

## **INSTRUCTIONAL EXTENSION**

### **OUTREACH INVOLVEMENT**

*How many faculty are involved?*

Reasonable levels of involvement in instructional extension across campus with over 45% of faculty reporting at least a moderate level of involvement and over 25% reporting a considerable or great level of involvement in instructional extension.

One in five faculty report that their level of instructional extension is greater than it was three years ago. Note that there were rather low levels of instructional extension going-on three years ago (21 % reported at least a moderate level of involvement). This suggests that more faculty are becoming involved.

*What is the nature of the involvement?*

52% of the faculty report that they have been involved in three or more instructional extension projects over the past three years.

In terms of activities that can be evaluated by the traditional canons of campus scholarship, the instructional extension picture is somewhat different--less than one fifth of the faculty report applying for instructional extension-type grants in the last three years.

*Summary*

Instructional extension involvement is widespread at MSU with 73% faculty saying that they have had at least slight involvement.

More faculty are involved in knowledge extension than are involved in instructional extension.

### **OUTREACH INTENTIONS**

*How pervasive will instructional extension become?*

Instructional extension will become even more pervasive in the years to come. 78% of all faculty intend to become involved in instructional extension some time in the next three years. Over 26% of the faculty intend their involvement to be considerable or great.

Over 22% of the faculty anticipate engaging in more instructional extension than they are currently involved in.

*What will the instructional extension look like?*

In terms of spending time in instructional extension activities, 40% of the faculty report that there is a considerable or great chance that they will spend time.

*Summary*

While many faculty anticipate becoming involved in instructional extension, they are much less likely to spend blocks of time. This suggests that there needs to be a dialogue about the nature of scholarly activities surrounding instructional extension.

## **COMMUNITY CONTACTS/INCENTIVES**

*How many contacts?*

80% of the faculty report having at least one contact each month--on average--with off-campus organizations, groups, and agencies.

45.8% of the faculty report that they average three or more contacts each month

22.7% of the faculty report that they have been asked to engage in instructional extension.

*What sort of incentives exist?*

Approximately 16% of the faculty feel that off-campus organizations, groups, or agencies expect them to engage in instructional extension.

Approximately 9% of the faculty report that they have been offered incentives to engage in instructional extension.

*Summary*

It appears that there are substantial levels of contact with off-campus organizations, groups, and agencies.

There are moderate levels of expectation that faculty will engage in instructional extension.

It is not clear that off-campus groups want to pay for the instructional extension.

## **PERSONAL VALUES--Instructional extension**

### *What do faculty value?*

Faculty are not committed to instructional extension--41.3% of the faculty report a considerable or great commitment to instructional extension. 26.8% of the faculty report no or a slight commitment to instructional extension.

50% of the faculty attach a considerable or great value to instruction to non-traditional audiences.

33.9% of the faculty attach a considerable or great value to collaboration with off-campus organizations, groups, or agencies.

21 % of the faculty attach a considerable or great value to an extensive time commitment to instructional extension.

### *How have personal values changed?*

30.8% of the faculty report that they value instructional extension more today than they did five years ago.

60% of the faculty report that they have not changed the value they attach to instructional extension over the past five years.

Only 8.6% of the faculty report that they value instructional extension less than they did five years ago.

### *Summary*

MSU faculty have personal values that are consistent with instructional extension.

While half of the faculty value instruction to non-traditional audiences, substantially fewer faculty value the type of collaboration and time commitments necessary for successful instructional extension.

## **DEPARTMENTAL INCENTIVES**

### *What are the basic beliefs?*

23% of the faculty feel that it is of considerable or great importance at MSU to be known for instructional extension.

53.4% of the faculty report that their chair/director is generally or very supportive of instructional extension.

36.4% of the faculty report that their chair/director attaches more value to instructional extension than s/he did five years ago.

43.4% of the faculty report that their Dean attaches more value to instructional extension than s/he did five years ago.

### *What types of incentives exist?*

Only 6.6% of the faculty feel that instructional extension is very important to decisions relating to tenure/promotion to associate, promotion to full, and merit salary decisions.

Over 40% of the faculty report that instructional extension has no importance whatsoever in key "reward" decision.

Over 65% of the faculty report that instructional extension should be rewarded more.

### *Summary*

While faculty report that the leadership attaches value to instructional extension, there is no evidence that meaningful rewards are given for instructional extension activities.

Strong majority of faculty report that instructional extension should be rewarded more.

## **DISCIPLINARY INCENTIVES**

### *Do disciplinary incentives exist?*

Approximately 22% of faculty report that instructional extension is career-enhancing to a considerable or great extent.

Approximately 23% of the faculty report that instructional extension has considerable or great benefit in their discipline or profession.

Over 50% of the faculty report that instructional extension has no or only slight career/disciplinary benefits.

### *Summary*

A relatively small number of faculty report that instructional extension is valued by their discipline or profession.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT**

### *Department Chair/Director*

Perceived to be the most supportive campus administrator across the basic research and campus teaching mission.

Substantially less supportive for the extension portion of the campus mission.

### *Dean*

Perceived to be less supportive for basic research and campus teaching than the department chair but much more supportive than the Provost or President.

Perceived to value instructional extension to the same degree as the department chair

### *Provost*

Provost is more supportive of basic research and on-campus teaching than she is of instructional extension.

With respect to instructional extension, Provost is perceived to be very supportive to the same degree as the Chair and the Dean.

### *President*

President is perceived to be most supportive of on-campus teaching with similar levels of support for basic research and instructional extension.

## **FACILITATOR/BARRIERS**

### *Barriers*

Financial Resources, Career Goals, and Departmental Norms are perceived to be the most significant barriers to instructional extension.

### *Facilitators*

Familiarity with non-traditional learners is perceived to be the most significant facilitator.

While the availability of distance technology is a net facilitator, the use of the technology is a net barrier.

### *Summary*

Most of the factors cut both ways--some faculty perceive them to be barriers while other faculty perceive them to be facilitators.

## **MULTIVARIATE EXPLANATION**

### *Explaining Community Contacts/Incentives*

Who MSU hires as faculty is more important than what the university does in determining involvement in instructional extension.

Personal values are relatively important to all stages of instructional extension. Of particular significance is the fact that personal values are the major determinant of community contacts.

Prior experience as a graduate student or being employed as a non-academic in a related field are all important determinants of establishing contact with the community.

In terms of contextual factors, there are three types of influences that have a bearing on the establishment of community contacts.

The presence of either facilitators/barriers enhances/inhibits faculty contacts with the community.

Disciplinary Incentives are the most important determinant of community contacts. Hence, even though only a small number of individuals report incentives, those that do follow-up on them.

Those faculty with an MSUE appointment are substantially more likely to establish community contacts, all other things being equal.

#### *Explaining Involvement in Instructional extension*

Most important determinant of outreach involvement is having contacts with the community. The greater one's involvement with the community, the more likely they are to become involved in outreach.

In terms of personal characteristics. Personal values are an important determinant of involvement. Longevity is also important; the longer you have been a faculty member, the more likely you are to engage in instructional extension.

Contextual factors play a less significant role in the level of outreach involvement.

Disciplinary and Departmental Incentives play an important role in the level of involvement in instructional extension.

All other things being equal, those faculty with an MSUE appointment are more likely to become involved in outreach.

#### *Explaining Future Outreach Intentions*

The most important determinant of future intentions is the current level of outreach involvement; the more involved a faculty member is currently, the more involved they intend to be in the future.

The second most important determinant of future intentions is the personal values of the faculty member. This effect is lessened somewhat by the faculty member's longevity; the older a faculty member is, the less likely they are to have future intentions to engage in outreach.

The level of administrative support plays a small but significant role in the formation of future outreach intentions.

### **OVERALL POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- I. The values and the prior experiences of MSU faculty members are extremely important to the University's outreach agenda. Develop hiring procedures and policies that highlight the importance of these factors in the hiring decision.

II. With one notable exception, the university context within which outreach takes place, is substantially less important than are the personal characteristics of the faculty. The once exception is the presence of disciplinary incentives. There are a number of disciplines that have taken a national stance with respect to teaching non-traditional audiences or in non-traditional ways. At the present time, these are the faculty who are most likely to be engaged in outreach. As a policy consideration, it would be wise to develop mentoring models so that those with experience can teach those who lack experience.

III. Establishing community contacts is extremely important to subsequent involvement in university outreach. At the present time there are a substantial number of contacts in spite of the fact that such contacts are often ad hoc. In this regard there are two concerns:

- A. Develop mechanisms to facilitate community contacts.
- B. Develop mechanisms to insure that there is appropriate follow-up once contact has been established. Either the contact should be told that there is nothing the University can do for them or efforts will be made to respond to the issue.