

Moore, Marsha M.

From: Justice, George
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2012 10:25 PM
To: Vaughn, Bev
Subject: Fwd: with Brian's new point #2...
Attachments: evening summer etc integration dft 2 011212 (GJ and JS comments).docx; ATT00001.htm

Bev, can you cancel with Dr. Cockriel and put this on my calendar please?

George

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Foster, Brian L. (Provost)" <fosterbl@missouri.edu>
Date: January 18, 2012 9:46:22 PM CST
To: "Davis, Teresa L. (Provost Office)" <DavisTL@missouri.edu>
Cc: "Justice, George" <justiceg@missouri.edu>, "McGruder, Ann C." <mcgrudera@missouri.edu>
Subject: FW: with Brian's new point #2...

Please print attachment (at least 3 copies) for meeting with Brady on Friday.
Brian

George, if you can be there, that would be good...would be 11:30 or after, maybe for 30 minutes. We could also discuss NSEI, Truman, and Grad School realignment with him. I'm meeting with him and Rob Duncan and Ken on entirely unrelated issues at 11:00.
Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: Justice, George
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2012 4:59 PM
To: Foster, Brian L. (Provost); Spain, James
Subject: with Brian's new point #2...

Summer, Evening, Intersession, and other delivery systems

For some time now, there has been discussion about integration of our summer, evening, intersession, e-learning, and other delivery modes. This integration received a great deal of attention in the strategic planning process. Faculty have expressed many concerns about how they relate to the many modes of delivery—issues of quality control, workload, division of labor among different kinds of faculty, compensation issues, fiscal implications for departments, and many other issues. The current fiscal crisis and reorganization of on-line education have also contributed to the urgency of these matters. There are many reasons that this topic is of great importance at this time:

- Meeting students' needs and expectations
- Taking full advantage of the new technologies and various e-learning modes
 - Distance delivery
 - Hybrid delivery
 - Hands-on learning experiences
- Making full use of facilities and faculty time to enhance capacity
- Assuring a unified learning experience across all modes
- Serving non-traditional students
- Bringing all instructional activity together to assure effective fiscal management
- Assuring the highest level of satisfaction to MU faculty members' for their delivery of outstanding education

The goal of this effort is to bring the high quality MU academic experience to all MU students, regardless of the mode of delivery—or the mix of modes of delivery—that suit individual students' needs. Thus, for example, an MU day student may take an evening course if it fits his/her schedule (e.g., while in an internship). An MU out of state student who returns home to work for the summer may take a distance education course. A course may use sophisticated technological means of creating team learning and/or problem-based learning. By bringing all of Mizzou's resources together to assure that all MU students have a great learning experience, the commitment of MU's faculty to the highest quality of education will be more satisfying as well.

The process of integrating the MU learning experience will be very complex, with many potential unintended consequences (some positive and some negative). There will be four discrete elements which will work together, each informing the other's deliberations:

1. It is critical that we ~~understand~~ coordinate the MU experience in all of the areas under consideration: evening, summer school, on-line education, intersession, modular courses, active/engaged learning, undergraduate research, service learning, collaborative programs with other institutions, honors, and ~~perhaps more~~ etc. Insights into MU's experience, with particular attention to faculty roles, in these areas will be important for integrating the various components. We will appoint a committee of faculty and administration to examine and document our past experience, building on subcommittee reports for each area. Based on this information, this group will examine faculty division of labor, different kinds of faculty (including graduate

Comment [GJ1]: I'm wondering if we need a bolder opening paragraph—something to help people take notice that this is an important topic that will prompt major action toward aligning instruction on campus.

Comment [GJ2]: Maybe "coordinate" is too strong—but I think we need to do more than "understand" the complexity of the situation from the very beginning.

assistants and postdoctoral fellows), faculty compensation, and other issues related to faculty role in delivering high-quality education.

2. The wide range of modes of delivery and the division of labor of the faculty (see item 1) that constitute the MU experience are supported directly by numerous, very different kinds of resources. For example, delivery of classes is supported by TAs (grading assistance, lab and discussion section assistants); students get support from tutors, the Student Success Center, faculty get IT support for designing and executing on-line and hybrid courses, and service learning and internships often receive from external mentors for students. A group of faculty, IT, student, and external support people will consider issues for integration of these support functions especially with issues under consideration by groups 1 and 3.

4.

- 4.3 A group of fiscal people—some institutional, some from colleges and departments—will work on the fiscal details of this integration, understanding changes from current outcomes and constructing a budget model for the integrated educational delivery.

- 4.4 A combined subset of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Curriculum Committee of the Graduate Faculty Senate will examine curriculum issues that may arise from the integration. For example, as we move to more use of technology (on campus or distance education), how will control of content be assured in the sense of maintaining integrity of prerequisite sequences. Or, will there be certificate programs that can be done either post-graduate or undergraduate? Or how will modular courses be integrated into curricula? Or how will developing state and national guidelines on transfer credit relate to “our” academic programs? Many other curricular issues will arise as discussions proceed.

- 4.5 A committee of people who do a wide variety of instructional support functions will examine the support systems: admission, registration, advising, financial aid, room assignment, recruitment, office space, career placement, and other areas that are determined to be relevant.

It is anticipated that these four groups’ work will be concluded by the end of the spring 2012 term, after which the chairs of the four groups will develop an integrated report with specific recommendations on how to proceed. That report, then, will be vetted during the fall spring 2012 semester by many constituent groups including at least the chancellor’s staff, provost’s staff, deans, chairs, faculty, staff, and students. Building on this extensive input, the Provost, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Dean, Budget Officer, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, and Chair of the Faculty Council will develop a work plan to implement the integrated educational system.

Comment [GJ3]: Jim Spain’s comment: *The discussion of Discrete Element #1 focuses on faculty division of labor, different types of faculty, faculty compensation, etc. It does not include broader support of faculty teaching. For example, many physical and life science faculty have a research technician and GRA to support their research efforts. Many of these same faculty have an equal commitment to teaching and yet we provide support to their teaching functions. While we may provide a GTA, this is often not at the same level of support compared to their research responsibilities. In other words, what support do we or should we provide our faculty to support them in their teaching responsibilities? I recognize there are large differences among colleges, and even within colleges based on differences by disciplines. I would however suggest the concept is worth investigating. The Academic Technology Liaisons that support teaching with technology is an example of this concept and has been very effective. Should this type of effort be expanded? We currently have 8 of these positions supporting our faculty across the entire campus – a very limited infrastructure with a very limit* ... [1]

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"; No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.5". No bullets or numbering

Comment [GJ4]: Is this different from RCM? Or a station on the way to RCM?

Comment [GJ5]: Jim Spain’s comment: *For Discrete Element #2, I assume we are looking at integrating funding for distance courses, evening courses, intersession courses, summer courses with “regul* ... [2]

Comment [GJ6]: Jim Spain’s comment: *I am not sure I understand the outcome of Discrete Element #3.*

Comment [GJ7]: Jim Spain’s comment: *For Discrete Element #4, the intent is stated to address instructional support functions. However, the list seems very broad relative to the stated* ... [3]

Comment [GJ8]: Jim Spain’s comment: *How do we integrate Discrete Elements #2 and #4 with current efforts to reshape our work in some of these areas?*

Comment [GJ9]: I think this is optimistic. More likely the end of fall 2012.

Comment [GJ10]: !!!! Or maybe you only wanted me involved at this point!

Jim Spain's comment: *The discussion of Discrete Element #1 focuses on faculty division of labor, different types of faculty, faculty compensation, etc. It does not include broader support of faculty teaching. For example, many physical and life science faculty have a research technician and GRA to support their research efforts. Many of these same faculty have an equal commitment to teaching and yet we provide support to their teaching functions. While we may provide a GTA, this is often not at the same level of support compared to their research responsibilities. In other words, what support do we or should we provide our faculty to support them in their teaching responsibilities? I recognize there are large differences among colleges, and even within colleges based on differences by disciplines. I would however suggest the concept is worth investigating. The Academic Technology Liaisons that support teaching with technology is an example of this concept and has been very effective. Should this type of effort be expanded? We currently have 8 of these positions supporting our faculty across the entire campus – a very limited infrastructure with a very limited focus. Are there “lower order” functions that could be done by support personnel to allow our faculty to focus on higher order functions related to teaching and learning. Again, a GTA model is an example, but the GTAs change from semester to semester and does not provide a continuity of experienced support of faculty teaching responsibilities. We certainly want to continue to involve GTA as part of faculty support, but perhaps additional support should be considered as part of Discrete Element #1.*

Jim Spain's comment:

For Discrete Element #2, I assume we are looking at integrating funding for distance courses, evening courses, intersession courses, summer courses with “regular session” courses? If that is the case, we should be more direct in the description.

Jim Spain's comment: *For Discrete Element #4, the intent is stated to address instructional support functions. However, the list seems very broad relative to the stated focus. Admissions and recruitment seem to be poor fits for instructional support. Registration, advising, financial aid, career services all focus on student support services and would need to be expanded to include learning center services and perhaps services through student health and the counseling center. Instructional support seems to fit better with the items and issues discussed under Discrete Element #1.*