

# Synthesis Report of the Provost Task Teams on Engaged Learning and Digital Instruction

James Holloway  
James Hilton

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction .....	2
Conception of Engaged Learning and its Importance .....	3
Effective Digital Instruction and its Importance .....	5
Specific Recommendations .....	6
<i>Common Language and Consistent Messages</i> .....	7
<i>Faculty Incentives, Motivation and Support</i> .....	8
<i>Student Incentives and Motivation</i> .....	9
<i>Central Support Offices</i> .....	9
<i>Communication, Sharing and Mapping the Landscape</i> .....	10
<i>Infrastructure and Space</i> .....	11
Appendix 1: Task Team Membership.....	12
Appendix 2: Charge to the Task Teams on Engaged Learning and Digital Instruction .....	15

## Executive Summary

The Provost Task Teams on Engaged Learning and Digital Instruction, comprised of 78 members of the U-M community organized into 8 teams, discussed a number of challenges and possible solutions needed to create greater buy-in and institutionalization of both engaged learning and digital instruction. Some of the solutions are aligned with work already ongoing, but some issues are deeply cultural and will require sustained effort over a number of years to effect. In broad strokes these recommendations comprise:

- **Common Language and Consistent Messages:** Create common language for both internal (students, faculty and staff) and external (parents, legislature, broader society) audiences to describe engaged education and its goals. Use this common language to share consistent messages with all members of our community about engaged learning and digital instruction.
- **Faculty Incentives, Motivation and Support:** Address the need to motivate and support faculty to take on new approaches in digital instruction and engaged learning. This should include both intrinsic and extrinsic incentives, and the provision of professional development and support in best practices, and support in simplifying adoption and execution of these new pedagogical modes.
- **Student Incentives and Motivation:** Address the need to motivate students to embrace these new pedagogical modes with an explicit understanding of the learning goals and how different elements of the entire U-M educational environment can help them develop intellectually, professionally, and personally. This must include an effort to move students beyond thinking of the GPA as the goal of an education. Equally, students must be explicitly shown the learning and developmental goals of their co-curricular work, and be expected to engage in the co-curricular with intentionality around their own intellectual, professional and personal development.
- **Central Support Offices:** Strategically create centralized offices and resources to help faculty and staff take on the work of digital instruction and engaged learning, providing an efficient means to support best approaches without duplicating processes and practices. This is especially important for the smaller academic units that cannot always stand up duplicative efforts, and is also very important for cross-unit and interdisciplinary efforts that seek, or should seek, to engage faculty and students across units.
- **Communication, Sharing and Mapping the Landscape:** Create systems to map the landscape of institutional complexity in both engaged learning and digital instruction, and to share information and ideas so that students and faculty can find programs and efforts to which they could usefully connect but that today remain easily hidden within the vast opportunity sea of the U-M.
- **Infrastructure and Space:** Develop physical space and reliable infrastructure with digital instruction and engaged learning explicitly in mind.

A set of proposed learning goals for engaged education was discussed and is also presented in this report. These goals include Creativity and innovation, Intercultural and ethical intelligence, Communication, collaboration and teamwork, and an Entrepreneurial Mindset.

## Introduction

In the fall of 2013 Provost Martha Pollack convened a series of four town halls on Engaged Learning and Digital Instruction. These town halls brought together groups of faculty, staff and students to discuss the future of education at the University of Michigan, and especially the roles of engaged education and of digital instruction in that future. In our roles as Vice Provost for Global and Engaged Education (James Holloway) and Vice Provost for Digital Education and Innovation (James Hilton), we organized these town halls. Several hundred members of our community participated in these gatherings.

A strategic decision behind these town halls and the subsequent task teams was to join conversations about both digital instruction and engaged learning into the same discussion. This decision reflects our belief that these are and must be complementary strategies and our goal was to foster creative thinking about these possible synergies:

- Engaged learning may be supported in part through technological mediation
- The additional cost of highly interactive and highly interpersonal engaged learning might be offset in part by more careful use of digital instruction
- Some basic knowledge acquisition that currently occurs through high-touch interactions might be better accomplished through on-line learning
- Technology might play a role in freeing time and shifting faculty focus on the high intellectual value of one-on-one engagement with students and authentic problems brought from the real world.

Following the open town hall meetings, the provost charged a set of eight task teams, comprised of 78 members of the U-M community, to continue these discussions. The charge to these groups is attached in Appendix 2 of this report. We, along with members of our staff, gathered these task teams together four times during the winter of 2014 to listen to their thinking, with the goal of creating this synthesis report. At the final joint meeting the task teams responded to a set of common prompts regarding their conception of engaged learning and how it can best be institutionalized and supported at the U-M. Similarly, they responded to a set of prompts asking about the most effective uses of digital instruction and how best to institutionalize and support this work. In parallel to these questions, the task teams considered the cost context of higher education and how we can best bring maximum value to students for a given unit of cost.

This report represents the synthesis of these discussions and reports. While it is directly authored by the vice provosts, we acknowledge that we are bringing together the ideas presented to us by all of the task team members. In doing so, we are of course editing what we have heard and seeking common themes, and we may have omitted or modified some of the ideas presented to us. Our goals for this effort have always been two-fold:

1. To create broad conversations on these topics among our colleagues, recognizing that in the end it is the creative breadth of the U-M community that will continue to transform the U-M into a place where engaged education and digital instruction are used to maximum effect.
2. To identify areas of action for the U-M's central leadership, transforming U-M into a place where engaged education and digital instruction are clearly articulated and well-understood norms.

In charging the task teams we did not precisely define either of the terms “engaged learning” or “digital instruction.” This was a purposeful choice, enabling some consensus views of these terms to arise from the task team members themselves. We bring our summary by sharing some thoughts from the task teams about these forms of pedagogy. We then address the issues of supporting and institutionalizing these approaches to education.

### Conception of Engaged Learning and its Importance

We observed two distinct approaches to defining engaged education. The first approach defined engaged education according to specific learning outcomes that are important for the future success of our graduates, but that are best developed through engaged pedagogies that go beyond traditional theoretical study. The second approach defined engaged education as set of pedagogical characteristics that distinguish student learning experiences. Our task team members generally gravitated towards the pedagogical definition, both by describing characteristics of the learning experience, and by naming examples of engaged education (the “I know it when I see it...” approach). They also considered and provided insight on the outcomes based definition. We review both here.

Higher education had been broadly conceived in the 20<sup>th</sup> century to provide students with the ability to write, to think critically, and to reason quantitatively, with these skills contextualized within a body of disciplinary knowledge. However, for students graduating into the 21<sup>st</sup> century a number of the U-M’s internal and external stakeholders have defined equally important characteristics or educational outcomes such as:

1. *Creativity and innovation* – students must develop an understanding of creative processes and understand their own capacity to create new works and ideas. They must understand that creativity is not a rare gift to the few, but a fundamental human trait that can be developed.
2. *Intercultural and ethical intelligence* – our learners must understand the role of values and culture in driving decisions, they must develop flexibility in working with others having different values, and develop their ability to hold and reason across the perspectives of multiple stakeholders.
3. *Communication, collaboration and teamwork* – students must have the ability to communicate with many audiences and to utilize varied formats and styles that will most effectively convey their messages. They must appreciate and leverage diverse contributions to a task, and know how to cooperate with others towards common purposes.
4. *Entrepreneurial mindset* – students must know how to observe the opportunities and capacities of human communities, understand where new or existing ideas or systems could bring value within those communities, and be able to act effectively in order to drive sustained and positive change to provide that value.

A key characteristic of these competencies is that they must be practiced to truly develop. *Engaged learning can then be conceived as a set of educational practices that provide students with these opportunities for practice* by addressing unexpected, unscripted challenges in imperfect, real-world settings where stakeholders beyond the students themselves are invested in the outcome.

Effectively, students need to understand the context of an increasingly diverse global society and their roles within it. However, while these learning goals are laudable, we recognize that they are difficult to assess (especially quantitatively), and that the capabilities they create within students must sometimes gestate for considerable periods of time until other life experiences allow the benefit to accrue. Given these factors, it is also useful to define engaged learning in terms of pedagogical characteristics that are known (or believed) to help students develop these capabilities.

There are many examples of such experiences at the U-M, along a spectrum of engagement ranging from direct hands-on use of our museum collections in the teaching of the ancient world, to undergraduate research, to education abroad experiences, to community-based service learning programs. *This leads to a definition of engaged learning based on a set of pedagogical characteristics both within and outside the classroom:*

- Engaged learning makes teaching a shared, social experience through exchanges within learning communities involving students, faculty, staff, and external constituents - all in the roles of both teacher and learner.
- Engaged learning is understood as cumulative, iterative, integrative and often retrospective.
- Engaged learning connects critical thinking to real world interactions. Student learning tasks are closely and clearly related to the problems and challenges of the global society in which the students currently live and will experience in the future. Engaged learning tasks are challenging, complex and require students to stretch their research, social, and thinking skills to address them.
- Teachers play the role of facilitator, fostering student learning by assigning authentic tasks, challenging assumptions, providing critical feedback and encouraging independent inquiry. Students act as motivated explorers and are expected to discover new knowledge, concepts, connections. They take risks to move toward deeper understanding and resolution of challenges and they are expected to observe and refine their own understanding and actions based on the feedback they receive.
- Students are engaged in constructing their own knowledge and assume responsibility for their own learning. They are active participants in the creation of the learning experiences and in their own assessment.
- Students have agency and choice in their learning experiences and select them based on a long-term conception of their own goals for intellectual, professional and personal growth. This selection includes intentionality in both their curricular and co-curricular elections, based on a framework of learning and developmental goals (such as the learning outcomes articulated above).
- Groups and teams are used as appropriate, including participants with a range of disciplines and skill sets, as well as external stakeholders who are invested in the output of the group.

This kind of engaged learning is important to allow students to dive deeper and to create more permanent learning of effective habits of thought and action, as opposed to passively hearing content to be repeated later.

To the extent that engaged learning is about connecting with the world beyond campus, it aligns strongly to our students' reasonable interest in their own future success. We should embrace our students' desire to have a fulfilling future that supports both personal success and positive social impact.

### **Effective Digital Instruction and its Importance**

Digital instruction broadly refers to the use of information technology tools within the educative enterprise.

Particularly important within the U-M context is the broad area of academic analytics, by which we mean the collection of any kind of data for the purpose of providing either individual or summative feedback on student performance. This includes the use of tools like eCoach to provide individual students with feedback on their current performance and to offer automated suggestions for improvement, and the use of similar systems by academic advisors in order to more efficiently allocate their time to the assistance of students most in need of direction. For individual students, a well-designed and carefully deployed tool could also provide them with personal coaching in individual classes, for study habits more broadly, and for time management skills.

While there is clearly great potential to build out such systems, we must be careful to recognize that we are not able to automatically or quantitatively measure all that we consider important. We must not fall into the trap of believing that only what we can measure is important. We must also recognize that much of our educational impact comes not at the time a student takes a course or completes a co-curricular project, but in the future after they have opportunity to reflect, even if implicitly, on the educational experience within the context of future challenges. Failure to observe an impact today is not evidence of no impact; the impact is often in the future after the student (or alum) is able to develop more perspective and experience. Going forward, we should endeavor to include measures of latent impact in our approach to analytics and assessment.

There is clear opportunity to use more automated instructional systems to displace some activity from faculty face-to-face time to an alternate time when the student is not with faculty (flipping classrooms). Because faculty members represent an expensive resource whose time should be used in the highest value way for students, this can be both more effective and more efficient. However, this approach must also recognize that student time is finite, and that student-faculty interaction is both a demonstrated key to student success and an important, high-impact selling point for a residential institution like Michigan. Freeing up faculty time for focused, in-person interactions with students is clearly a desirable goal for digital instruction.

Digital instructional tools can also improve the quality of assessment by facilitating frequent, authentic assessments. To the extent that some (likely not all) assessments can be automated, this represents a chance for both increased effectiveness and improved efficiency. In principle, such assessments could also be personalized based on the learner and her performance, diagnosing certain kinds of conceptual difficulties or skill deficits for the student, and providing individualized learning opportunities to address these difficulties or deficits.

Looking forward, there is a strong connection between potential digital instructional technologies and the enrichment and assessment of engaged learning. Engaged learning is both enhanced and assessed through reflective work on the part of students. ePortfolio systems being piloted at the U-M and elsewhere could help make such work scalable and sustainable. In addition, digital badging processes could provide a way to certify student accomplishment along the engaged learning objectives outlined in the previous section. Digitally documenting and connecting the evidence of student learning with practical accomplishments could revolutionize the way in which universities certify learning and student development to external stakeholders.

We note that digital technology can facilitate opportunities for engagement that would not otherwise exist. By providing for interactions of people who are otherwise widely dispersed we can create teams and stakeholder interactions that would otherwise need to be simulated or be impossible. The Global Teaching with Videoconferencing project is an example of this work, in which courses at the U-M are linked to courses being taught at institutions in other countries.

More generally, digital technology has transformed the way scholarship and discovery occur. In some fields, lone scholars have given way to global teams collaborating through technology. Static publications are giving way to dynamic conversations that link text, data, visualization and commentary, all mediated by communication and information technologies. That the classroom has remained fairly impervious to these kinds of changes so far is curious, but unlikely to hold. Michigan has the opportunity to lead in the reimagining of what a residential learning experience should be in a community that is fueled by a shared passion for discovery and engagement and that operates in a digital environment that makes collaboration, information access, and instruction extend well beyond the classroom.

### Specific Recommendations

The task teams discussed a number of challenges and possible solutions needed to create greater buy-in and institutionalization of both engaged learning and digital instruction. Some of the solutions are aligned with work already ongoing, but some issues are deeply cultural and will require sustained effort over a number of years to effect. In broad strokes these recommendations comprise:

- **Common Language and Consistent Messages:** Create common language for both internal (students, faculty and staff) and external (parents, legislature, broader society) audiences to describe engaged education and its goals. Use this common language to share consistent messages with all members of our community about engaged learning and digital instruction.
- **Faculty Incentives, Motivation and Support:** Address the need to motivate and support faculty to take on new approaches in digital instruction and engaged learning. This should include both intrinsic and extrinsic incentives, and the provision of professional development and support in best practices, and support in simplifying adoption and execution of these new pedagogical modes.
- **Student Incentives and Motivation:** Address the need to motivate students to embrace these new pedagogical modes with an explicit understanding of the

learning goals and how different elements of the entire U-M educational environment can help them develop intellectually, professionally, and personally. This must include an effort to move students beyond thinking of the GPA as the goal of an education. Equally, students must be explicitly shown the learning and developmental goals of their co-curricular work, and be expected to engage in the co-curricular with intentionality around their own intellectual, professional and personal development.

- **Central Support Offices:** Strategically create centralized offices and resources to help faculty and staff take on the work of digital instruction and engaged learning, providing an efficient means to support best approaches without duplicating processes and practices. This is especially important for the smaller academic units that cannot always stand up duplicative efforts, and is also very important for cross-unit and interdisciplinary efforts that seek, or should seek, to engage faculty and students across units.
- **Communication, Sharing and Mapping the Landscape:** Create systems to map the landscape of institutional complexity in both engaged learning and digital instruction, and to share information and ideas so that students and faculty can find programs and efforts to which they could usefully connect but that today remain easily hidden within the vast opportunity sea of the U-M.
- **Infrastructure and Space:** Develop physical space and reliable infrastructure with digital instruction and engaged learning explicitly in mind.

We expand on each of these recommendations in the following sections.

### Common Language and Consistent Messages

There is a strong need for common language, especially around engaged education, to be shared by faculty, students and staff. This language should be reflected to students starting with the admission process (e.g. in recruiting material, application material, and post-admission communication), in orientation, in curricular communication, in describing co-curricular opportunities, in messages from housing and Student Life, and even in career services. Similarly this language should be reflected to faculty and staff in communication from leadership (president, provost, deans, etc.), from support units such as CRLT, in annual reviews, in promotion and tenure processes, and in unit strategic plans.

While each academic unit at the U-M will have unique disciplinary needs and language, this should, to the extent possible, be layered on top of a foundation of common language so that students, especially at the undergraduate and non-professional level, hear a consistent message both about their learning goals and the kinds of experiences that they should seek out to achieve their intellectual, professional and personal development.

The consistent use of common language will help to shift the culture to one in which all students expect to see their education as engaged with the world and structured around authentic challenges in which they have responsibility and agency for their own learning. It will help shift our institutional and instructional culture to one in which faculty and staff think of their roles as fostering this educational experience and creating the environment and opportunities in which this learning occurs.



The learning goals provided above provide one form of common language, organized around the abstract developmental needs of learners. Other common language can be built around the pedagogical characteristics of engaged learning, also outlined above. We note that there is already confusion between active learning and engaged learning. While these pedagogies are complementary and not in conflict, they are by no means identical. (Active learning focuses on students engaging in tasks that promote analysis, synthesis and evaluation, but these tasks in no way need be driven by engagement with the world – engaged learning tends to be active learning, but not all active learning is engaged learning.)

At each level within our institution, leadership must clearly articulate that we expect engaged learning and digital instruction to be pursued. The provost, deans, and department chairs should talk about these initiatives not as a wonderful Michigan extra, but as core to our future identity as an elite residential institution of higher learning and place of discovery.

### **Faculty Incentives, Motivation and Support**

As faculty career success is most easily ensured through scholarship and external peer judgment of visible scholarship, it is difficult to motivate faculty to spend time on student engagement or on developing new pedagogical tools – be they for digital instruction or engaged learning. Faculty time is rationally prioritized for their work in research and discovery. While faculty members are intrinsically and extrinsically motivated towards their teaching, this is balanced against the reality that an hour spent on pedagogical work has less visible and immediate career impact than an hour spent on scholarship.

Faculty require institutional support (partially outlined below) to most effectively use their time, and they also require positive motivation to engage in new forms of pedagogy. Faculty need the freedom and time to create and implement immersive, authentic educational experiences without jeopardizing promotion or tenure. Provost Phil Hanlon's memo on the importance of recognizing non-traditional forms of faculty activity (such as entrepreneurship, action-based learning, creative works, etc.) was one step in this direction. We should now work to more systematically include the development of new pedagogy around engaged learning and/or digital instruction into annual evaluation and tenure and promotion packages. This could include the recognition of the scholarship of learning and teaching as part of a faculty member's research. Where there is good understanding of best practices, faculty should be challenged in annual reviews for failing to use these best practices.

In hiring, consideration should be given to a candidate's ideas for engaged learning and digital instruction, and new faculty orientations should socialize faculty to the U-M vision of these pedagogies. Programs like the LSA Teaching Academy (and similar programs in other schools) should focus on pedagogical practices that increase likelihood of student attention and engagement.

Faculty awards and CRLT grant programs should similarly be aligned with the importance of making engaged learning and digital instruction a core value of the U-M experience. Faculty development efforts should emphasize the cognitive development of our students

common learning goals, and the pedagogical worth of structured reflection as it has been applied rigorously in particular fields.

### **Student Incentives and Motivation**

Our students are very bright, but they are products of their culture. As such they expect teaching to have a certain form, for learning to take place in a certain way, and they expect to be motivated and rewarded in a particular way. Greater use of engaged learning and increased use of digital instruction can challenge these expectations. It is therefore important to recognize this resistance and systematically work to shift our students' perspective. This requires university-wide effort; it will be difficult and inefficient to create this shift within the context of individual courses or individual co-curricular projects.

Shifting student motivation begins when they consider applying for admission and continues through the recruitment/matriculation process, through orientation, and through their entire career at the U-M. It occurs in their classes, through advising, in housing, in co-curricular experiences, and in the work of Student Life. All of these systems must emphasize that a Michigan student will assume responsibility for her own learning, and will select among the rich options at Michigan (curricular and co-curricular) in part based on her own learning goals and long-term aspirations. And not just her aspirations for career but also her aspirations for intellectual and personal development.

The U-M should explore systems for recognizing student achievement that go beyond grades and credit hours. Digital badging and ePortfolio systems may provide integrative mechanisms for this recognition and we should explore this fully. A richer transcript could include certification of development along the engaged learning objectives, independent of the mechanisms of achievement. We should link courses, or sets of courses and co-curricular opportunities, with specific skills and learning outcomes via tools like digital badges and digital portfolios.

This would be a controlled effort in competency-based certification, but in complement to course grades. Equally we should consider how we can help our students best present themselves through traditional mechanisms such as resumes so that they can explain to employers how their activities and achievements at the U-M developed their capabilities along the competencies outlined above.

Student awards and recognitions could similarly be aligned with student achievement along specific learning goals, rather than being so focused on the GPA as the key performance metric.

### **Central Support Offices**

There is a need for central support in digital instruction and engaged learning. This support is along several dimensions:

1. Understanding of best practices and educational quality of varied program models
2. Understanding of the existing practices, programs and capabilities within the U-M
3. Assistance with the tasks of digital instruction and engaged learning
4. Expert guidance on best approaches to these pedagogies for both effectiveness and efficiency, and alignment with institutional priorities.

The task teams felt that we need multilevel support to help faculty understand how to best use digital instructional technologies and to help implement and deploy these tools. Central level resources (such as the newly created Digital Education and Innovation Laboratory) could focus on common resources and tools that could be used across units, creating cost efficiencies by sharing resources. But we also recognize the need for more specialized discipline-specific facilities that might best be housed within individual units. This multilevel approach would provide our faculty and staff with the broadest range of tools and resources possible for best implementing new pedagogies using digital technologies. Dedicated instructional designers could help faculty in designing and creating the most appropriate digital materials and tools for their classes, and could also help ensure that these materials are shared across courses. Because faculty time is a limited resource, having instructional technologists who can help convert faculty learning materials into digital resources is critical to making rapid progress. Having these instructional designers close to the disciplines that they serve can be of benefit.

A central umbrella organization for engaged learning should be charged with supporting high quality practices, encouraging faculty development, providing training and facilitating community engagement. Such an organization could also provide a platform for developing and sharing interdisciplinary programs in engaged learning that can support students from multiple units.

These central organizations can also support an online presence where faculty know they should go when they want help with either digital instruction or engaged learning. These operations might create cohorts of faculty – Engagement Explorers and Digital Docents – who work to change the pedagogical culture on campus by focusing on innovative teaching practices both in engaged learning and in digital instruction.

### **Communication, Sharing and Mapping the Landscape**

It is difficult to know all that is going on at the University of Michigan. For students interested in discovering a program that would support their intellectual, professional or personal development, there is little systematic information available. Similarly, there is no clearinghouse for faculty interested in discovering what their colleagues may be doing in engaged learning. There is a need for an online system to allow students and faculty to discover programs, and ideally to then apply for those programs. A system that allows students to keyword search based on their interest (e.g. “Detroit”) and pull up all relevant classes, clubs, events, academic programs, etc. would be of value. Similarly, faculty interested in using digital instructional tools do not have a clean way to discover what kinds of pedagogy might be supported by particular tools – it is difficult to discover where a faculty member should put her effort in learning a new Ctools object without having clear advice on how each tool might address a specific learning or teaching challenge first.

The ongoing project to bring together M-Compass and MJoin under one system may partially address the need for cataloging engaged learning activity. Developing a taxonomy based on common language for instructors is also an important prerequisite. A common language and common norms and practices will allow us to communicate about engaged learning across disciplinary boundaries and across schools and colleges.

Similarly there is a need to create communities of practice for faculty to come together and learn new ideas and best practices. Existing councils such as the Council on Global Engagement (CGE) and the Council on Engaged Civic Education (CECE) could be leveraged for this purpose, and the recently created Digital Innovation Advisory Group is intended to play this role around digital instruction. There is a need for a campus wide space for the currently disjointed communities of practice engaged in online learning environments.

The central support offices and systems outlined above are natural homes to drive this communication and sharing work at the institutional level.

### **Infrastructure and Space**

Digital instruction and engaged learning require intentional development of appropriate infrastructure and learning spaces. This includes flexible learning spaces for in-class engaged learning, including reconfigurable classrooms with desks or tables on wheels, movable detached chairs and moveable whiteboards, etc. Flat spaces are needed to support this reconfiguration and students working in groups. Classrooms should support the devices that students bring, with fewer classrooms built around fixed computers. Good Wi-Fi access in classrooms is essential, and sufficient power outlets to support student owned computers in these rooms. Plug and play classrooms with standard equipment (or easily ordered carts) are needed.

The technology we rely on day in and day out – learning management systems, email, discussion, chat, file storage, content delivery systems for video, and auto-grading of multiple choice tests – must exist and be superbly functional.

Other infrastructure is needed beyond the classroom to support engaged learning. The Detroit Connector transportation service to Detroit is an example which addresses needs across multiple units, solving in a university-wide way a problem that is otherwise solved idiosyncratically and redundantly within individual units (or left unsolved, to the detriment of our educational programs). These infrastructural needs must be identified and addressed, perhaps by the central office recommended above.

## Appendix 1: Task Team Membership

Following the Provost Town Halls eight task teams were formed, with membership drawn from faculty, staff and students. Each task team had a leader charged with convening the group in any way that each team considered best. The team memberships are listed here.

Team 1	Name	Email
	Lorelle Meadows (team leader)	lmeadows@umich.edu
	Anne Gwozdek	agwozdek@umich.edu
	Doreen Bradley	dbradley@umich.edu
	Denise Galarza Sepúlveda	galarzad@umich.edu
	Karl Daubmann	kmdaub@umich.edu
	Robert Bain	bbain@umich.edu
	Anne Mondro	ammondro@umich.edu
	David Gerdes	gerdes@umich.edu
	Melody Racine	red@umich.edu
	Ray Batra (student)	raybatra@umich.edu
Team 2	Name	Email
	Mary Ruffolo (team leader)	mruffolo@umich.edu
	Kristin Klein	kriklein@umich.edu
	Margaret Wooldridge	mswool@umich.edu
	Crisca Bierwert	crisca@umich.edu
	Daniel Fessahazion	danfdan@umich.edu
	Jessica Loh	lohj@umich.edu
	Peter von Buelow	pvbuelow@umich.edu
	Seth Ellis	sellis@umich.edu
	Aaron Pierce	atpierce@umich.edu
	Michael Lerner (student)	lerner@umich.edu
Team 3	Name	Email
	Bill Gehring (team leader)	wgehring@umich.edu
	Amanda Peters	arforres@umich.edu
	Sean DeMonner	demonner@umich.edu
	Steve Rush	srush@umich.edu
	Tatiana Calixto	tcalixto@umich.edu
	Emily Keeler	sharlane@umich.edu
	Jean Krisch	jkrisch@umich.edu
	Priscilla Lindsay	pfergwag@umich.edu
	Carrie Luke	clluke@umich.edu
	Linh Huynh (student)	lmhuynh@umich.edu

Team 4	Name	Email
	Marc Ammerlaan (team leader)	mcammer@umich.edu
	Roy Johnson	roycj@umich.edu
	Bill Schultz	schultz@umich.edu
	Kerin Borland	kborland@umich.edu
	Gautam Kaul	kaul@umich.edu
	Glenn Wilcox	gwil@umich.edu
	Pamela Bogart	pbogart@umich.edu
	Susan Hollar	shollar@umich.edu
	Timothy R B Johnson	trbj@umich.edu
	Grant Schroll (student)	gschroll@umich.edu
	Darren Hou (student)	hdarren@umich.edu
Team 5	Name	Email
	Nancy Songer (team leader)	songer@umich.edu
	Scott Mahler	samahler@umich.edu
	Len Middleton	lenm@umich.edu
	Roger Fisher	rogerf@umich.edu
	Caren Stalburg	carens@umich.edu
	Mike Kraft	mdkraft@umich.edu
	Nell Duke	nkduke@umich.edu
	Malinda Matney	mmatney@umich.edu
	Laurie Alexander	lauriea@umich.edu
	Christian Fischer (student)	chrisfi@umich.edu
Team 6	Name	Email
	Robin Queen (team leader)	rqueen@umich.edu
	Greg Hulbert	hulbert@umich.edu
	Monika Dressler	mdressle@umich.edu
	Sandy Gregerman	sgreger@umich.edu
	Mika LaVaque-Manty	mmanty@umich.edu
	Gavin LaRose	glarose@umich.edu
	Linda Knox	lkendall@umich.edu
	Steve Lonn	slohn@umich.edu
	Ken Heindel (student)	kphe@umich.edu

Team 7	Name	Email
	Julie Ellison (team leader)	jeson@umich.edu
	Paul Conway	pconway@umich.edu
	Jackie Miller	jabmille@umich.edu
	Steve Yalisove	smy@umich.edu
	Tom Drake	tdrakejr@umich.edu
	Melissa Gross	mgross@umich.edu
	Matt Kaplan	mlkaplan@umich.edu
	Shelie Miller	sheliem@umich.edu
	Stacie Edington	sjed@umich.edu
Team 8	Name	Email
	Joanna Millunchick (team leader)	joannamm@umich.edu
	Eric Bell	ericbell@umich.edu
	Barry Bleske	bbleske@umich.edu
	Bruce Palfey	brupalf@umich.edu
	Martin Strauss	martinjs@umich.edu
	Emily Rodgers	epuckett@umich.edu
	Emily Springfield	espring@umich.edu
	Laura Rozek	rozekl@umich.edu
	Hanna Smotrich	smotrich@umich.edu

## Appendix 2: Charge to the Task Teams on Engaged Learning and Digital Instruction

Higher education faces a challenge. Universities like ours have a critically important mission, but our funding model is broken, and we have become expensive for our students. As a result, the public increasingly questions the value of the educational experience we provide. In fact, some go so far as to claim that what we provide can be replaced by inexpensive online educational services. To ensure that we continue to fulfill our mission of providing an educational experience that we know is valuable and has a deep impact on our students' lives, we need to achieve several goals: better articulate the value we bring through the residential educational experience we provide; make good on the promise to educate through experiences that are engaged with the world and not replicable online; and take best advantage of digital learning technology where appropriate to make education cost effective and efficient.

Fortunately, across the University of Michigan, faculty, students and staff are transforming our educational model towards one in which action-based engaged learning is a standard part of every student's experience and in which digital learning tools are used to their best advantage alongside these engaged experiences.

The purpose of the Task Teams on Engaged Learning and Digital Instruction is to advance the University's strategies for achieving these goals. We ask that the teams consider two related questions:

*How do we transform our educational experience to one in which every student has multiple richly educational engaged learning experiences, and in which digital instruction is used to best effect?*

*How will we take this to scale, appropriately encompassing the entire U-M student population, taking best advantage of the fact that we are a research university, and keeping cost-efficiency in mind?*

In approaching the task, you may choose, or we may ask you, to segment the student population, and focus on one or few subgroups of the U-M. If you do that, we ask you to be sure to identify explicitly the group(s) on which you focus.

Your team has a team leader, who is responsible for driving conversation and thinking around these questions. You can elect to meet in person, online, frequently, in-frequently, or however your team finds useful. Once per month, you will meet with the Vice Provost for Global and Engaged Education, the Vice Provost for Digital Educational Initiatives, and other senior provost office staff to share your thinking with the provost and the other task teams. The schedule for these meetings is: February 26<sup>th</sup> from 3:30pm to 5:00pm in the Kuenzel Room of the Michigan Union; March 26<sup>th</sup> from 3:30pm to 5:00pm in the Koessler Room of the Michigan League; and April 21<sup>st</sup> from 9:00am to 10:30am in the Kuenzel Room of the Michigan Union. Each team must select at least two members to attend this monthly meeting, but all are welcome (RSVPs will be required). At these meetings, the vice-provosts and provost's staff will make notes of common themes, ideas, barriers, needs, and implementation ideas. At the end of the process in April a synthesis report will be created.

A kickoff meeting for all task teams will take place on January 31, 9:00 – 10:30 in the Pond Room of the Michigan Union. At least two representatives from each team must attend,



but all are welcome (RSVPs will be required). At this meeting the goals and structure of the task team process will be reviewed, ideas around learning goals for engaged education will be presented, and a primer on the University budget will be provided.