Task Force Members

**Team 1 (Vision):** Leonard Bohmann, Ellen Marks, Walt Milligan, Darrell Radson, Erin Smith, Jean DeClerk (graduate student), Britta Anderson (undergraduate)

**Team 2 (Inventory):** Chad Arney, Dave Chard, Jeff Toorongian, Jacque Smith

**Team 3 (Benchmarks):** James DeClerk, Steve Kampe (Senate), Mike Meyer, Nancy Seely, Jeff Toorongian, Linda Wanless

I. Introduction [Darrell]

   A. Task Force Charge

      **Part 1: Articulate a clear vision and direction for enhanced teaching/learning environment and support systems at MTU.**

      Part 2: Propose an organizational structure for realizing this vision that will create strong coordinated leadership and effective, efficient and integrated use of resources.

      The task force has completed Part 1 and is seeking feedback and input on it before moving on to Part 2.

   B. Contexts [Chad]

      - Rapidly changing technological environment
      - New student learning styles and expectations
      - National trends in higher education
      - Employer expectations
      - Globalization

   C. Additional Local Contexts

      - Reorganization of IT Support Structure
      - New e-learning group resulting following ETS director retirement
      - Library initiatives related to learning commons and e-learning
      - Upcoming change in Center for Teaching, Learning and Faculty Development (CTLFD)

   D. Increased demands on faculty time.
II. Benchmarks [Mike]

A. About Benchmarking Technology Initiatives

While benchmarks are helpful indicators of what may be happening at other institutions, technology is changing so quickly that these benchmarks are not necessarily the best guide to what, specifically, should be adopted or part of our vision. What we have tried to do is identify the characteristics of programs that appear to have been implemented with some success and to provide you with some examples. Not every program has all of these features.

B. Significant Characteristics

• Clearly defined multiple modes of instruction (for faculty, students and administrators).
  Example: UCF Blended Learning Toolkit (http://blended.online.ucf.edu/)

• Coordinated, proactive technology support structures that address pedagogy in context and foster innovative practice.
  Examples: Central Michigan Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching (http://facit.cmich.edu/)

• Resources for testing and experimentation; tools are available.
  Example: Lehigh Lab Technology Resource Learning Center (http://www.lehigh.edu/~inllab/trlc.html)

• Strong communication vehicles with resources that allow faculty to learn at times and places that suit their schedules.
  Example: Georgetown Teaching Commons (https://commons.georgetown.edu/teaching/)

• Targeted and coordinated programs and courses for purely online instruction with unique administrative support system.
  Example: Carnegie Mellon Professional and Distance Learning (http://www.cmu.edu/academics/distance-learning.shtml)

• Opportunities for cross-institutional content or open content that participate in institutional branding and afford other possibilities.
  Examples: CMU Open Learning, Stanford Engineering Everywhere and MIT’s Open Courseware

C. Concern shared by benchmark interview subjects

Need for stronger administrative/college/school support in order for these initiatives to really take root
III. MTU Inventory [Jeff]

A. Process

- Physical inventory/staffing
- Program offerings
- Enrollment
- Faculty survey
- Support structures

B. Comparison: MTU to Benchmark Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
<th>MTU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined multiple modes of instruction</td>
<td>No clear definitions yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated, proactive support structures for technology aimed at enhanced pedagogy and innovation</td>
<td>Support structures exist, but are not coordinated. Some training through workshops. Minimal formal faculty training, much done through informal or decentralized efforts of departments and faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for testing and experimentation</td>
<td>Some resources available but not widely supported or publicized (library, CTLFD, e-learning group). No testing facilities for online courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong communication vehicles with teaching resources</td>
<td>No coordinated web presence focused on pedagogy and/or teaching innovation. CTLFD, e-learning, library and ITSS all have different sites, communication models and emphases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted and coordinated programs and courses for purely online instruction</td>
<td>Online efforts driven by schools/departments, individuals or ad hoc. (6 grad degrees, 2 grad certificates, 1 undergrad degree). Not coordinated or centrally marketed or administered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for cross-institutional content or open content that participate in institutional branding</td>
<td>Open online content delivery minimal; intellectual property issues large barrier in this regard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Vision and Goals

A. VISION STATEMENT

**One University Focused All Students’ Learning**

Michigan Tech strives to create an innovative and ubiquitous teaching and learning environment—one that enhances and expands the education of residential students through blended learning and effectively extends the institution's reach and resources to non-residential students online. Thereby, Michigan Tech will be recognized as a higher education leader in creating and continually improving an enhanced learning environment that takes advantage of technologies, tools and techniques aimed at improving student learning.

B. Goals [Erin]

Campus-wide commitment to creating a model enhanced and technology-rich learning environment at Michigan Tech that:

- Moves away from the dominant instructional paradigm of the fixed time to learn and the fixed classroom location to more flexible learning models in terms of time and location. Defines enhanced learning as on a continuum, where technologies are used appropriately, creatively and innovatively to support curricular goals.

- Is student centered in its use of technology, promoting engaged and interactive student learning and providing reliable and flexible access to instructional materials

- Provides a robust and centralized coordination of enhanced learning environment tools and support with well-defined parameters and expectations for students, faculty and administrators, as well as clear leadership at all levels to support this initiative.

C. Immediate Challenges [Darrell]

- The roles and responsibilities of the Provost, deans, department chairs and the CTLFD must be clearly delineated.
- Incentives for faculty and instruction staff, including promotion and merit salary, must be developed.
- Intellectual property and copyright policies for online content must be developed campus-wide.
- Student response to new initiatives must be sought after and considered fully.

This presentation outline, task force team reports and slides, as well as other resources and links, are available at: [http://blogs.mtu.edu/enhanced-learning](http://blogs.mtu.edu/enhanced-learning)