
    - The consultants modeled enrollments, revenue, etc. based on unrestrained growth, (that is, CMU Worldwide would be entirely responsive to market demands).
    - Our accrediting body (HLC of NCA) said they had no problems with an associated unit; they are encouraging more innovative delivery models.
    - Rao found one institution that had gone this route with disappointing results and which is now trying to undo the separation.
    - As a practical matter, it is possible that the advantages envisioned by separation would be greatly limited by legal issues.

- c. Rao has come to believe this is not the way to go, but would like our Task Force to make an independent assessment. Whether or not a CMU Worldwide model should be further considered is one issue that we need to resolve by our November 30 deadline. Osborn expressed hope we could dispose of it at this meeting.
4. Stephens and Osborn walked the group through the Eduventures July presentation to the Board of Trustees (see document distributed earlier). Some points:
    - a. ProfEd enrollments have been declining. The large decline in MSA has been partly masked by growth in education programs, but these have now leveled out.
    - b. The identified factors affecting ProfEd enrollments:  
External: increased competition, product proliferation, an MBA versus our MSA, flexible formats for adult learners; Internal: CMU's program portfolio (MSA in an MBA market, on-line courses but not on-line programs, less focus on undergraduate and military markets), CMU culture (time to market, supply driven offerings)
    - c. Present ProfEd structure has profits forecasted to go to zero by 2014, so something must be done. Unrestrained growth (31 new programs with new locations and new delivery formats) would reverse the enrollment declines.
    - d. The "moon" slide in the presentation summarizes the differences between the current ProfEd structure and a CMU Worldwide one.
  5. There was a lively and candid discussion about some of the assumptions of the CMU Worldwide model, as well as some myths about and features of the current model. Comments included that the first issue that should be addressed is that of the optimal organizational structure for ProfEd, i.e. how should it fit into CMU (Love) and that the closeness between "ProfEd" and "profit" projects a negative image (Kennedy). Osborn noted that many of the issues would be discussed at future meetings. The group should focus on the question of whether or not a CMU Worldwide model is worth further study.
    - a. Advantages of the model are an ability to quickly respond to market demands, it saves work on campus (don't have to review courses, instructors, etc.), has more profit potential.
    - b. Negatives of this model include campus loses quality control (could cheapen products in response to market desires), lose revenue control (may lose revenue to departments and individual faculty as there is no guarantee profits come to campus), causes brand name confusion, makes CMU community less diverse, loss of ability to count ProfEd students could have financial impact, couldn't do seamless (on- and off-campus hybrid) programs, credits may not transfer, the legal issue, part of CMU's mission and vision is that we will serve non-traditional students, harder to offer programs off campus (HLC can give blanket authorization for programs offered off-campus through ProfEd but we need individual authorizations for programs based on-campus to go off-campus)
    - c. Some non-obvious disadvantages include loss of access by faculty to non-traditional age students with resultant limits on learning about real world cases, less opportunity for useful business contacts, less access to non 18-22 age subjects for research projects.
  6. After a straw poll, it was agreed that our report would include a recommendation that CMU not further consider a CMU Worldwide model for off-campus programming. A summary of the rationale, including quoting the legal opinion, will be added.

## PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

### Meeting Notes - November 10, 2006 Foust 255, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Present: Coles, Ericksen, Kennedy, Osborn, Ross, Scukanec, Stephens, Swartz, Sykes, Wagner, Zainea. Absent: Adams, Kurtz, Love, Shapiro.

1. The Task Force began discussion of the topic “Where should off-campus operations be located in CMU’s organizational structure?” At the previous meeting Love had argued that this is one of the first things that need to be decided. Love’s comments on this had been circulated to the group.
2. Osborn had agreed to prepare and distribute a set of questions to guide the discussions. In doing so, he came to believe that some background issues needed to be understood first. It is a given (a Board of Trustees decision) that CMU will have off-campus programming:

*CMU Mission Statement: Through its off-campus delivery service, ProfEd, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult learners. ...*

*To achieve its mission and realize its values, CMU is committed to ... Design and develop innovative and effective learning systems to meet contemporary educational needs.*

3. Discussion question 1: Who do we intend to serve through off-campus programs?
  - a. The mission statement talks of “adult learners.” The group discussed if there should be age or other restrictions on who could enroll in off-campus courses/programs.
    - Zainea noted that 60% of on-campus students now meet the CAEL definition of “adult learner.”
    - Ericksen noted the growing market for high school students.
    - Stephens noted the growing market for degree completion for traditional-age students who do not want to travel to campus

**It was agreed that there should be no restrictions; our programming should serve adolescent through senior learners, as needed.**

    - The idea of separate markets for on- and off-campus students becomes a moot point if programs are integrated.

**There was a strong sentiment CMU should work to integrate on- and off-campus programs.** Academically this should be seamless; that is our courses, programs, quality, etc. for on-and off-campus should be equivalent.
  - b. The mission statement talks of programming both “nationally and internationally.” The group discussed if there should be geographical restrictions.
    - Modern technology and delivery methods permit programming worldwide, and some of the largest potential markets are China and India (Stephens noted that CMU is working now on setting up a program in India).
    - Scukanec noted that while we can go anywhere, the problems of language, degree equivalency, etc. take resources to solve.
    - If CMU can go everywhere, others can too. We need to look for niche markets. It boils down to a branding issue: what do we offer that others don’t.

**It was agreed that we should attract and serve those students that meet our normal standards and policies.**

- c. The group considered if there are other reasons why off-campus enrollments should be restricted. None was identified. The basic feeling was that we already have policies in place, and any student should be allowed could take any course for which the normal requirements are met.
4. Discussion question 2: What do those we intend to serve need and what do they want?
    - a. The two factors may not be fully compatible, but there should be some correlation.
      - Two factors besides programming concerns (the specific courses/programs) are convenience to the student and ensuring quality.
      - Quality assurance is closely tied to the financial model. We now have department control over program quality (e.g. instructor qualifications, courses) but there is little financial reward to a department so in practice there is often little direct interest by the department in its ProfEd offerings.
      - Integration again seems to be an answer: more overlap and interaction between on- and off-campus faculty and seamless courses in a program would help in quality control.
    - b. The group discussed if the focus of off-campus programming should be on offering courses or on offering programs.
      - Students in general seek courses that satisfy program requirements, although there are some exceptions (elderhostel-type courses).
      - Most students are attracted by the programs available, not the courses. But to have departments invest in developing and running programs there must be a financial model that rewards, not penalizes, participating departments.

**It was agreed it would not be warranted to try and have all courses in the CMU catalog available off-campus. Our offerings should focus mainly on making programs available.**

- c. There was discussion of what programs that might be successful. The consensus was that CMU should decide what its market is, then let the market decide.

**The market should drive what off-campus programs are offered**

5. Discussion question 3. What other factors need to be considered (not answered!)?
  - a. One is how the market analysis is done. Presently there is a disconnect between departments and ProfEd. Would it be best for a department to ask ProfEd “Can you do a market analysis for this program?” or for ProfEd to tell a department “We see a good market, will you develop/offer this?”
  - b. While the Task Force was told to focus on academic, not financial, issues it was agreed financial matters need to be a consideration. CMU should not subsidize off-campus operations merely to provide a service or to have a presence in the off-campus market.

**There was agreement that off-campus programming must at least break even and probably should be asked to turn a profit.**

Where profits are invested needs to be carefully determined. There is strong feeling they should support specific academic programming rather than general budgetary needs.

- c. The financial model is critical – how individuals, departments and colleges are rewarded.  
**It was agreed the present financial structure is broken.**

There are problems at all levels: colleges, departments, individual faculty

- SCH production and revenue are not attributed to colleges/departments.
- Incentives for MSA program are not the same as for other programs.
- Incentives for colleges, for departments and indeed for many faculty are small.

Another financial consideration is that the number of high school graduates in Michigan is expected to decline significantly from 2007-08 to 2013-14. Skukanec reported Bruce Roscoe feels CMU can handle the decline, but off-campus and non-traditional student enrollments nevertheless may be important in helping CMU avoid financial difficulties.

- d. With increased competition from other operations, there is a large need to develop a stable pool of faculty that teach off-campus courses (our adjunct faculty).
- Zainea distributed copies of an article showing Rio Salado College's approach: rely almost entirely on adjunct faculty
  - Increasing opportunities with other operations will make it harder to keep those on a course-to-course basis.
  - A stable, qualified faculty can be a strong marketing advantage.
  - Ways to a more stable adjunct faculty include longer term contracts and more contact with departments and regular faculty. There would be more contact with regular faculty if more regular faculty were involved in ProfEd programming.

**It was decided it would be valuable to survey on-campus faculty members to learn (1) what rewards they desire for participating in off-campus programs and (2) what barriers to this participation exist.**

Such a survey needs to be carefully designed.

6. The discussion next returned to the original question of where off-campus operations should be located in CMU's organizational structure.

- a. Discussion question 5: Is a unit dedicated to off-campus operations needed?
- ProfEd is essentially a mini-university, with its own accounting, admissions, and other operations.
  - Some operations would be very difficult to integrate into the analogous units on campus such as financial aid, facilities management, library services.

**It was agreed that there needs to be a separate unit dedicated to handling off-campus operations.**

- b. [CMU's organizational chart](#) was distributed. Task Force members were asked to review the chart and be prepared to decide our recommendation of the level at which the responsibility for off-campus operations should be: department, college, provost/vice president, president.

## PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

**Meeting Notes - November 13, 2006**  
**Lake Huron Room, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.**

Present: Adams, Coles, Ericksen, Kennedy, Kurtz, Osborn, Ross, Scukanec, Shapiro, Stephens, Swartz, Sykes, Wagner, Zainea. Absent: Love.

1. The Task Force reviewed the decisions made at the last meeting, indicated in bold on the meeting notes. The only suggested change was that item 5(d) should be modified to:  
**It was decided it would be valuable to survey on-campus faculty members to learn (1) what rewards they desire for participating in off-campus programs, (2) what barriers they see to their participation and (3) what benefits there are in participation at present.**  
A typographical error was also noted as was the erroneous meeting date on Meeting Notes 2.
2. Discussion resumed on the general topic of where off-campus operations should be located in CMU's organizational structure. [CMU's organizational chart](#) in combination with some "guiding questions" were used to provide structure to the discussion.
3. Discussion question 1: Should the off campus unit report directly to the President?  
In this model, off-campus programs would have a similar status as Athletics – a unit with a specific focus whose director reported directly to the President.  
**It was agreed this was not the appropriate organizational structure.**
4. Discussion question 2: Given that the off-campus unit should not report to the President, in which division should the unit be placed: Academic Affairs, Governmental Relations and Public Affairs, Finance and Administrative Services, or Development and Alumni Relations?  
**It was agreed that the unit responsible for off-campus programs should be in the Academic Affairs Division.**
5. Discussion question 3: At what level in the Academic Affairs Division should the off-campus programs unit be?
  - a. The choices are at the dean/vice provost/vice president level or at a level reporting to one of the units at the dean level (e.g., Faculty Personnel Services which reports to the Vice Provost for Academic Administration)
  - b. It was noted that while the off-campus unit has academic aspects, it is not a college. It delivers, but is not responsible for, the academics.
  - c. It was noted that most of ProfEd's 200+ regular employees are not faculty but are in student services functions. There are, however, other Academic Affairs units with a focus on student services: Dean of Students, International Education, Information Technology.**It was agreed that the off campus unit should be at the college level, with its senior officer at the dean level and reporting directly to the Provost.**

6. Discussion question 4: What would be the recommended title for the leader of the off-campus programs unit?
- The position has both an academic role, but not like a dean, and a financial management one.
  - Concerns have been expressed about the title of Vice President.
    - This seems to suggest a direct report to the President – a higher level than deans
    - Nevertheless, there are analogous cases in the Academic Division: Vice President for Diversity, Vice President/Technology
  - Titles of direct reports to the Provost include dean, vice provost, vice president, director. The role is not that of a dean.
  - The current title is Vice President and Executive Director, which is how it was advertised in the current search (Note: Merodie Hancock of U. Maryland has now accepted the position).

**It was agreed that the titles “dean” and “vice president” send the wrong message about the nature of the unit and its level in the CMU organizational structure.**

- ProfEd has both academic and service aspects. The idea of splitting the unit by function, with different reporting lines (e.g., an academic leader at dean level and a financial person reporting to Ray Christie) was considered.

**It was agreed that there should be a single leader of the off-campus programs unit; it was felt dividing ProfEd by function would not be wise.**

7. Discussion question 5: What organizational structure should this unit have?
- This is a complex issue. Each department or program should be responsible for the academics of its off-campus offerings as well as its on-campus ones, but ProfEd is responsible for making off-campus offerings possible: arranging facilities, recruiting and enrolling students, recruiting those faculty the program can't provide, etc. It needs to be decided how much administrative oversight a department wants compared to how much it does not want to deal with it.
  - Coordination is obviously needed between ProfEd and the programs. It is not clear how this should be done. Some ideas and comments:
    - The idea of a structure like Development – a person responsible for off-campus issues in each college – had some support (Adams, Stephens). At present there is no single point of contact in the colleges. At the graduate level, the point of contact is the program director (Scukanec). Could the associate deans be the point of contact?
    - Kurtz argued that what is most needed is a single point of contact person in ProfEd, not in the colleges. This would be someone who understands how ProfEd operates and, therefore, can resolve problems and cut red tape when needed. In response, Zainea said he is the point of contact at ProfEd at the undergraduate level but there is no single person at the graduate level. Perhaps have “project managers” that handle the problems that arise at or with ProfEd.
  - Programs should be seamless for students and for reporting.
    - Reporting issues includes having on-campus and off-campus SCH, enrollments, graduates, considered together. There could be distinctions (X on-campus and Y off-campus SCH in the totals) for compelling reason. Stephens feels this is an accounting issue and can be done. It was noted that some separations is required by Institutional Research for federal and state reporting requirements.

- Seamless does not mean exactly equivalent (micro-level), such as each instructor covers the same thing in the same way. There might be differences in off-campus and on-campus versions of the same program (delivery formats, different background and maturity levels of students).
  - The outcomes of off-campus and on-campus versions of the same program must be the same to satisfy HLC accreditation requirements. Showing this requires effective assessment data. Faculty often don't believe the off-campus versions are equivalent to on-campus ones, and outcomes assessment would be a way to prove or disprove this belief. It was noted that more and better on-campus assessment would also be needed (but on-campus faculty may resist systematic assessment).
- d. ProfEd operates on a fee for service basis for "venture programs." An example of a successful such program is the MPA, but presently not all programs can operate under this financial model.
  - e. There was agreement that the organizational structure for ProfEd and related issues should be left to the new Vice President and Executive Director.  
**It was agreed that the role of the Task Force is to identify the concerns and/or questions we would like the new VP/Executive Director to address/consider in order to facilitate a closer relationship between ProfEd and on-campus departments and colleges. Areas of potential concern are communication channels, organizational structure, personnel, and curricular development.**

8. The group next turned to the topic of what recommendations, if any, does the Task Force have concerning the name "ProfEd?"
  - a. The former names of Institute for Personal and Career Development (IPCD) and College of Extended Learning (CEL) were noted. Part of the reason for the recent change to ProfEd (Professional Education Services) was that the unit is not a college, but provides the service of delivering courses off campus.
  - b. Using CMU in the name is advantageous for marketing. Use of "off-campus programs" in the name seems logical.
  - c. ProfEd is too close to "profit" and inadvertently sends the wrong message about the unit's function.

**It was agreed that the name of CMU's off-campus programs unit should be changed from ProfEd.**

9. The Task Force started to consider the topic of what incentives are needed to produce increased participation in off-campus programming. There are several levels to be considered: increased participation by colleges, by departments and by individual faculty members. A few areas of concern were mentioned:
  - a. All SCH production should be attached to the course designator.
  - b. The salary and workload policies need to be simplified:
    - Differences between what ProfEd pays for course versus that of for a summer course or when "buying out" a course.
    - How teaching for ProfEd in-load is handled and compensated versus when the teaching is out of load, and the differences between out of load and overload teaching.
 Discussions on this topic will continue at the next session. Osborn will prepare some guiding questions.

10. Osborn asked about sharing the meeting notes with the President. There were no objections.

## PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

### Meeting Notes - November 15, 2006 Lake Huron Room, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Present: Ericksen., Kurtz, Osborn, Ross, Scukanec, Shapiro, Stephens, Swartz, Sykes, Wagner.  
Absent: Adams, Coles, Kennedy, Love, Zainea (submitted responses to guiding questions)

1. Osborn reported that he had sent an executive summary of our preliminary recommendations to President Rao.
  - a. Rao responded that the information was useful, thanks the committee for its work, and asked if the November 30 deadline was feasible.
  - b. Looking at the timeline, it was felt we could have a preliminary report ready by November 30. The schedule will be:
    - Nov. 15 meeting: Discussion of incentives to increase participation in ProfEd
    - Nov. 20 meeting: Discussion of delivery method options
    - Nov. 27 meeting: Develop draft report
2. Discussion resumed on the general topic of what incentives are needed to produce increased participation in off-campus programming.
  - a. Consideration was first given to incentives for colleges, then incentives for departments, and finally incentives for individual faculty members although it was recognized, and the discussions reflected, there are large overlaps.
  - b. The discussion was loosely structured around what are the current incentives, are they standardized or on a case by case basis, how well are they working, and what modifications or alternatives should be considered and why.
3. Financial incentives
  - a. The basic financial incentive is tied to SCH production: \$1/credit hour
    - This flows to the dean, who generally passes it on to the department/program
    - There is a one-time \$10 bonus for significant growth (example: increasing enrollments from 1,000 to 1,500 would yield  $1,000 \times \$1 + 500 \times \$10 = \$6,000$ ). This model is a problem because unless there is an additional growth the following year (in the example, say 500 students more), the bonus goes away (1,500 enrollment now yields only \$1,500). The resultant transient funding bumps create problems (e.g., staff have been added that now can't be retained)
  - b. The financial incentive is not standardized.
    - MSA receives a flat \$75,000 (supports S&E)
    - ProfEd makes occasional special deals (“you will get X dollars if you offer this program/course off campus”)
  - c. Under the venture program incentive, the unit offering the program gets 60% of the revenue from which it must pay its expenses (e.g., faculty salaries) and ProfEd receives 40% of the revenue to cover its expenses.
    - The venture program model has a detailed chart of which unit is responsible for which activity (the MPA Off Campus Degree Program chart was distributed).
    - The venture program goal is 50:50 = 50% of courses taught by regular faculty, 50% by adjuncts.
    - With a successful program, a department can use the venture programs revenue to obtain GA's, etc.

- d. Stephens circulated a list of all ProfEd funds transfers for FY2005/06. It shows
  - Payments to on-campus faculty totaled \$1,061,925.
  - Payment to the Provost's Office (the required contribution to budget) was \$4,200,228
  - School Principalship MA: \$180,504
  - Ed.S and MPA venture programs: \$59,711 and \$56,309
  - Typical department incentive payments: \$120 – 5,000
- e. Comments on the current financial incentives were noted:
  - For colleges and most departments, the present small return provides no incentive.
  - Shapiro: from a dean perspective, there is no motivation to be involved in off-campus programming. Colleges make their money on regular on-campus courses, and the preference would be to treat off-campus courses like regular courses – all revenue goes to the appropriate college.
  - Shapiro: colleges even lose money on summer offerings of a course compared to offering it in a regular semester because the average enrollments are smaller. Also, some of the summer students may have been taken from regular semester offerings. Kurtz countered that while one only gets a certain number of students to come to campus, if go we off-campus or off-season (e.g., summer for students at home) we can gain enrollments.
  - Deans are often left out of the loop between ProfEd and departments. Stephens noted this has been the philosophy of ProfEd. That is, they try to work outside of the deans as they make many deals.
  - The difference in return between an on-campus course and an off-campus may allow for additional faculty to cover the increased course sections.

**It was agreed that the present system of financial incentives needs modification. An incentive system like or similar to the venture program model should be explored.**

4. It was asked what is the incentive to develop new offerings on campus.
  - a. Several indicated their department's programs change in response to competition (keeping up to date in field) or when enrollments decline.
  - b. It was noted that offering an incentive, when one will do it anyway, may create a disincentive.
5. Other benefits of off-campus programming, which can be incentives.
  - a. Provides faculty and programs exposure to different populations.
  - b. Benefits CMU through such factors greater exposure (both nationally and in state's population centers), greater diversity, and higher total enrollments.
  - c. The possibility of a tie-in to differential teaching loads was mentioned – those that desire to focus on teaching may wish to have off-campus opportunities.
  - d. Under venture programs, relatively large amounts of money can be generated which can be used to strengthen one's program or department.
6. The discussion turned more to incentives for individual faculty
  - a. Zainea's floated the proposal that all departments be required to teach a minimum of six credit hours per year of off-campus programming (could be on-line or face-to-face outside of Mount Pleasant). Most felt this was impractical.
  - b. A quick list of benefits to faculty: off-campus students allow access to professional contacts and different types of students (which can lead to improved teaching), financial incentives include direct salary or professional development funds from profits, can provide travel opportunities.

- c. Compensation is obviously an incentive, but such factors as (1) some faculty teach off-campus courses as part of their regular teaching loads (“in-load” model) and (2) the differences in the value of a course depending on if it is taught as an overload, as out of load (supplemental pay), or the cost to “buy out” a course. Possible ProfEd compensation is too low to motivate many on-campus faculty.
- d. Ericksen: some faculty are not involved because they don’t know how to become involved.
  - There has been a take it or leave it philosophy: courses and locations are scheduled fixed, then ask on-campus faculty if they want to teach them.
  - Faculty must decide on an off-campus course before they know on-campus teaching assignments, etc.
  - Stephens noted ProfEd scheduling has many components besides program and faculty member preferences: If going to have an adjunct, need to contract well ahead of course; many off-campus courses are cancelled (don’t reach 12-14 required enrollment)
  - Kurtz: cohort format can give guidance on scheduling: know what courses are needed, who will be teaching it, etc.

**It was agreed on-campus faculty need to be better informed on how to be involved with ProfEd.**

- 7. There was a brief discussion of how ProfEd should be evaluated.
  - a. One metric: financial (the bottom line).
  - b. Another metric: outcomes assessment results (measures need to be defined by experts, not ProfEd, and be consistent with on-campus and across sections).
  - c. It was noted that CMU has many goals, and some are conflicting.
- 8. The problem of the disconnect between MSA and the rest of campus was discussed. One help would be if department bylaws gave credit for participation with MSA or on the MSA council. Some recommendations have been made, but the decisions are presently on hold.  
**It was agreed that the problems of the present MSA organizational structure and model need to be addressed.**
- 9. There was a brief discussion of what incentives are needed to attract and retain a corps of well-qualified adjunct faculty for courses that cannot be offered with regular faculty.
  - a. Two important incentives would be multi-term contracts and closer ties to the on-campus department and its faculty.
  - b. Zainea noted there are excellent potential instructors that cannot receive approval to teach undergraduate courses. An example is IT in the Detroit area, where there are industry leaders with 15+ years experience and well-versed in the newest technology but with only a bachelors degree they cannot receive approval to teach as adjuncts by the course’s on-campus department.
- 10. The session concluded with Stephens commenting that there is tremendous potential with ProfEd, and it boils down to money
  - a. For profit higher education institutions are able to do well financially in spite of a lack of a reputation. One of the least successful institutions is DeVry, which makes \$32,000,000 profit per year. Many are in the hundreds of millions range.
  - b. CMU can cut into this market if we embrace the idea of growth. ProfEd will be able to compensate some instructors (i.e., regular faculty teaching off-campus) \$15,000 per class provided it pays less for some courses.

## PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

### Meeting Notes - November 20, 2006 Lake Huron Room, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Present: Adams, Ericksen, Kennedy, Kurtz, Love, Osborn, Ross, Scukanec, Shapiro, Stephens, Swartz, Sykes, Wagner, Zainea. Absent: Coles.

1. Administrative matters
  - a. After the first meeting, Osborn asked that Task Force members submit to him questions that should be considered. A compilation sorted by general area was distributed. Osborn remarked that in preparing the compilation, he noted that most of the questions had been covered other than those dealing with delivery methods. That is today's topic: what course delivery formats should be used for off-campus programming.
  - b. It was agreed that Osborn will compile a draft preliminary report of the committee for consideration at our next meeting. This will likely consist of bullets highlighting our findings and recommendations. The main audience will be President Rao (and perhaps the Board of Trustees)
  - c. A more formal report will need to be prepared for the Senate, which will consider it sometime in the Spring semester.
  
2. Discussion question 1: What delivery formats are currently in use at CMU, both on campus and off campus?
  - a. Osborn had prepared, but forgotten to bring, a worksheet to be used in discussion of this topic. In its place, a virtual worksheet was used to focus on the following questions
    - What are the current formats and approximate frequencies on campus?
    - What are the current formats and approximate frequencies off campus?
    - What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of the different formats?
  - b. The discussions led to the attached table.
  - c. The question of whether some formats are not suitable for some courses and some formats are not suitable for some audiences was posed. Members felt that as a practical matter the answer is yes. The practical aspect depends on the amount of resources that one wants to devote to solving the problems associated with an unusual delivery format.
  - d. After discussion, it was generally agreed that:
    - **The effectiveness of a given format depends critically on the discipline, the type of course, and the student audience.**
    - **Students prefer both face to face interaction and convenience, which non-traditional formats, like on-line, offer. They make pragmatic decisions on course enrollments based on personal issues. One personal factor for students, as well as for instructors, is their attitude toward a particular format.**

3. Discussion question 2: How much should various factors determine what format is used?
  - a. The following factors were initially noted as important in determining delivery format:
    - (i) Research on pedagogical effectiveness (which may not be available),
    - (ii) Market (which may conflict with i),
    - (iii) Cost effectiveness (which is related to ii; which may conflict with i),
    - (iv) Target audience, and
    - (v) On campus beliefs and/or biases (of individuals, departments, Academic Senate, ...).

**It was agreed that assuring high quality is fundamental.**

    - There must be a fairly high bar over which all courses must pass, irrespective of if a course is on-campus or off-campus.
    - It is important to maintain the institutional reputation. If one offers a quality product, then students will come.
  - b. Other factors that can or should influence delivery formats:
    - How facilities are used. Capacity forces on-campus courses to be spread across days and times; off-campus facilities are generally little used in weekday, daytime hours.
    - The need to maintain a university atmosphere. This implies having faculty and students physically on-campus for significant periods.
  
4. Discussion question 3: Is our current mix of course delivery platforms appropriate?
  - a. For our off-campus offerings, we are less competitive than other providers.
    - We offer less on-line and fewer programs than our competitors.
    - All CMU “centers” must produce a profit or they are closed. Nevertheless, we need to find ways to use facilities more effectively (they sit empty during the day).
    - There is a question if we will be able to compete with other providers given their growing investments in centers.
  - b. For our on-campus offerings, there was the feeling that the present mix needs modification.
    - While there was a feeling more diversity in formats is needed, the Task Force lacked information on what is actually occurring.
    - It was mentioned that while CMU faculty generally see alternative formats (e.g., on-line offerings) as innovative and/or not proven effective, some well-respected institutions have been using them for years.

**Statistical information on the delivery formats in use on-campus would be of interest.**
  - c. Whether there should further migration to web-based delivery of courses was discussed.
    - Most thought we should, but it has to be done right (which involves considerable investment).
    - Shapiro asked for the rationale as to why we should offer more on-line courses. There were two responses: it makes us more competitive (we can reach and attract more students) and it can enhance teaching effectiveness.
    - It was noted that an on-line course may not be more economical than a face-to-face one when one has large classes.

5. Discussion question 4: Should there be policies/restrictions on what delivery formats can be used?
- a. Integrity in course offerings is essential.  
**It was agreed that some policies on delivery formats are necessary to assure course quality.**
    - It was noted that, regarding quality assurance, the current curricular structure (under the Academic Senate) usually has been effective.
    - It was noted that some institutions require a student to apply for approval to take an on-line course.
  - b. There were a variety of views on who should determine the policies on course formats: departments, colleges, the provost's office, the Academic Senate, or other entity.
    - One proposal was to let a department notify its college of a proposed alternate format. Possibly require the college to vote on approval. There would be a period for objections from other units. If none, alternate format would be approved. If no agreement is reached within a set time period, department would be granted provisional approval.
    - Another idea was that responsibility and decisions should be at the dean level. If deans have enrollment goals set, they will set department goals and work with departments to find the best format for achieving the goals.
  - c. How policies can be set up to assure timeliness in response to market demands was considered.
    - There have been persistent comments that the present curricular process is too slow to address changes in the marketplace as well as encourage innovation and change.
    - Another view was that the present process need not be slow. There have been cases of approval in a timely manner when there was a champion to move things along. The process might also be quickened if there are obvious general benefits or incentives.
  - d. Whether delivery formats should be the same for the on- and off-campus versions of the same course was considered. A case study can be done using the MSA program, which has sizeable component both on and off campus.  
**It was agreed that if the learning outcomes are achieved, the delivery format is immaterial.**  
**It was agreed that if the learning outcomes are the same – and they should be, there is no reason to restrict formats either on or off campus**
6. Discussion question 5: Should ProfEd become CMU's central point for handling delivery system development for all academic programs, both on- and off-campus ones?
- a. Love expressed the opinion that ProfEd should function more like FaCIT by assisting faculty on-campus as well as off-campus with course development. Whether through ProfEd or FaCIT, CMU needs a good instructional design and other academic support services unit.
  - b. ProfEd needs to be integrated into, not folded under, on-campus programs. Examples where integration is needed: site licenses (such as for SPSS, which now is unavailable off-campus), library services (availability of databases, journal access).
  - c. ProfEd has expertise in areas of interest for on-campus programs as well as off-campus ones (e.g., marketing).

## **PRESIDENTIAL -- ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS**

### **Meeting Notes - November 27, 2006 Lake Huron Room, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.**

Present: Adams, Coles, Ericksen, Kennedy, Kurtz, Love, Osborn, Ross, Scukanec, Shapiro, Stephens, Swartz, Sykes, Wagner, Zainea.

1. Osborn proposed that a request be made to the Academic Senate seeking an extension for completing our report to that body. Swartz said this would likely be acceptable to the Senate. It was agreed to seek the extension.
2. An initial draft of the report was distributed
  - a. Osborn proposed that a preliminary report based on the draft be submitted to President Rao prior to the December meeting of the Board of Trustees. This was agreed to.
  - b. It was suggested that a copy be provided to ProfEd's new Executive Director, Merodie Hancock. Osborn will ask Rao if he would like to have it shared with her.
3. The group reviewed the draft.
  - a. It was agreed that the format contained in the draft was acceptable for the preliminary report.
  - b. Several corrections and omissions were noted and there were suggestions for clarity. It was agreed that the recommendations, after correction, reflected the views of the Task Force.
4. It was agreed that Swartz and Osborn would prepare a revised draft and distribute it to the Task Force for their further review and comments. Corrections would be incorporated into a final version to be submitted to the President. This version will also form the basis of the report to be presented to the Academic Senate.
5. The Group will meet again in January to prepare the final report.

## APPENDIX C: Summary of information available on course formats

DELIVERY FORMAT <sup>5</sup>		% of courses on-campus	% of courses off-campus	Advantages	Disadvantages
Traditional (1–1.5 hour per week, 15-16 week, daytime face to face (f2f). <sup>6</sup>		~80% (very common)	~ 0% (essentially none)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows direct professor – student interaction</li> <li>• Provides significant time for integration/incubation</li> <li>• Well known format, so comfortable for student and for instructor</li> <li>• Can demonstrate things better</li> <li>• Allows large classes, so economical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a good format for non-traditional student</li> <li>• For some courses this format may be poor for learning</li> <li>• Class lengths may be insufficient for some activities</li> </ul>
Alternate time format f2f (8-week terms, weekends, etc)		~20%	~88% (presently the most common ProfEd format)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can have more time-intensive activities (e.g., chat rooms)</li> <li>• Preference of working-adult students (many want to take only one class at a time)</li> <li>• Works well when students are practitioners (e.g. nurses)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of integration/incubation time.</li> <li>• Larger problems for student if miss a class</li> <li>• Students may not be at peak performance (are tired)</li> <li>• Shortened time pushed to extremes may compromise learning (1 week only good for workshop type courses)</li> </ul>
On-line courses		~1%	~12%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convenient for student</li> <li>• Student/market demand for this format (and competitors offer it)</li> <li>• Can repeat a class (if missed class, if didn't understand, ...)</li> <li>• Works well for a tech-savvy population if done well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires care in testing and assessment (proctors, checks for collaborations)</li> <li>• Difficult to demonstrate things on-line (can be done with much time investment)</li> <li>• Takes lots of instructor time if done well (so it is harder to teach in this format)</li> <li>• Instructors may need specialized training, may need site licenses</li> </ul>
Hybrid courses (both f2f and on-line components)				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can have advantages of both f2f and on-line formats</li> </ul>	
Self-study learning packages (course packs)			~5% (ProfEd is phasing out)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A good fit for many of present instructors as can adapt from lecture format courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Antiquated format. Can do the same with an on-line course.</li> </ul>
Other	“Keller system”			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can handle large numbers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can have problems with student motivation/grading</li> </ul>
	Laboratory classes				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenging to offer real labs (not simulations) on-line/off-campus</li> </ul>
	Lecture and recitation			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overcomes some disadvantages of lecture format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased cost over only-lecture format</li> </ul>
	Independent study/tutorials			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only way to offer some courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expensive (but at CMI is often uncompensated)</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Shapiro expressed his idea that this table should really be two dimensional; delivery format and time format should be separated as different variables.

<sup>6</sup> The worksheet with this definition was not available. The Task Force elected to also include under this once a week for 15 week courses and courses at night.