1. CALL TO ORDER
2. Approval of Agenda for February 12, 2019
3. Approval of Draft Minutes for January 8, 2019 (Appendix A)
4. President’s Remarks: Acting President Satish Udpa
5. Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt
6. Chairperson’s Remarks: Professor Deborah Moriarty
   6.a. University Council Working Session (Appendix B)
7. Committee Reports
8. NEW BUSINESS
   8.1. MSU Website Issues, Heather Swain, Vice President for Communications and Brand Strategy
   8.2. IT Update, Rob McCurdy, Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer
   8.3. MSU Online Strategy, Letter from Education, Provost Youatt and Dr. Laura Torterelli, Elementary Literacy and Department of Teacher Education, (Appendix C & D)
   8.4. Revised Emeritus Policy Changes Request, Professor Mark Waddell, University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA) Chairperson (Appendix E & F)
   8.5. University Committee for the Library (UCL) Bylaw Change Request, Sara Long, UCL Chairperson, (Appendix G)
   8.6. Teladoc Utilization, Renee Rivard, Executive Management Director and Director for HR Benefits (Appendix H)
   8.7. Budget Update, Dave Byelich, Assistant Vice President and Director for Planning and Budgets
9. Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for February 19, 2019
   9.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Action Item) (Short Report, Appendix) (Long Report, click on link)
   9.2. High Risk Travel Process, Dr. Steve Hanson, Associate Provost and Dean, Dr. DeAndra Beck, Associate Dean for Research and Chris Daniel, Director of the Office of Health Safety, International Studies and Programs (Information Item) (Appendixes)
9.3. Teladoc Utilization, Renee Rivard, Executive Management Director and Director for HR Benefits (Information Item) (Appendix)

9.4. Budget Update, Dave Byelich, Assistant Vice President and Director for Planning and Budgets (Information Item)

9.5. At-Large Slate of Nominees, for Approval, Amanda Tickner, University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) (Action Item) (Appendix)

9.6. Athletic Council Slate of Nominees, for Approval, Professor Amanda Tickner University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) (may have to be moved to March meeting) (Action Item) (Appendix)

9.7. Invitation for the Board of Trustees to Attend Faculty Senate - Confirmed for Trustees Byrum and TeBay to attend, arriving at 4:30 (Information Item)

10. Draft Agenda for University Council for February 26, 2019

10.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Information Item) (Short Report, Appendix) (Long Report, click on link)

10.2. IT update, Rob McCurdy, Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer (Information Item) (Appendix)

10.3. Revised Emeritus Policy Changes Request, Professor Mark Waddell, University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA) Chairperson (Appendixes)

10.4. Faculty Senate Work Session with John Beck, Results of Asks/Actions, Chairperson Deborah Moriarty (Information Item) (Appendix)

11. ADJOURNMENT
At the meeting of the University Council held on January 22, 2019, a working session was led by Professor John Beck (Human Resources and Labor Relations). The working session focused on two questions:

1. What should be on the list of “asks” that we as a faculty and staff should bring to our initial conversations with the new president?

2. What are the “actions” we should be developing and leading that should not wait on, or be dependent upon, the arrival of the new president?

A summary of the responses from the different breakout groups is given below. Topics listed below are ones the search committee should probe with the candidates. Candidate responses should then be somehow with shared the broader MSU community prior to a hiring.

1. Asks
   a. Develop greater shared governance processes and trust between upper administration and faculty/staff.
   b. Transparency in decision making.
   c. Increasing faculty input, guidance and opinion on decisions.
   d. Tenure suspension (BOT change during summer of 2018 – Recent Changes to the Discipline and Dismissal of Tenured Faculty for Cause Policy – forced leave without pay) and problems with the block tuition plan. Policy change made by BOT without consultation of UCFT and others.
   e. Support culture change across campus and shared governance.
   f. Support endorsement commission for diversity equity and inclusion.
   g. What are the priorities for investment (financial and personnel)?
   h. How will they interact with the student body to get feedback – how are they going to learn about the culture here?
   i. Have humility and be a healer given MSU’s current situation.
   j. Give voice to students and faculty at highest levels of governance, define rights.
k. Review support of international students (change in culture, funding).

l. How can we be globally competitive?

m. Role of fixed-term and promotion of these faculty?

n. Fostering trust within shared governance – what is the plan for it?

o. Consider and review prominence of athletics over academics.

p. Where would you like MSU to be five years from now?

q. Will records of Title IX investigations be made available to the public?

r. What do you think about the centralization/decentralization of the university management?

s. What is the vision for how MSU can be both an R1 and land grant university?

2. Actions

a. Revisit centralization of IT and Communication, and roll back centralization moves.

b. Work with BOT for By-law changes.

c. Assess each unit of the University – is it functional and necessary?

d. Revamping the core undergraduate curriculum.

e. Revamp action of governance.

f. Pushing for shared governance and revise policies to increase involvement of faculty and staff in university decisions.

g. Address concerns for numerous recent VP hires.

h. Explore ways for engagement for BOT with greater university community and revisiting block tuition.

i. Increase transparency and accountability of the BOT.

j. Better understanding of university and college budgets, review by students and faculty.

k. Create budgets that can be understood by the average person.

l. Student success initiatives and reboot things that have stalled.

m. More follow through about student and faculty feedback – more in-depth and thorough feedback (e.g.: campus climate survey).

n. MSU needs to operate from an ethical center rather than a legal standpoint.
o. Continue improving disability, counselling services and representation of minority faculty.
p. Demand transparency instead of obstructing external investigations.
q. Continue to work on policy changes that better define the roles of The Steering Committee, University and the President.
r. Make a public apology for past MSU actions – less emphasis on MSU branding and what the community wants.
s. Continue with efforts to have a more open presidential search.
t. As University Council -> come up with more coherent ideas about what needs to change (TSC – focus on the list).
u. Talk about the value of closed searches vs. open presidential searches.
Dear Colleagues,

We, members of the Faculty Senate who represent the College of Education, are writing to bring concerns about the process and content of the “MSU On-line Strategy” document that is currently circulating on campus to the broader Faculty Senate. We are doing so at the request of our colleagues in the College of Education, who were informed of this strategy via the College Curriculum Committee. The CCC was told by our Dean. Faculty themselves, it seems, were never consulted in the creation of this strategy, despite curriculum being the responsibility of the university faculty.

To briefly summarize, this document proposes consolidating on-line programing across the university under the auspices of the HUB, with 15% of the revenue from these programs being diverted away from the colleges which currently house them, split between the Provost’s office (10%) and the HUB (5%). This memo details our concerns and questions about this proposal, which fall into three large categories: 1) curriculum and quality control over on-line programs, 2) the opacity of the decision-making processes that direct after curriculum, and 3) financial and logistical issues.

1. **Curriculum and quality control.** On-line programming is a major part of the instructional work done in many departments and falls under the purview of the faculty as part of our responsibility for curriculum. In the Teacher Education department, for example, all our Master’s programming is on-line. Faculty have already undertaken the work to create and teach high quality on-line programming in many areas across the university, resulting in programs that are widely regarded as excellent and highly ranked, both nationally and internationally. These programs have been designed to meet the needs of their students (in the case of our Master of Arts in Teaching and Curriculum programs, Michigan teachers) and are already highly visible to our target populations and successful in recruitment. We are very concerned about the implications of nationally recognized on-line graduate programs being swept into the proposed centralized strategy. We believe that maintaining faculty control over these programs is crucial to their continued success. In particular, centralization poses many challenges and few obvious benefits to established programs:

   a. First, programs differ considerably across the university. In Teacher Education, on-line graduate classes are intentionally small in size (i.e., capped at 25) and focused on portfolio forms of assessment. We are, therefore, dramatically, different from large hard science and social science graduate courses (e.g., psychology) that may be offered by other units on campus.

   b. Second, faculty need to maintain control of successful programming in order to continue to innovate. The strategy document refers to TPCK, or Technological and Pedagogical Content Knowledge (p. 13), which was developed in the College of Education. The very faculty who developed and continue to discuss this model would have less incentive than ever
before to develop and teach courses using applications of this same intellectual work.

c. Third, it is not clear how centralization or the HUB would contribute to the improvement of existing programs, rather than simply taking credit (and revenue) for work already completed and conducted in academic departments. We do not see this strategy embracing cutting edge work in on-line learning design (e.g., potential affordances of Artificial Intelligence technology), for example, nor does this strategy address broader issues and conversations about equity in teaching and learning design that are a core commitment of our university. The broader campus conversation about learning accessibility is, surprisingly, absent in this report. This is a huge task confronting departments and colleges, both on-line and face-to-face, that the strategy does not address. The strategy document claims that the HUB will be able to help improve on-line course offerings but in reality, the staff of the HUB have very different expertise and limited if any teaching experiences, so it is unclear how they could actually serve in this role.

d. Fourth, the area discussed in this strategy where existing programs could use assistance is in marketing our programs. Any marketing assistance for our existing on-line programs, however, would need to be aligned with departmental and college visions for specific programs and driven by curricular directions determined by faculty.

In short, we are concerned that the proposed strategy would diminish the role of faculty in our on-line program, undermine quality of our graduate programs, and discourage continuing innovation by re-routing revenues emerging from expert curriculum and teaching work already completed in many colleges to the Hub and to the Provost’s office.

2. The decision-making process. We have a concern about the process through which this on-line strategy has been developed. It is not clear if departments and faculty want to make the move of growing on-line grad programs around campus, or if the HUB plans to drive on-line program growth against the wishes of faculty. In addition, faculty, departments, and academic governance not yet being consulted or involved in the creation, evaluation, and implementation of the strategy. In fact, the kinds of issues that should in fact be leading and driving any campus-wide on-line learning strategy begin to be listed on page 7 of the On-line Strategy document as “questions still remaining”:

- Which online programs in colleges have program managers (Can this capacity can be shared across programs)?
- Which online programs in colleges have dedicated advising or other student services?
- What is the state of the financial planning for online programs in each college? What do the profit and loss statements look like?

These questions address program management, coordination, and advising. However, perhaps even more important questions, not listed, relate to graduate curriculum and graduate programs. Because faculty have not been including, important questions have not been addressed.
In addition, this strategy appears to reflect other centralizing moves made by former Interim President Engler and his team, during a time of central administrative instability at MSU. We are concerned that this strategy, and the process by which it was constructed, contribute to and reflect, a culture of backroom deals and institutional bullying at MSU that neglects faculty input.

3. Fiscal and logistical concerns. We believe that departments with already existing, successful on-line programs developed and taught by faculty with scholarly expertise on teaching and learning should not be placed in the same fiscal bucket as graduate programs on campus with no on-line presence yet developed. Moreover, any marketing and resulting growth of on-line graduate programs need to be supported by additional funding for in-house infrastructure for faculty continuing to do the curriculum and instructional work. Nobody in the HUB would be able to help with that. Such support needs to happen internally within colleges and departments. Perhaps a better strategy would be to allocate 5% of revenues back to the college to spend however is needed (e.g., reinvesting in the program through marketing help from the HUB). Overall, it appears that the colleges stands to lose 15% of their revenue from this model, including 5% going to the HUB and its administration and staff, in return for very little. It is unclear how this re-financing serves our university and our students.

In sum, we fail to see what value the proposed On-line Learning Strategy would add already existing and successful on-line programs, we believe that faculty are entitled to a voice on decisions of this magnitude which concern curriculum and instruction, and we are concerned that important questions about the diversion of finances and other important logistical concerns have yet to be addressed. We believe the Faculty Steering Committee, the Faculty Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate all have a responsibility to weigh in on this decision.

Sincerely,

Laura Tortorelli and Alyssa Hadley Dunn

Faculty Senators

College of Education
Overview: An Online/Blended Program Strategy for Michigan State University

This document addresses a long standing need at Michigan State University (MSU) for a University-wide strategic approach to graduate online/blended education. Such a strategy should be used to enable MSU to realize opportunities that are consistent with our values and expertise. This strategy will address both fully-online and blended programs, in which students may be required to attend some formal educational or clinical sessions in-person in East Lansing or another designated instructional site. Much of what must be thoughtfully addressed for an online program applies to blended programs as well, as it may not be assumed that the visits to an instructional site will afford students all the benefits associated with attendance on the East Lansing campus in a traditional face-to-face graduate program.

This strategy does not address undergraduate online program potential, the strategy and methods for launching undergraduate degrees differs significantly, the market is fundamentally different, and the institution’s motivations would be different. While MSU offers online/blended
undergraduate courses as options within our existing undergraduate degrees, these are complementary to the residential experience and not designed to be a stand-alone degree experience. Nor do we have the administrative and service centers necessary to be a fully online undergraduate experience. Considering those opportunities and go-to-market strategy is beyond the scope of this document.

In this document, the term “online” will be used as an umbrella for both fully-online and blended online/in-person programs. Where we need to be specific to only “fully-online” programs or “blended” programs to differentiate, language will be more precise.

Online programs in many subject areas are growing, and have become more attractive to certain segments of the educational market. It is assumed in this strategy that thoughtful planned expansion of MSU’s online program offerings is in both the interest of society and the institution.

- Provide access to graduate degrees necessary for career advancement to employed and career-change individuals beyond the traditional reach of major universities
- Graduate programs with flagging enrollment and quality of candidate may expand the breadth and depth of their applicant pool
- Some online programs are the first choice for individuals who do not wish to experience a gap in employment, depend on full-time family care services, or relocate.
- Some online programs provide distinctive certificates that round out and individual’s capabilities for their current or next job, and have currency with employers.
- In some cases, due to employment patterns and demographics, the only viable way to launch a masters program is through the reach of online.

We face a number of challenges as an institution with regard to online programming:

- MSU is stagnating with regard to online programs. Enrollment revenue suggests 7% growth, but when tuition increases are factored, growth is flat.
- We see a steady decline in MSU’s market share in the online education landscape. A 2017 BiSK report highlighting online degree conferrals places MSU 15th among peer institutions. MSU lags behind Big10 peers Illinois, Rutgers, Penn State, Purdue, Wisconsin, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska and Wisconsin. We should decide if this is acceptable or a situation that should be addressed.
- Central, collegiate, and program responsibilities and revenue-sharing agreements have been separately negotiated over time, and thus are variable and uneven across our current portfolio of programs.

Revenue per se is not the primary reason to enter the marketplace or the single criterion for assessing value. Rather, there exist a set of compelling opportunities for MSU to consider

1. To position ourselves, consistent with our mission and values, to meet the changing learning needs of a changing population (adults, community, and corporate populations). We can and should be both creative and entrepreneurial
2. To develop models grounded in our values and adapted to emerging market needs

To seize these opportunities, we see MSU as having internal opportunities

3. To align human capital, incentives, funding, and revenue-share to enable our success
4. To help programs obtain substantive start-up support for a timely build and to launch a quality experience in the initial offering

We have been engaged in the online program market for 20-years and have developed a robust list of program offerings, including 26-fully online degrees and 52-fully online certificate
programs. But the online learning marketplace has evolved significantly over the last 20 years. A recent digital learning compass report notes that

- More than 6,000,000 students are now enrolled in higher education distance courses
- 30% of all students in higher education are now taking at least one distance course
- 68% of distance learners attend public institutions
- Distance education enrollments are highly concentrated, with 5% of institutions accounting for almost half of all distance education students.
- Graduate students are twice as likely as undergraduates to take all their courses at a distance, and more than ⅔ of graduate students study at least in part via distance (vs. 29% for undergraduates).

We have a good history and experience to build on. There is opportunity for MSU.

The strategy proposed here asks that Deans create and manage college-level portfolios that must be thoughtfully composed and sustainable. The Provost must similarly manage a university portfolio. It is assumed that MSU will be most successful keeping online programs as a mainstream option in program and curricular design, run through the academic units, and not operate in a highly centralized (e.g. Penn State World Campus) or privatized model (e.g. Purdue) that operates online offerings like a parallel but separate campus.

The strategy assumes each program ought to possess certain capabilities. These may be developed in-house or obtained through partnerships. The build or buy question for each capacity will be considered in the proposed implementation of this strategy for the institution and for any given program opportunity.

The strategy is grounded in five required elements of program design:

1. Academic Staffing and Administration
2. Learning Design and Production
3. Student Success Support (program management and proactive advising)
4. Marketing and Sales (traditional and positioning based on societal needs)
5. Financial Planning

MSU has incentivized course development (via assistive services, RBI, and OCCI) over engaging in a broader range of professional and continuing education activities, including online programs. A more expansive portfolio of learning experiences would entail degree programs but also an array of learning experiences that learners would find valuable (e.g. micromasters, certificates). These experiences are likely more sophisticated in design, and they have potential to expand our social impact, reach a broader audience with need, and generate revenues to be reinvested in the academic enterprise. To move in this direction, MSU needs to align incentives appropriately. This strategy proposes a new incentive structure to emphasize what MSU calls RBI experiences and does so in a way that can provide the capacity and quality required.

The document covers the required design elements for online graduate programs, the current state of online capacity, market opportunities for MSU, incentives, and an appendix with a summary of “learning design” as an area of research and expert practice.
Grounded in Values, Built to Compete: Five Required Elements for Online Programs

For MSU to succeed in a competitive online space in ways that are sustainable and mission-driven, our approach must be grounded in values and expertise.

As an institution, we have long identified Quality, Connectivity, and Inclusivity as values. These are values worth living through our decisions about what sorts of online learning experiences we provide to the world and how we design and deliver them. We also need to have important and often challenging conversations about what we mean by “quality,” about how an online program increases connectivity (and why this is valuable), and how our experiences can be inclusive, accessible, and equitable.

Essential as well is to avoid the pitfalls of others. Higher education has considerable experience with regard to what sorts of approaches will be successful and which ones are likely to fail. The most concise summary can be found in Joshua Kim’s “10 Ways to Fail When Creating Online Programs.”

If Kim’s list is expressed as a set of positive principles, it might look like this:

1. **Center student learning** as the core design principle.
2. **Play to MSU’s strengths**: Focus on where we best and make choices at the college and university levels about where we invest.
3. **Align with values**: We must make choices that align with our values and deliver experiences that we are proud of. Nowhere in our values do we list “make money” as a value. Decisions and how we execute those decisions cannot be driven only by money.
4. **Engage faculty**: Faculty must own and be engaged in the work or our efforts are not sustainable or engaging.
5. **Online differs from on-campus**: While we want online experiences that are as valuable as our on-campus experiences, online students have different needs that we must attend to and design for.
6. **Marketing and sales are required**: All the risk is in the market. We must be modest about who we are and the fact that we are late to the market (in many but not all cases). Our decisions must be disciplined by markets.

This leads to what we should think of as the five required elements of any online program. Across these dimensions MSU must decide which central services to offer that help create a quality student experience, incentivize growth in online offerings or create economies of scale in sustaining quality experiences and programs. Furthermore, any proposed program should develop a program plan that details how these program design elements are to be fulfilled, either by building up the local program staff, relying on pooled resources across programs in the college, depending on university services, or fulfilling specific capacities with an external partner or vendor.

1. **Academic Staffing & Administration**
   The primary investment the college makes in a new online academic program is dedicating academic staffing to leading, producing, and ultimately teaching in the program. This includes recruiting early leaders among the faculty that will form the core of the program. MSU’s experience has taught us, successful programs are deeper than the college and department administrators. Ultimately the academic affairs administrators and faculty will decide on the staffing composition of online programs, this may include tenure-system faculty, fixed-term faculty, adjunct faculty, and associated academic and support staff. Often Deans and Chairs
hire a program director, someone that takes administrative responsibility for planning and executing the program. From the academic staff whose appointment and assessment include duties in the online program, leadership needs to:

1. Identify academic staff who will develop the program, curriculum, courses, content
2. Identify faculty and academic staff who will teach in the program
3. Manage intellectual property concerns, clearly articulating authorship agreements
4. Reach agreement on compensation, teaching load with faculty who develop or teach

2. Learning Design and Production
Learning design is an evidence-based practice grounded in strong research and pedagogical literatures that is fundamental to learning environments and a culture in which we care about students and their learning (see Appendix A for more on Learning Design). Designing to support student learning requires the expertise of learning designers and faculty working collaboratively and collegially. The complexity of the work exceeds the capacity of any individual or type of individual and demands professional design. Learning design adds value to an online program, but it is also a cost category that must be accounted for. Design also entails that the experiences will be produced, which may require video, audio, technology, or facilities.

3. Student Success Support
An often assumed or overlooked capacity, effort by those tasked with managing a program are the associated student support services. These are fundamental to a quality online educational experience. This includes effort focused on ongoing enrollment management, tutoring/review, practicum/clinical-placement, student advising, career services, etc. Online students have different needs than our on campus students, but all students need effective, proactive support in an effort to ensure success. Like learning design, both program management and advising add value, and are costs that must be accounted for.

4. Marketing and Sales
Market intelligence informs our investment choices and our positioning of a given program. Sales ensures not simply that we have students but that we have the students we want. In addition to traditional forms of market knowledge, it is also necessary to leverage faculty and staff expertise to make investment decisions based on an understanding of emerging and changing societal shifts (e.g., culture, learning, careers/jobs, emerging tech, global issues). Here again, understanding markets, marketing, and sales each are fundamental and add costs as well as value to programs.

5. Financial planning
Not surprising, then, each program needs a sound financial plan--but so does the portfolio of each college. Each of the capacity areas named above adds value and cost to a program. Full-cost accounting is required up-front along with a financial plan that models a path toward sustainability.

This new approach to online program strategy also asks Deans and the Provost to take more active ownership of a portfolio of programs. For Deans, this means leveraging market intelligence in relation to university and college values and in conversation with faculty to make decisions about developing new programs and revising existing ones. Some intelligence on MSU opportunities is provided below (“MSU Market Opportunities”). A “portfolio” suggests choices and coherence. A college portfolio should be sustainable, but this doesn’t mean that each program or opportunity must make money. Choice implies investing in some ideas bubbling up from departments and programs and saying “no” to other ideas. Faculty engagement is critical, but not every idea that faculty have is worth investment.
The Current State of Online Programs at MSU

Let’s begin with MSU’s capacity with regard to the five elements detailed above. It is modest:

- Learning Design in IT and the Hub have 10 designers for the entire campus. Those designers work on more than online experiences.
- Colleges may or may not have learning design capacity (learning designers are not IT staff). If they do, it is 1 or 2 people.
- MSU has no marketing or sales capability.

Because our internal capacity is modest, some colleges/programs have engaged external partners. Often this involves revenue sharing, but could be fee-for-service. Notably:
- College of Business is partnered with BISK for extensive services with a significant revenue share.
- College of Engineering has negotiated a more narrow set of services from All Campus.
- Other colleges are considering partnerships or services from Wiley.

Questions that still remain that would better identify our capacity:
- Which online programs in colleges have program managers (Can this capacity can be shared across programs)?
- Which online programs in colleges have dedicated advising or other student services?
- What is the state of the financial planning for online programs in each college? What do the profit and loss statements look like?

MSU has some capacity to resource the five elements but not much. Each of the questions above can and should be answered. MSU should thoughtfully consider the relative advantages of attempting to build certain capacities multiple times (per program or per college), developing a central service, or securing design elements through a strategic partnership or a program-at-a-time negotiation with a service provider. Given the intimacy of business process and necessary technologies, integrating a new partner has overhead costs.

The Build vs. Buy consideration for services ought to include an assessment of MSU’s current capacity, an understanding of how rapidly the service/solution will need to continue to evolve, and the effort/time required for MSU to develop capacity that is already available in the market. If the goal is an immediate step forward, the buy options may be more attractive, and MSU should consider how to leverage partners to develop internal capacities for long-term sustainability and resilience.

Our situation means that the development of new online learning experiences at MSU will require a thoughtful mix of internal resource allocation, external partnerships, and exploring new investments in our own capacity.

So what do we look like from the outside?

- A Google Search, using the string “Online Programs at MSU” yields the following:
  - Six paid (advertisement) placements with the top search result going to ASU Online, followed by American Public University, and then MSU’s certificate programs from the Broad College and College of Social Science—because of our partnership with BiSK.
The fifth result is our own MSU Registrar’s office page, which is not a marketing and sales portal.

- MSU Colleges with the most online degree programs in the marketplace break down this way:
  - **College of Education**: Provides a dedicated website for online programs.
  - **Broad College of Business**: Provides a dedicated website (managed by Bisk) with a large Request for Information (RFI) pop-out (a sales technique).
  - **College of Social Science**: Programs are featured on individual department websites, inconsistently, with no rollup or links on College’s home page.
  - **College of Nursing**: Information regarding online programs can be found beneath the “Continuing Education” tab.

Essentially, even though MSU has a substantial number of for-credit degrees and certificate programs (including fully-online and those with hybrid components) in the online education and learning space there exists no coordinated strategy or framework to assist learners who may be interested in learning more about these programs.

**MSU Market Opportunities**

Michigan State University has been engaged in the online program market for the last 20-years and has developed a robust list of program offerings including 26-fully online degrees and 52-fully online certificate programs. MSU was an early entrant in the online learning market and realized the benefits of limited competition in online learning overall and in their respective program disciplines. Programs were able to recruit students with minimal regard to program market position, competitive understanding, strategic marketing planning and budget allocation and an overall understanding of the true cost inputs to develop and maintain a successful online program.

The online learning marketplace has evolved significantly over the last 20-years, while MSU’s approach to adapting to these changes has stagnated. This stagnation and lack of coordinated strategy has led to a plateau and in many cases a downward trend in online graduate degree enrollments and revenues. MSU enrollment revenue data suggests a 7% growth, but when tuition increases are factored, we believe that growth is flat. A 2018 BiSK report highlighting online degree conferrals (2016 IPEDS) places MSU 15th among peer institutions. MSU lags behind Big10 peers Illinois, Rutgers, Penn State, Purdue, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska and Wisconsin.

For the past two years, the Hub has been developing stronger business intelligence with regard to online programs and identifying partners outside the university who can help us. MSU has an opportunity to define a strategic position in the online marketplace that will serve the evolving needs of learners from across the United States and globally. Our relationships with online program management companies (BiSK, All-Campus, and Wiley) provide data-driven market and growth opportunities in several key discipline areas.

Summaries of these market analyses are included at the conclusion of this document in Appendix B. There are three primary patterns in the feedback: (1) MSU has opportunities, (2) the opportunities are unevenly distributed, and (3) there is good agreement as to what the opportunities are.
Any new program proposal ought to have a market analysis conducted that minimally provides the following information.

- Career opportunities and Job Market analysis (Job postings and top industry employer analysis)
- Department of Labor/BLS data and job posting analysis (e.g. Burning Glass, Emsi, Talent Neuron etc...)
- Knowledge, skills and abilities assessment, compensation
- Degree Market (IPEDS Data).
- Degrees in market and modality; degrees conferred and directional trends. Corresponding offerings and leverage-able approaches (e.g. certificates, micro credentials etc...)
- Competitive Analysis (program, program structure, pricing)
- Naming Recommendations
- Pricing Recommendations
- Product recommendations (types of credential, number of credits or hours etc...)

Aligning Incentives

Historically, MSU has incentivized course development over engaging in a broader range of professional and continuing education activities, including online programs. Our current OCCI model was designed to incentivize course development, and it worked well to create some initial graduate certificates and programs, and shift many undergraduate electives and summer study towards online delivery.

This section seeks to create an incentive for a more expansive portfolio of learning experiences that we have been calling “online programs” would entail degree programs but also an array of learning experiences that learners would find valuable. “Experiences” in this case should include options like micromasters, certificates, and other such things, in addition to traditional degree programs. These experiences might create a more complex portfolio, but they also could extend geographic reach, expand our social impact and generate revenues to be reinvested in the academic enterprise. To move in this direction, MSU needs to align incentives appropriately.

Currently, colleges receive 75% of tuition revenue from RBI and OCCI activities, with some exceptions (i.e., when a student takes an online and face/face course in the same term, all tuition revenue is retained by the Provost.). The funds received by colleges supports all costs associated with providing the online experiences, inclusive of course development, instruction (including faculty and graduate assistants), advising, and administrative support. Some colleges have become dependent on OCCI funds for indirect administrative expenses that are beyond the scope of their online programs.

In the current planning and budgeting model at MSU, it is assumed that college funding from the University general fund is generally perceived as flat at best, more likely in a gradual decline. The incentives to produce course development for current MSU students via OCCI has been capped. Incentives to find and engage new students (via RBI) remains a viable pathway for colleges to grow revenues. “Alignment,” then, means rewarding colleges for compiling and executing a strong portfolio of actual growth and ensuring that we have the resources to be provide excellent learning experiences: learning design, program management and advising, marketing and sales, and strong financial planning.
The baseline revenue sharing would be as follows.

Gross-Revenue (from tuition and fees inputs)
- First apply any revenue sharing agreement or university-level fee-for service with external partners

Internal to MSU share of Net-Revenue*:
- Provost 20%
- Hub 5%
- College baseline: 60%
- Open: 15% (incentives to add to College baseline)

*Net-revenue is MSU dollars after any external revenue sharing agreement or university direct-expenses for the program are removed from gross-revenue.

**Funding Central Capacity via the Hub for Innovation in Learning and Technology**
MSU has little central capacity to support the university’s existing portfolio, let alone any growth. All of our peers have a mechanism for bootstrapping central capacity. The 5% will be used to support colleges and departments that engage in activities such as:

- Learning design and development in quality content
- Marketing and recruitment for online programs
- Baseline program management support and startup incubation
- Faculty development for teaching online
- Developing common infrastructure for running online programs

Beyond this support, the Hub would also work with central administration to ensure that colleges and departments have infrastructure that will support innovative offerings (e.g. micromasters, CBE, badges, for example). Furthermore, the Hub would use these funds to leverage growth opportunities for programs, inclusive of providing assistance for programs looking to scale their work and impact.

**The College Baseline and “Open” Dollars**
Colleges have significant opportunities with this new approach but also significant responsibilities. As new opportunities are imagined and designed--and as existing opportunities are revamped--learning design, management, advising, and marketing and sales have to be resourced. Again, MSU has limited capacity in some areas, no capacity in others. Thus the centrality of planning and design.

To achieve these goals, the university would phase in a new cost share model as follows:

- The College receives 60% of net-revenue as baseline.
- The College’s share of revenue should cover direct expenses for the program in all the five dimensions of program management, including academic staffing, content licensing, course production, marketing, student services, etc, and indirect expenses within the college. The college will also compensate fee-for-service providers within the institution and external service providers that are providing contracted services for the program.
- The “open” dollars can be allocated to incentivize colleges to create quality product and experiences, consistent with MSU’s intent to sustain a good reputation in the online marketplace:
  - The course is verified as web accessible.
  - The course is verified as QM certified (certification lasts for three years).
○ The program maintains an exceptional career progression and placement rate for graduates. (How to measure this?)
○ The college dedicates and direct-expenses staffing or service-contracts to support the program in excess of what the baseline revenue share can support.

Programs need time to adjust to new expectations, therefore this model should be phased in for grandfathered programs, with an explicit and transparent timeline to be established for each program, if these recommendations become standard university practice for new programs.

Considerations in the Have / Build / Buy model for OPM functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have</th>
<th>Build</th>
<th>Buy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Adequate supply?</td>
<td>• Scales to demand?</td>
<td>• To burst capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused?</td>
<td>• Improve focus?</td>
<td>• To leverage focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competent?</td>
<td>• Can develop process, expertise?</td>
<td>• To gain competitive advantage (e.g. process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well led, discipline?</td>
<td>• Firewalled for business discipline?</td>
<td>• Where we lack.. willpower or focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evolves with demand?</td>
<td>• Ready on time?</td>
<td>• When we need instant capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adds something unique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: The Importance of Learning Design in Digital Teaching and Transformation

Summary

- As early as the 1970s, Gagne and Briggs (1974) recognized that successful learning took place in systemic (designed) contexts. To design successful learning contexts, faculty subject matter experts, teaching experts, curriculum and learning designers, assessment experts, instructional technologists, technical practitioners, and private industry must work together to create seamless course experiences—a process called instructional, or learning design (Aggarwal, 2018; Jaschik, 2017; Knott, 2015; Brooks 2015; Tabata & Johnsrud, 2008; Wenger, 1998; Gagne & Briggs, 1974).

- Quality learning design, such as easy-to-navigate course structures, opportunities for autonomous learning, instructor knowledge and facilitation, faculty-to-student and student-to-student interaction, and instructor feedback have significant impact on student satisfaction and learning (Clapper, 2018; Eom, Wen & Ashill, 2006; Brooks, Dahlstrom, Grajek & Reeves, J, 2015; Brooks, 2017; Silver, Bourke & Strehorn, 2006).

- Execution of effective learning design requires a team with a varied disciplinary, intellectual, and practical skill set. Few people have all of the skills and bandwidth necessary to deploy well-designed, pedagogically sound learning experiences. This results in the need for multi-dimensional teams and rapid development and iteration processes (Dahlstrom & Bischel, 2015; Bierne & Romanowski, 2018; Morrison, 2013; Mcdonald, Rich, Gubler & Rich, 2018; Aggarwal, 2018).

Definitions and Importance of Learning Design

Faculty subject matter experts, teaching experts, curriculum and learning designers, assessment experts, instructional technologists and technical practitioners must work together to design and create seamless course and curricular experiences (Aggarwal, 2018) Jaschik, 2017, Knott, 2015, Allen & Seaman, Dahlstrom, Brooks, Pomerantz & Reeves, 2016; Tabata & Johnsrud, 2008; Wenger, 1998). While the design of learning, or learning design, is defined in a number of ways, the practice is grounded in an understanding of learning as a function of engagement (between and among humans; with material and technologies), not the one way distribution and consumption of content. The purposeful design of learning environments and contexts should facilitate learning (Aggarwal, 2018; Silver, Bourke & Strehorn, 2006; Gagne, 1970; Gagne & Briggs, 1979).

So what is learning design? A common definition is that learning design refers to a range of activities associated with better describing, understanding, supporting and guiding pedagogic design practices and processes. It is, therefore, about supporting teachers in managing and responding to new perspectives, pedagogies, and work practices resulting, to a greater or lesser extent, from new uses of technology to support teaching and learning. (Conole 2009; 2013, p. 1)
As technology adds complexity to the environments that students must navigate to learn, the purposeful, intentional, and strategic design of learning experiences becomes increasingly critical. In addition to the student experience within the learning environment, the act of teaching requires more than lectures, finding technology, and porting face-to-face course structures to online environments. This is why designed online experiences require a broad ranging skill set that exceeds technology and subject matter expertise.

One of the strongest frameworks for describing the forms of knowledge and expertise is TPACK (Technological, Pedagogical, and Content Knowledge). Developed by researchers at MSU (Mishra and Koehler 2006), TPACK names three critical knowledge spheres that should work together in the development of teaching. The gist of the research is that all three forms of knowledge are required for effective teaching. While two are long-standing areas of knowledge and expertise, technology is recently embedded into nearly every aspect of student and faculty life, requiring intentional thought and purposeful analysis of the affordances and challenges in learning design and teaching practice. Few faculty members are expert in each knowledge domain, but every faculty member has capacity and expertise. But learning design teams can and should be formed to supply necessary expertise.

Without learning design support, faculty tend to revert to less effective methods of instruction, often emulating the ways in which they themselves were taught rather than a student-centered and focused approach to the student needs, technology, and learning contexts of today (Yelon, Sheppard, Sleight, & Ford, 2004; Yelon & Ford, 1999). Indeed, faculty struggle to find support and resources to incorporate technologies in ways that students find helpful (Dahlstrom, Brooks, Pomerantz & Reeves, 2016). The need for design support, therefore, is perfectly reasonable. Faculty need support (both in teaching methods and technical help) to create courses that encompass the best of what we know to be effective with regard to technical and experiential aspects of usability and accessibility, instructor presence, and communication and responsiveness to student needs (Clapper, 2018; Dahlstrom, Brooks, Pomerantz & Reeves, 2016; Brooks, Dahlstrom, Grajek & Reeves, 2015; Silver, Bourke & Strehorn, 2006; Eom, Wen & Ashill, 2006).

Learning design is an evidence-based practice grounded in both strong research and pedagogical literatures that is fundamental to learning environments and a culture in which we care about students and their learning. Effective learning design is best achieved by teams working in collaboration and sharing the desire to create caring, navigable, accessible, rigorous, quality learning experiences and spaces.
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Appendix A: Relevant Institutional Policies and Guidelines

Intellectual Property & Copyright
Covers shared rights for creation of works by MSU employees, licensing of university property to 3rd parties, and use of other entities copyrighted works at MSU.
https://technologies.msu.edu/researchers/patent-copyright-policy
https://technologies.msu.edu/researchers/patent-copyright-policy/msu-copyright-policy

Contracts with Partners
Corporate entities that wish to sponsor creation of a dedicated online program for their employees or customers should do so under a sponsored research agreement via MSU Business Connect.

MSU programs that wish to purchase services from an Online Program Management vendor, especially if shopping from niche providers for specific needs, should work with the MSU Innovation Hub to review options, and MSU Purchasing to select and contract a vendor.

MSU colleges and programs that seek a strategic partnership with an Online Program Management vendor, or another entity which would result in revenue sharing and joint operation of an MSU academic program ought to work with MSU’s Innovation Hub to select and develop a business plan with the partner, with Office of General Counsel and the Provost’s Office reviewing the relationship, joint venture business plan, and contract prior to commitment.

Startup Packages for Revenue Based Initiatives
Each situation is different, colleges often develop the seed funding themselves. The MSU Copyright fund might be a valid source for creation of licensable content. The Provost or Hub may want to preserve a portion of collected revenue to fund future RBI. Deans should plan to discuss startup packages for RBIs with the Provost and OPB, and possibly address them in annual planning processes.

APPENDIX B: Past Market Analyses

We asked BiSK to produce an analysis for purposes of this conversation (July 2018). They looked at MSU’s entire portfolio of existing graduate degrees and considered market factors such as education, labor, and MSU brand presence. The list below is specific to MSU, and does not include other institutions in the market. This list was developed with a growth strategy in mind: launching foundation programs and leveraging that success to facilitate the launch of other programs – true portfolio development.¹ The tables below include existing programs with

¹ Please note that financial efficiencies may be gained by launching a portfolio of programs sharing courses, faculty resources, development costs, and so on. This may require collaboration between colleges and programs.
growth opportunity as well as new opportunities not offered online at this time (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1: BiSK Analysis of MSU Opportunities, Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>High Potential</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Social Science</td>
<td>MA Psychology</td>
<td>MA Economics</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Social Work - OCL</td>
<td>MA Family Community Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Criminal Justice</td>
<td>MA Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Judicial Administration</td>
<td>MA Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA Youth Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of HR and Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Public Policy - Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Social Work - CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Forensic Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Law Enforcement Intelligence and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Science</td>
<td>MS Applied Statistics</td>
<td>MS Biomedical Laboratory Operations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Statistics</td>
<td>MS Biomedical Laboratory Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Clinical Laboratory Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA/MS Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Applied Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Geological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Industrial Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Mathematics Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Physiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly, we invited All Campus in 2016 to identify opportunities with the strongest potential, and they provided us with

- Criminal Justice
- Social Work
- Strategic Communication
- Psychology

From Wiley (September 2017), we received the following:

**Business:**
- MBA
- MS Accounting
- MS Data Analytics/Business Analytics

**Education:**
- MA Education Technology
- MA Programs in Special Education

**School of Social Work:**
Finally, from Noodle Partners (September 2017), the following prioritized list:

**Tier One:**
- MS Computer Science (Engineering)
- MSW (Social Science)
- MBA (Business)
- RN to BSN (Nursing)
- MSN (Nursing)
- Doctor of Nursing Practice (Nursing)
- MATC (Education)
- MAED (Education)
- MA Special Education (Education)
- Educational Leadership EdD (Education)

**Tier Two:**
- MA Communication, Applied Track (Communication Arts and Sciences)
- MPH (Human Medicine)
- MS Statistics (Natural Science)
- MS Biostatistics (Natural Science)
- MS Agriculture, Food and Resource Economics (Ag and Natural Resources)
- MS Criminal Justice (Social Science)
- MS Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysis (Social Science)
- MS Cyber Security (Social Science)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mark Waddell, Chair, University Committee for Faculty Affairs

FROM: Theodore H. Curry II, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President of Academic Human Resources

SUBJECT: Changes to the Emeritus Policy

The Emeritus policy was last reviewed and revised in 1991. At MSU, Emeritus status is automatically granted at the time of one’s retirement. A faculty member is eligible to retire from the University at age 62 with 15 years of service or after 25 years of service at any age.

It is not uncommon for other institutions to provide Emeritus status after a faculty member has attained a substantial period of service short of the years needed for retirement eligibility. MSU’s current policy does not provide for this flexibility.

Further, recent events have required the University to review its policies accordingly. As such, we propose that the Emeritus policy be modified as follows:

1. Allow emeritus status to be granted to faculty and academic staff who end their employment at MSU after a substantial period of distinguished service short of the years needed for retirement eligibility, upon the recommendation of the Provost to the President, after consultation with the University Committee for Faculty Affairs.

2. Add to spirit of current policy that emeritus is granted automatically upon retirement assuming good standing. Good Standing is assumed unless one ends employment while suspended or during termination proceedings.

3. Allow for the revocation of emeritus status upon the recommendation of the Provost to the President, after consultation with the University Committee for Faculty Affairs, in those exceptional cases in which behavior occurring or discovered after being awarded emeritus status is deemed to be substantially inconsistent with the behavior expected of MSU faculty and academic staff.

Additionally, the Emeritus policy is contained with the Faculty Handbook. We also propose to remove executive managers from the provisions of this policy as executive managers are not faculty or academic staff appointments. A separate policy provision may be developed to address how Emeritus status is granted for executive managers.

Attached is a draft revised policy for the committee’s review. We look forward to discussion on this matter at an upcoming UCFA meeting.
Emeritus


IV. ACADEMIC HUMAN RESOURCES POLICIES (Cont.)

The following policy was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 18, 1950 and revised on April 5, 1991 and ________.

Members of the Faculty, academic staff and administrative staff who leave the University with official retirement status and in good standing are granted certain privileges and the "emeritus" title. For faculty members with the rank of professor, associate professor or assistant professor, the "emeritus" designation is appended to the rank held at the time of retirement, e.g., professor emeritus. For academic staff the title would be librarian emeritus, etc. For administrators whose administrative appointment requires approval by the Board of Trustees and for all executive managers, the emeritus designation, upon approval by the Provost and the President, is appended only to the most senior administrative title held at Michigan State University, which may be held at or prior to the time of retirement, e.g., dean emeritus. The emeritus designation is not normally awarded for administrative titles held on an "acting" or “interim” basis.

Faculty, academic staff and administrators who end their employment at the University after a substantial period of distinguished service short of the years of service needed for retirement eligibility, may be granted emeritus status upon the recommendation of the Provost to the President, after the Provost consults with the University Committee for Faculty Affairs.

Faculty with the emeritus designation are entitled to attend Academic Senate meetings with voice but without vote; to march in academic processions such as commencement; to receive the MSU News-Bulletin; to avail themselves of the libraries; to receive, on application, a faculty vehicle permit; to represent the University, on appointment, at academic ceremonies of other institutions; and, in general, to take part in the social and ceremonial functions of the University.

Emeritus status that had previously been granted may be revoked upon the recommendation of the Provost to the President, after consultation with the University Committee for Faculty Affairs in those exceptional cases in which behavior occurring or discovered after being awarded emeritus status is deemed to be substantially inconsistent with the behavior expected of Michigan State University faculty, academic staff and administrators.

1 “Good Standing” is assumed unless one ends employment while suspended or during termination proceedings.
To the Steering Committee:

The UCL is in the process of revising our bylaws, and we would like guidance on how to add a section on Dispute Resolution (primarily when a dispute arises between the University Librarian and the Committee that is unable to be resolved). We thought that perhaps the Steering Committee would like to suggest general language for all consultative-advisory committees to use for this purpose. Below, I am providing only the section of our bylaws that outlines our function, just to provide some context for what the function of the committee is. Then, I have included the new language that we have drafted for dispute resolution below that.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to meeting with you on Tuesday, February 5.

Sincerely,
Sarah Ann Long
Assistant Professor of Musicology
College of Music

Michigan State University
University Committee for the Libraries-Bylaws
Revised January 2019

PURPOSE

The University Committee for the Libraries (UCL) is one of the primary advisory/consultative committees designed to encourage and facilitate faculty support for and utilization of the MSU Libraries in accordance with Bylaws for Academic Governance, Section 5, University Council Advisory-Consultative Committees.

FUNCTIONS

The duties of the committee are threefold:

A. To actively monitor faculty and student concerns about the libraries’ resources, policies and services.

B. To work with the Director of Libraries/University Librarian in developing the Libraries’ programs and policies that meet and promote the instructional and research needs of faculty, students, and staff.

C. To advise and consult with the university administration about:
   a. The state of the libraries: resources, services, and policies.
b. The university commitment necessary to assure that the Libraries adequately supports the university mission of preservation, creation, transmission, and application of knowledge.

[In accordance with the function of the UCL, as outlined above, the committee is adding a section to the bylaws on Dispute Resolution. We would like to know

**Dispute Resolution**

Any disputes that arise between the UCL and the University Librarian that are unable to be resolved by the Committee itself shall be referred to the University Committee on Academic Governance.
Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Utilization*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Period</td>
<td>YTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Medical</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Behavioral Health</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dermatology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall member satisfaction

Gender

- **General Medical**:
  - 74% Female
  - 26% Male

- **Behavioral Health**:
  - 88% Female
  - 12% Male

- **Dermatology**:
  - 100% Female

* Behavioral Health utilization is calculated assuming 20% of the population needs care in a given year. This is in accordance to a Kaiser Family Foundation Analysis of the 2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. Dermatology utilization is calculated assuming a 25% portion of the population needs care. This is in accordance to the American Academy of Dermatology in a 2013 report, Burden of Skin Disease.
Claim savings & utilization

Annualized Utilization
YTD Total Visits X 12 / # months accrued
YTD / YTD Average Subscribers
7.3%

Claim Savings Per Episode
$472

Total Net Claim Savings YTD
Claim Savings Per Episode X Number of Visits YTD
$32,568

Annualized utilization trend
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Member activity

Visits this period 69

Registrations this period 209

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISITS</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>REGISTRATIONS</th>
<th>MEDICAL HISTORY COMPLETIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primaries</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Lives</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* YTD Average: Sum of each month’s eligible lives divided by the number of calendar months the account is effective. Eligible Lives: All members with access to the service (primaries & dependents).
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How your members received care YTD

Visit request method
- Call center: 51%
- Mobile app: 41%
- Website: 9%

Visit method
- Phone: 75%
- Visualized: 25%

On demand vs scheduled
- On demand: 87%
- Scheduled: 13%

Visit frequency
- Total number of unique users: 63
- 1 visit: 100%
- 2 visits: 0%
- 3 visits: 0%
- 4 or more: 0%

Where member would have gone if Teladoc were not available
- No treatment: 68%
- PCP: 10%
- Specialist: 20%
- Urgent Care: 1%
Who received care and when YTD

Gender

74% Female

26% Male

Day of week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-26</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66+</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time of day*

* Times in CST
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Where your members received care YTD

**AVERAGE RESPONSE TIME YTD**
The time between the visit request and when the physician contacted the member

**8 minutes**
REPORT PERIOD: 8 min

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>% Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copyright © 2019 Teladoc Health, Inc. All rights reserved.
Clinical details YTD

Member satisfaction

![Circle diagram showing 100% Excellent](image)

Number of Respondents: 5

Prescriptions by visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits with Rx:</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rx:</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Visits with Rx:</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits without Rx:</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rx per Visit:</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top diagnoses

- Acute upper respiratory infection, unspecified: 14%
- Acute maxillary sinusitis, unspecified: 9%
- Acute sinusitis, unspecified: 6%
- Acute vaginitis: 4%
- Candidiasis of vulva and vagina: 4%
- Acute frontal sinusitis, unspecified: 3%
- Acute pharyngitis, unspecified: 3%
- Allergic rhinitis, unspecified: 3%
- Flu due to unidentified influenza virus w/other respiratory manifestations: 3%
- Otalgia, unspecified ear: 3%

Top prescriptions

- Augmentin 875 mg-125 mg oral tablet: 8%
- Flonase 50 mcg/inh nasal spray: 8%
- Amoxicillin 500 mg oral capsule: 6%
- Amoxicillin 875 mg oral tablet: 6%
- Azithromycin 5 Day Dose Pack 250 mg oral tablet: 6%
- Diflucan 150 mg oral tablet: 6%
- Benzonatate 200 mg oral capsule: 4%
- Medrol Dosepak 4 mg oral tablet: 4%
- Tigan 300 mg oral capsule: 4%
- Advair Diskus 250 mcg-50 mcg inhalation powder: 2%
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Behavioral Health
Behavioral Health Report

AVERAGE RESPONSE TIME YTD
Time from member’s initial request for a session until provider’s initial response. Initial response is accepting member’s session request or may be proposing an alternate session time.
27.5 hours

AVERAGE SCHEDULING TIME FOR SESSIONS YTD
Time from member’s initial request for a session until the session is scheduled.
34 hours

UPCOMING VISITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Utilization*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primaries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Lives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL # UNIQUE USERS - YTD
5

AVG. VISITS PER USER - YTD
1.6

Provider type delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Period</th>
<th>YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Therapist</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Period</th>
<th>YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Visits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Visits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member satisfaction YTD
Number of Respondents: 3
33% Excellent, 67% Good

* Behavioral Health utilization is calculated assuming 20% of the population needs care in a given year. This is in accordance to a Kaiser Family Foundation Analysis of the 2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health.
** Visits that are scheduled, but have not yet occurred.
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Behavioral Health - Clinical Details YTD

Top diagnoses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major depressive disorder, recurrent, moderate</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment disorder, unspecified</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major depressive disorder, recurrent, mild</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reactions to severe stress</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems in relationship with spouse or partner</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top prescriptions

No Data Available

Where member would have gone if Teladoc were not available

Utilization by age
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Dermatology
Dermatology report

Member satisfaction

No Data Available

Annualized Utilization
YTD Total Visits X 12 / # months accrued
YTD / YTD Average Subscribers

0.4%

Total Net Claims Savings YTD
Savings Per Episode x Visits YTD

$91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Utilization*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primaries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Lives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE RESPONSE TIME YTD
Time from member’s initial request for visit until provider’s initial response. Initial response may be request for additional information or visit completion.

122.6 hours

YTD where participants would have gone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISITS</th>
<th>SAVINGS COST PER VISIT* Redirected cost less consult fee x # visits</th>
<th>TOTAL SAVINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dermatologist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Physician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Visits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total savings YTD is calculated by savings cost per visit, less consult fee X # of visits. Redirected costs per visit for dermatologists are $221/visit and other physician visits are $166/visit.

** Dermatology utilization is calculated assuming a 25% portion of the population needs care. This is in accordance to the American Academy of Dermatology in a 2013 report, Burden of Skin Disease.

Copyright © 2019 Teladoc Health, Inc. All rights reserved.
**Top diagnoses**

- Other acne: 100%

**Top prescriptions**

- Benzoyl Peroxide 2.5% topical gel: 33%
- Doxycycline Monohydrate: 33%
- Salicylic Acid 6% topical gel: 33%

**Prescriptions by visit**

- Visits with Rx: 1
- Total Rx: 3
- % Visits with Rx: 100%
- Visits without Rx: 0
- Average Rx per Visit: 3.0

**Utilization by age**

- 18-26: 100%

**Visit request method**

- Website: 100%