



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
February 14, 1985
626 Coffman Memorial Union
12:30 - 3:00

AGENDA

1. Minutes of January 31 (enclosed).
2. Reports:
 - A. Student Chair
 - B. SCC Chair
 - C. Finance Committee
 - D. Regents meetings
 - University mission focus
 - Other
 - E. Presidential Search Advisory Committee.
3. University Grievance Procedures, Part C: "Academic Freedom and Responsibility Issues Involving Faculty, Staff, and Students."
4. 1974 Senate request regarding early registration for student senators (enclosed).
5. Special Working Committee on the Semester System;
Guest: Vice President Robinett.
6. Governance:
 - A. February 14 Senate meeting
 - B. Further specific SCC plans based on reports of its two subcommittees
 - C. Discussion of and possible proposals growing from President Keller's January 31 remarks to SCC.

university
of
minnesota
memo

Date February 8, 1985
To Senate Consultative Committee
From Jack Merwin
Subject Enclosure

We'll attend to President Keller's just-released report,
"A Commitment to Focus," in our February 14 meeting when
we hear reports from the Regents' meetings.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
February 14, 1985
626 Coffman Memorial Union
12:30 - 2:55

APPROVED 2/28/85

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Sue Gruenes, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chr.), Paul Murphy, Paul Schulte, David Shope, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Burt Sundquist.

Guests: John Aune, Jacque Jodl, Mary Jane Plunkett, Associate Vice President Robinett.

Before turning to the printed agenda, the SCC briefly discussed the format of Senate debate on action items. Members observed that on some issues the allotted time has been almost filled with pre-scheduled speakers. That is good in that the speakers tend to come well-prepared, but unfortunate in that some of the best thoughts on the subject may go unexpressed. The SCC decided to observe what happens in this year's remaining Senate meetings before considering whether some procedural change might be desirable.

Agenda change. Chairman Merwin asked for and received the Committee's consent to make item 2.D (University mission focus) agenda item 3, and to postpone item 3 (Part C of the Grievance Procedures proposal) to the February 28 meeting.

1. The minutes of the January 31 meeting were approved as distributed.

2. Reports.

A. SSCC Chair. Mr. Melby. SSCC held a Student Senate social on the evening of February 13 for coordinate campus senators visiting the Twin Cities campus. Some FCC members attended.

Eric Stroschein is resigning as Crookston's student representative to SCC; Maria Sikaffy will replace him. Bruce Williams had to return to UMD before today's SCC meeting for a final exam.

B. SCC Chair. Professor Merwin. The Facilitative Committee of the Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly will meet February 22. Agenda will cover (1) status of committee reviews of the planning task force reports, (2) Senate and Assembly business anticipated for the spring, (3) coordinating the work of committees, (4) 1985 committee nominations, and (5) the newsletter.

Promotions and sponsorships policy: continuing effort to resolve. Assembly Committee on Student Affairs' chairman Kahn has written President Keller appealing for help in naming faculty to the Assembly-approved review committee. Professor Merwin has written an explanation to the president of the status quo and has arranged a meeting with Student Affairs Associate Vice President Zander, Professor Kahn, and Business and Rules Chairman Purple. Mr. Shope will attend as well.

Joy Conolly has contacted some SCC members regarding a Daily article she is preparing on the Senate structure and committees.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman. The interim president on January 31 brought SFC up to date on the University's request to the legislature and on the governor's budget recommendation. SFC discussed the deans' proposal on budget priorities for which retrenchment could be required; the Finance Committee did not disagree greatly with the deans' ranking.

At its February 28 meeting, SFC will address two Biennial Budget Request-related matters. The Committee will (1) hear a report on the current situation regarding retrenchment plans already in place (how much of their bills collegiate units have paid and what schedule is anticipated for the rest) and (2) meet with Dr. Wolfe, Assistant Vice President for Information Systems, to become better informed about the University's hardware for instructional computing -- what the University has and what it needs.

D. Reports from the Regents' meetings. Professor Merwin briefly summarized the main items of action and information from February 7 Regents' committee meetings. The Committee of the Whole on February 8 approved the new tenure code and extended its compliments to the Tenure Committee, its chairman, and the faculty for bringing them a document they could approve. A few interpretations must be worked out before it goes into effect on July 1. Much of the remainder of the meeting was devoted to the President's recommendations in "A Commitment to Focus!" (see #3 below).

E. Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Professor Sundquist. The Committee met on February 1 with the Board of Regents and the national consultant who had been collecting information on 25 candidates. Participants had a good interchange. The Committee has a good relationship with the Board, things are moving forward in a constructive vein, and all are quite hopeful about the outcome.

Professor Sorauf asked if the Committee and Board are still dealing with several dozen candidates, and if the candidates know they are being considered. Professor Sundquist said the committee is concentrating on a shorter list while not letting go of its total list. Professor Merwin mentioned that Regent Lebedoff in the Regents meeting implied that some of the people under consideration know that they have been nominated.

The status of legislation to permit the University to keep its list of finalists private for a year has passed a committee of the House.

3. "A Commitment to Focus," Interim President Keller's report to the Regents.

Dr. Keller has asked SCC to determine which committees in addition to

SCC ought to consult on the proposal at an early date. The Regents may well feel the need to take some action regarding the proposal at their March meeting. SCC will discuss it with Dr. Keller on February 28.

The Committee agreed that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Planning Committee should be asked to study and comment on the report.

Professor Clark remarked that it would be helpful for the President to share widely the fact that most items contained in the report come from earlier planning and documents and that basically what is new is this comprehensive format.

Professor Merwin will ask the chairs of SCEP and Planning to put the report on an early agenda to consider from the perspective of policy. At some later time, if the proposal moves ahead, it will be appropriate to involve other committees to consult on implementation questions.

SCC Discussion.

I. Undergraduate education. Professor Stuthman remarked that the guiding assumption that produced this section is that because Minnesota's undergraduate-to-graduate ratio is out of line with that of its peers, it should be reduced.

Professor Sorauf called the suggestion to "coordinate lower division education across Twin Cities units" probably the most radical of the report, and one which would have implications for thousands of lower division students. In the long run, he said, it would have the largest ramifications. It recognizes the need to raise this part of the University's program to a higher level.

If professional school undergraduate enrollments are reduced, Professor Sorauf said, one must consider where students who would otherwise enroll there would go. (See also II. below.) The change would impact heavily on CLA. The result of the change won't necessarily reduce undergraduate enrollments, so one must ask where and by what mechanisms overall undergraduate enrollments are to be cut.

Professor Freier inquired whether the plan would result in a reduction in the number of Twin Cities residents who could get four-year degrees. Professor Merwin reported that President Keller has told the Regents the University would welcome the state universities, such as Mankato and St. Cloud, making offerings in the Twin Cities.

Professor Clark referred to the tension between issues of access and issues of quality. The proposal to raise entrance requirements to the University implies that the high schools have to change as well. Professor Merwin noted that the President reported to the Regents that he had already initiated conversations with Commissioner Ruth Randall regarding such matters.

Professor Stuthman observed that the University's testimony to the legislature with respect to funding the new Electrical Engineering/Computer Science building is consistent with this report. The case for the new building was presented in terms of graduate education needs and not in competition with the new undergraduate programs at UMD and St. Cloud.

Mr. Shope remarked that one would assume University graduation requirements would change as a result of changed admissions requirements. He cautioned that minority students are the ones most likely to be cut out under the charge.

Mr. Melby pointed out that the only other public four-year institution in the Twin Cities is Metropolitan State University and that the University of Minnesota is a major Twin Cities' vehicle providing what the other state universities provide in other areas of the state. Poor areas of the state, he warned, lack the tax dollars to increase their offerings to qualify their graduates for admission to the University.

With the number of undergraduate students falling, he said, there is an opportunity to improve services such as advising. However, he feared that with more emphasis on graduate education, more graduate students would be teaching undergraduates. He voiced the hope that professors would still do most of the undergraduate teaching.

Professor Stuthman replied that the number of graduate students is not likely to rise. The thrust of the plan lies in the hope for a rise in the ratio of resources to students by modifying the funding assumptions for the University. The result ought to be better opportunities for all students enrolled.

Mr. Schulte reported from President Keller's latest presentation to a legislative committee that legislators from beyond the metro area are asking about access, while Twin Cities' legislators like the prospect of improved quality.

Professor Melsa suggested the transfer of resources within the University might be considerable if undergraduates in the reduced programs transfer to other undergraduate colleges. He asked that people think about the distances University students have to travel within Minnesota. And he cautioned that it is hard to imagine the legislature justifying putting the same amount of money into the University if the numbers of students are significantly less.

Professor Sorauf said there is no talisman in any particular undergraduate-to-graduate student ratio. The recommendations on the question are descriptive, not evaluative. He agreed there is the danger of overpromising that no one will lose any money. We can't pretend, he said, that all these changes will take place without any ripples. Moreover, the University needs to engage the other state systems with it in a rational separating out of the programs.

Professor Stuthman assessed the proposal as intending to bring about enough division of the offerings in the state that there would be less competition between the systems for students. There have been, he said, some over-arching discussions already with the heads of other systems.

Mr. Shope said that trying to improve excellence through reducing competition does not relate to Crookston's case since UMC serves its area as a community college would as well as a part of the University.

II. Professional Education. (Reducing and capping program sizes.)

Professor Merwin pointed out the present opportunity for local residents to commute here for programs they want.

Professor Clark reiterated here Professor Sorauf's earlier point. If CLA lower division students can't transfer into the School of Management or Education, what are the implications for CLA? Will those students remain in CLA, yet have essentially professional majors? We also need to consider what the implications will be if the University reduces Education majors in response to lowered need but other institutions do not, and to take note of the national interest in raising standards for teacher education.

Professor Sorauf noted CLA already has a problem with students who are not accepted into Management or another professional program, and stay, less than happily, in CLA.

Professor Sundquist suggested acknowledging that there are no circumstances under which everybody can get his or her first choice. Constraints in the system mean that some people get suboptimal outcomes of their situations. He asked that people think about the cross-compliance kinds of constraints--the effects the proposed changes will generate elsewhere.

He reinforced the point that the plan requires rational, complementary behavior by other actors including the state universities and the community colleges. Above all, he said, the plan can work only if backed up by the funding agency.

Professor Melsa introduced the question of preferential admissions. If School of Management undergraduate enrollment is reduced by 50%, will there be a quota system favoring University students? What will be the chances for community college or state university students hoping to transfer there after two years? The change could make it difficult for the community colleges to prepare students for transferring. Would their students only be able to go on to the state universities? There is an implication that students who want to graduate from the University had better start there.

Professor Sorauf reported that transfers into the University from community colleges have already declined sharply.

Mr. Melby asked whether the caps would mean students aspiring to be teachers would have to go to state universities to earn their certificates and lose the chance to have the richer opportunities of education at the University.

Professor Stuthman closed this part of the discussion with an admonition. The legislature has tried in recent sessions to close down campuses, but it has now backed away from that effort and is telling the educational systems to get their own houses in order. The legislature, he said, is giving the University the chance to control its own fate and we had better get on with it.

III. Coordinate Campuses.

Professor Merwin asked whether there was a necessary logic in lumping

the Crookston and Waseca campuses together for purposes of the proposal. SCC members saw two significant differences: Crookston's location makes it serve logically a community college function in addition to its University mission; Waseca's programs are almost all agriculture-related while at Crookston, strictly agriculture students number less than one-third of the total.

Regarding the proposal to affiliate the UMC and UMW agriculture programs with the College of Agriculture, Professor Stuthman said he for one would welcome explorations of positive changes which might emerge from such a link. Professor Sundquist agreed, saying there is at least an open mind within the Institute of Agriculture and they would see the link as a two-way street. Even a two-year agriculture program, he noted, includes business, science, and communications courses as well as agriculture courses. It needs a fairly broad support base to be a meaningful program. He favors looking at Crookston and Waseca separately because they have different mixes of students and programs and serve different regional functions.

Mr. Shope also noted the need for legislative support for any program of changes, and the current division of legislative opinion according to geography.

Professor Melsa pointed out that UMC has programs which are not agriculture-related in the strictest sense. Only 300 UMC students out of 1000 are in the agriculture programs and UMC would pick up no more than 50 to 100 if it inherited agriculture students from the closest other institutions. The funding would not hold, he argued. UMC's studies show the campus is not taking students away from the nearby AVTI and community college.

He emphasized that fewer than 50% of northwestern Minnesota's high school graduates go on to any form of higher education. The proposed change regarding Crookston would reduce that proportion still further.

IV. Continuing Education and Extension.

The report suggests setting admission requirements for CEE. Professor Sorauf noted that many of the students taking CEE courses for credit clearly don't meet the admissions standards of the college offering the course. Were inloading carried out, the University would confront this problem even more regularly. Professor Murphy noted there are related Graduate School implications.

Mr. Shope argued that since CEE has a completely different purpose from the rest of the University, that of enabling people to continue their educations, it should have different entrance requirements.

Professor Sorauf noted that the University has tried to make a distinction by offering credit and non-credit courses, but most people want to earn credit regardless of their reason for registering. Professor Stuthman said the parallel structure makes for the possibility of a double set of standards.

Professor Sorauf commented that the concern being expressed over "elitist" implications of the proposals is one which always arises when one talks about raising quality. He asked people to keep in mind that President Keller is talking about an elite of ambition, desire, and goals, which he called a more defensible position than the customary understanding of "elite."

4. Semester Working Group. Guest: Associate Vice President Robinett.

Dr. Robinett distributed copies of the Working Group's interim report. She read a portion of the letter of charge and said it has been an incorrect interpretation to conclude that the University is necessarily going to make the change from quarters to semesters.

The Working Group will report to the Regents in April for information. The group wants to hear lots of comments. They have received a large amount of mail on both sides of the question. The Working Group's approach is to consider this question: If the change were to be made, what would be the problems?

Dr. Robinett skimmed through the interim report with the SCC, calling attention to main concerns which have arisen and the information the Working Group has gathered which relates to them. With respect to problems and concerns generally, she noted that many other institutions seem to have worked them out.

Faculty concerns: Workload, single quarter leaves. An arithmetic analysis indicates workload in a semester system could be virtually the same. Single quarter leaves, said Dr. Robinett, are one of the unique and valuable opportunities University faculty have. The opportunity would have to be preserved as semester leaves. Also to be preserved would be the arrangements departments permit whereby faculty can teach two out of three quarters. Such flexibility could still be maintained, but would require careful planning over a multi-year period. The problems can be worked out, she said, but must be carefully thought through.

She told SCC there must be strong academic reasons for making the change, and that the change could only be done with the support of the faculty.

Student concerns. Access. The data show the University wouldn't lose a lot of transfers by moving from three periods a year to two.

Transcripts. The conversion would be shown clearly on student transcripts.

Larger tuition due at one time. There is no reason the installment payment provisions can't be continued.

Costs. Administrative Data Processing cost savings would be great, given the present database system, if all campuses of the University moved to the same calendar. Dr. Robinett said she cannot otherwise answer the questions about costs and savings. Faculty time on curriculum revision would be the biggest cost. Yet the exercise of deciding what to keep and what to drop could be a very good one.

Model calendars. A pre-Labor Day start is out of the question because of St. Paul Campus parking and noise conflict from the State Fair, whose scheduling is virtually immutable. However, the Michigan model looks promising. It includes two fourteen-week semesters with 50-minute classes as the basic module and 75-minute classes for the Tuesday-Thursday schedule. Classes start after Labor Day and conclude in very early May. A 7-week spring term and a 7-week summer term complete the 12-month year.

Other state systems. The Working Group has communicated with other systems in the state. They appear to be waiting to see what the University chooses and to intend to then do likewise.

Timing. If the University decided to change to a semester system, it would take three years from the date of decision to implement the conversion.

SCC follow-up. Mr. Shope suggested that since it hadn't been possible for SCC members to have the interim report ahead of today's meeting, it would be helpful for them to have time to study it and talk with Dr. Robinett a second time.

Mr. Shope thought semesters make it unlikely that students could schedule all their courses in either the a.m. or p.m. and be free to work for the other half of the day.

Course and credit structure. Whether there would be the same number of courses or fewer would depend on the credit structure, Dr. Robinett said. She added that the Florida experience indicates it would be better not to change the credit module.

The number of courses offered in each semester would in that case be the same as the number offered now in each quarter. Over the year that would mean one-third fewer courses offered, whose content would have to be compressed into the remaining, lengthened, courses.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Clerk of the Senate
424 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2125

February 18, 1985

Professor Jack Merwin
Senate Consultative Committee
210E Burton Hall

The following resolution was approved by the
University Senate on February 14, 1985:

Resolved, that no definitive action be
taken on the possible changeover from
the quarter system to the semester system
until there has been adequate opportunity--
after the relevant factual information has
been gathered--for the Senate Consultative
Committee to discuss the matter thoroughly
and for the Senate to debate the issue.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marilee Ward".

Marilee Ward
Clerk

POSSIBLE TRANSITION TO SEMESTER SYSTEM

DISCUSSION MATERIALS

- A. Reasons for Preferring Quarter/Semester
- B. Faculty Workload
- C. Student Concerns
- D. Curriculum Conversion
- E. Alternative Semester Calendars
- F. University Bulletins
- G. Transfer and External Issues
- H. Costs and Savings

SEMESTER WORKING GROUP

**John Q. Imholte
Russell Hobbie
Sam Lewis
Cherie Perlmutter
Betty W. Robinett, Chair
Craig Swan
William Weiler
Keith Wharton
Dorothy Abts, ex officio
DeeAnn Olsen, staff**

February, 1985

REASONS FOR PREFERRING QUARTER/SEMESTER

The possibility of converting from one academic calendar to another raises questions about the reasons behind the selection of one or the other. If a change is to be made, there should be strong academic reasons for making such a change. For the sake of discussion we will present reasons which tend to support either the quarter or the semester system that come from literature on the subject, from discussions with other institutions that have recently changed from the quarter to the semester system, and from the correspondence already received from faculty at the University.

We will divide the issues into three sections: 1) those that pertain to students; 2) those that pertain to faculty; and 3) those that may be classified as administrative in nature. Some of the issues, of course, pertain to more than one category.

STUDENTS

Those preferring the semester system believe that the longer time frame enhances learning and results in a better educational experience. It allows for increased maturation of concepts and time to integrate course material. There is also the feeling that there will be fewer incompletes. Students believe that there will be more time to develop a theoretical perspective, to impart skills in research method, and to carry out field projects. Thus, serious research papers will be possible, thereby improving graduate and undergraduate education.

The quarter system advocates believe that the shorter time frame provides more intense learning and allows less time for procrastination. They note that the quarter system allows easier access to the institution and makes changing majors easier. And while those advocating the semester system speak of the greater depth and breadth of a semester course, the quarter system proponents speak of the greater variety of courses possible for a student studying under the quarter system.

It is argued that students in the quarter system have exposure to a variety of professors. Also, it is pointed out that if an instructor is not a "good" teacher the student has to spend less time with that person. On the other hand, it is argued for the semester system that if a student happens to have a "good" instructor, the student is able to have longer exposure to that individual.

The question of what happens when a student becomes ill is approached differently from the two perspectives. The semester system allows more time for a student to recover from an illness and complete the term, while a student in the quarter system, if forced to drop out because of extended illness, stands to lose only one quarter instead of a full semester of work.

FACULTY

Some faculty are seriously concerned over the possible loss of a free quarter for research each year, which has sometimes been arranged under the quarter system. However, multiple-year scheduling of classes could allow for a full semester free every three years if carefully planned. In fact, since each semester is contiguous to a summer, a free semester plus a contiguous summer would provide almost eight months of uninterrupted research time.

Those favoring the semester system point out the savings in time in having to give finals and grade students only twice a year instead of three, and of engaging in major advising and counseling of students twice instead of three times a year.

Questions are raised as to whether the teaching load of faculty would be raised if a semester system were implemented. There is no reason to believe that this would happen, and based on the experience at other institutions, this has not happened.

Concerns have been raised about the ability of some departments to handle laboratory courses that are taught with a finite number of student locations if class size is increased in the conversion. This would be a concern only if two-quarter sequences were to be extended to two semesters.

Others think that the effort to undertake thorough curricular reviews would be time well spent and would result in a better educational experience.

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

Although the change to a semester system would necessitate expenditure in time on the part of every member of the academic community, it is clear that there will be long range savings both in time and money because of less time in the future spent on registration, grading, textbook ordering, and other administrative activities that have to be carried out for each of the three quarters.

Cost saving estimates are very difficult to obtain, and the other institutions that were asked about this could not provide any useful dollar figures. Some information on this is provided in this material in the section entitled "University Bulletins" and in the section entitled "Costs and Savings."

It is clear that if the whole University were to go on the same calendar, there would be tremendous monetary savings in the operation of the administrative data gathering process.

COMMENT

The above discussion has by no means exhausted all the issues that could be raised in regard to calendar changes. We are sure that, depending upon specific departmental and programmatic needs, others will surface as discussion of this matter ensues.

FACULTY WORKLOAD

It is important that across the University the conversion to the semester system have as minor an impact as possible on instructional workload and research opportunities. A systematic reduction in instructional workload could easily lead to a reduction in state funding and would be unfair to students. Any systematic increase in instructional workload could have an adverse impact on faculty research opportunities.

While classroom instruction is only part of the total instructional effort, there is much concern about the implications of a possible change to the semester system on course loads. If one defines an individual faculty member's classroom instruction responsibilities in terms of contact time and maintains the same contact time over the year whether the University is on the quarter or semester system, then there need not be any change in this element of instructional workload. With no change in contact time over the year, it may be unclear what the implication for an individual faculty member's course load would be under the semester system. If all semester courses meet for 50 percent more time than their quarterly counterparts, course loads could be defined by requiring the same number of courses over three semesters as are currently required over three quarters. This adjustment of course loads is consistent with the constraint of no change in contact time as seen below.

| <u>Course Load</u> <u>(3 qtrs)</u> | <u>Contact Time</u> <u>(3 qtrs)</u> | <u>Annual Contact Time</u> | <u>Course Load</u> <u>(3 smstrs)</u> | <u>Contact Time</u> <u>(3 smstrs)</u> | <u>Annual Contact Time</u> <u>(2 smstrs)</u> |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| 4 | 90 hrs | 90 hrs | 4 | 135 hrs | 90 |
| 5 | 112.5 hrs | 112.5 hrs | 5 | 168.75 hrs | 112.4 hrs |
| 6 | 135 hrs | 135 hrs | 6 | 202.5 hrs | 135 hrs |
| (30 meetings of 45 minutes) | | | (45 meetings of 45 minutes) | | |

Teaching loads vary from unit to unit for a variety of reasons including different missions and differences in research funding. A decision to measure course requirements over three semesters instead of three quarters would preserve autonomy of units in terms of setting course loads.

Implications for average class size are examined below. The table shows that for a faculty supplying the same amount of contact time and with semester courses meeting for fifty percent more time and carrying fifty percent more credit than quarter courses, then, for the same sized student body enrolling for the same amount of instruction, there need be no change in average class size. The table is an illustration based on a six-course teaching load under the quarter system. A different teaching load would not change any fundamental result.

- 2 -

Quarter/Semester Conversion

| | <u>Current Quarter System</u> | <u>Semester System</u> |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. # FTE students | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| 2. # faculty | 500 | 500 |
| 3. # credits/course | 4 | 4 |
| 4. # weekly meetings/course | 3 | 3 |
| 5. # courses/faculty | 6 | 4 |
| 6. # courses FTE student/year | 12 | 8 |
| (6)X(3) 7. # units FTE students/year | 48 | 32 |
| 8. # units to degree | 180 | 120 |
| (8):(3) 9. # courses to degree | 45 | 30 |
| (3)X(5) 10. # units/faculty/year | 24 | 16 |
| (2)X(5) 11. # sections/year | 3,000 | 2,000 |
| (1)X(6):(11) 12. # Average class size | 48 | 48 |
| (4)X(5)XQorS 13. # Contact hours/faculty/year | 135* | 135** |
| (4)X(9)XQorS 14. # Contact hours to degree | 1,012.5* | 1,012.5** |

*Q = 22.5 hrs

**S = 33.75 hrs

Notes:

- Conversion to semesters is assumed to have no impact on the number of students or faculty.
- Interrelations indicate that not all items can be set independently. For example, if items 3, 4, 5, and 8 are set by policy considerations and item 6 determined by student behavior, then everything else follows arithmetically.

There is concern that the semester system will offer less flexibility in terms of scheduling time for research activities. The quarter system appears to offer a number of advantages. They include the following:

- By appropriately scheduling courses one may be able to "free up" a quarter in terms of limited classroom responsibilities, although counseling and advising as well as administrative obligations would remain. It is widely believed that such internal flexibility would be more difficult under the semester system, although with the conversion of course loads discussed above the ability to "free up" a quarter would now translate into the ability to "free up" a semester. While under a semester system the ability to free up time would be spread over a longer period of time, one could free up a larger block of time.

- Beyond internal flexibility many faculty members arrange for a quarter off from teaching by buying off time through research grants or taking a single quarter leave without pay to pursue research and/or teaching opportunities away from the University. In these cases a department loses only one-third of a colleague's contribution to the curriculum and funding need be found for only one-third of an individual's annual salary. Under the semester system leaves-without-pay would absent a faculty member for one-half of a year. Complete elimination of teaching responsibilities for a semester would require one-half a year's salary rather than one-third. While one can imagine buying off one-third of one's teaching obligations, the necessary bookkeeping under the semester system may be more cumbersome than under the quarter system.

- It has been argued that it is easier to respond to new research opportunities within a year under the quarter system. The argument is the same as above, that is in terms of course scheduling or buying off time, it is easier to make the necessary adjustments and free up one-third of a year than it would be to free up one-half of a year.

STUDENT CONCERNS REGARDING SEMESTER CONVERSION

Most students currently attending the University of Minnesota probably have not attended school under the semester system unless they transferred in from a private school or from out of state. The student body has not been polled to assess their opinion on the possible change.

Tuition Assessment and Financial Aid

Under the semester system total tuition and fee payments for a year would be the same as under the quarter system. The payment for an individual semester would be 50% larger than for a quarter. This fact worries some students. There is no doubt that accumulating the necessary funds could be difficult, particularly for those part-time students not eligible for student financial aid or help from other sources. On the other hand 50% of the Minneapolis-St. Paul campus student body is eligible for student aid to help pay expenses. Student aid is awarded based on expenditures for the academic year. While annual student awards would remain unchanged, students would have their quarterly allocations augmented by 50% to cover the longer semester time periods and the larger tuition. They should not encounter any greater difficulty paying for tuition and fees. On the other campuses up to 80% of the students are eligible for aid. The semester system would likely make it financially easier for all students eligible for aid since they would only need to make arrangements twice rather than three times a year to pick up their financial assistance. Graduate students often have their tuition and fees paid through payroll deduction or student aid and should not have major difficulties paying the larger sum.

All day school students are eligible to participate in an installment payment plan for tuition and fees. Under the semester system the installment plan could be expanded to three payments rather than the current two. This would allow payment to be spread out enough so that students and parents would not have a more significant problem with cash flow.

The majority of CEE students pay their own way and may have problems gathering together the money to pay tuition. To alleviate this problem consideration should be given to an installment payment plan for CEE students. CEE students now must pay when they register. Approximately 20% of CEE students receive direct tuition reimbursement from their employers. Additional students are funded by student aid or veteran benefits. These latter two groups of students would not be significantly affected by having to pay a larger tuition bill.

Stop-in/Stop-out

These phrases have become common to describe post-secondary educational attendance patterns in recent years. The average undergraduate student now enrolls for about 12 credits per term. Once quarters out of school and courses taken which were not successfully completed are considered, it takes about six years for the average student to earn an undergraduate degree. Under a semester system the stop-in/stop-out phenomenon would be inhibited by the longer length of the term. Some student attendance patterns are quite irregular and may relate to the need to accumulate the necessary finances to pay tuition--in one quarter, out

one quarter, in one quarter This pattern is most prevalent among part time, adult special, and evening school students. Evening school students usually work full-time during the day. They may find it more difficult to make the special commitment to continuing education if it involves a semester in length.

Student Employment

Each quarter 70-75% of the student body is employed. During the course of an academic year the percentage of employed students is even higher. Many students attempt to organize their academic schedules in patterns which will make it easy for them to fit in their work hours. Schedules which have all classes in the morning or afternoon, or on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday are not uncommon. Students will be worried about the semester system if it inhibits their ability to work. If the semester system does not significantly increase the number of hours per week they must be in class, then problems with working hours will be minimized.

University Access

The semester system will eliminate the possibility of starting school in spring quarter. In spring 1984, 1,328 new students began attending the five campuses of the University. Only 339 of these students were new high school students (those who have never previously attended a post-secondary institution). All the rest were transfer students from other educational institutions. In fall quarter 1983 there were 14,131 new students of whom 8,151 were new high school students and in winter 1984 there were 2,243 new students and 691 new high school students. The percentage of new students who started in spring is 7.5% of the fall, winter, spring total. The percentage of new high school students who started in spring is 3.7% of the fall, winter, spring total. These low percentages indicate that not many students wish to begin their University careers in spring quarter. If the University were on the semester system, it is possible that other state public systems of higher education would also switch to semesters. In that case the lack of access to spring quarter would be even less important.

Depending on the semester calendar adopted, access to summer school could be more limited than it currently is. Now students can start in first Summer Session or second Summer Session. It will be important to plan for maximum flexibility in whatever calendar is adopted so that perspective students have access to multiple starting dates for summer session.

Transcripts

Student transcripts would have to identify clearly the date the University converted to semesters. Student cumulative credit calculations would have to be converted from quarter to semester equivalencies. Attached are several examples of how transcripts could be modified to inform students and others about the conversion to semesters.

Students could be adversely affected by changes in academic program requirements, elimination or recombination of courses, and the general academic

conversion in such a way that their graduation date could be delayed. This possibility could be eliminated by allowing students to graduate under the requirements for their major or program that were listed in a previous or new catalog. Degree program advisors and faculty could be requested to be flexible with the requirements so students caught in the conversion would not be unfairly disadvantaged. There should be a broad-based dissemination of information campaign to inform students and allay their fears regarding credit conversions.

Advising

Special emphasis should be given to the improvement of the advising process under the semester system. Advising is a major concern of students at the University. The large number of recommendations in the report of the Task Force on the Student Experience is evidence of this concern. On the face of it students would not have to have as many advising contacts under the semester system. This would save students and advisors time. Students would feel the need for good advising more strongly under the semester system, however, since it is more important that they be enrolled in the correct mix of courses than it is under the quarter system. Careful student program planning will be needed. Current advising systems rely in large measure on the registration system to enforce advising contacts between students, faculty, and college offices. Extensive thought should be given to the whole issue of assisting students to make sure that they have developed a good academic plan for themselves. Uninformed course selection decisions would commit students to longer periods of instruction which may be counterproductive to the completion of their academic programs.

Minnesota's Climate

Minnesota springs often don't get underway until May 1. If a spring semester were to end by early May, activities which rely on the weather being warm would be severely restricted. Courses in agriculture, biology, geology, horticulture, studio art, and other subjects which rely on outdoor activity would be limited. Recreational activities would be similarly disadvantaged more than they are in semester schools in warmer climates.

Administrative Operations

Students can find functions such as registration, tuition payment, and financial aid check disbursement time consuming and frustrating if they are not well organized. Bureaucratic run-around can be a definite headache. While conversion to the semester system will not in and of itself help eliminate such run-around, students will only need to endure two such periods per academic year.

NOTES ON CURRICULUM CONVERSION

Conversion from a quarter-based curriculum to a semester-based curriculum has followed a number of models. Some of these include:

- A) Adjusting the pace so that existing courses are taught over 15 weeks instead of ten weeks. For example, single-quarter courses that meet three times a week for ten weeks would meet twice a week for 15 weeks. Two-quarter sequences that meet three times a week for a total of 20 weeks could meet four times a week for 15 weeks.
- B) Adopting a standard course module for the majority of courses and converting courses to semester courses by the addition of fifty percent more material. Note that this adjustment is unnecessary for year-long sequences and implies that all other one- and two-quarter courses would be expanded to one and two semesters. If all courses were offered regularly, this model implies a substantial increase in faculty teaching loads. It is also unclear whether there would be enough classrooms to handle the increased number of courses per term.
- C) Adopting a standard course module and converting department curricula to semester offerings subject to some sort of two-thirds constraint on the number of courses and/or offerings. This adjustment is straightforward for year-long sequences and implies that units must restructure other course offerings. For example, three separate courses that covered the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries could be offered in two semesters that covered the 17th and first half of the 18th century in the first semester and the second half of the 18th and 19th centuries in the second semester.
- D) Another possibility would call for a more fundamental change in the University's whole curriculum. For instance, one might stop measuring courses in terms of units and instead measure all offerings in terms of "courses." A full load might be four courses and all courses would be expected to require an equivalent measure of work. Under this scheme, graduation requirements would be defined in terms of courses rather than units.

Colleges and departments must address a number of issues when thinking of curriculum conversion, including decisions about course modules, collegiate distribution requirements, major requirements, department-specific course offerings, student course loads, faculty workloads, course availability, and room scheduling capacity.

COURSE MODULE

Decisions about unit credit and contact hours reflect basic concerns about breadth and depth and have direct implications for student course loads and faculty workloads. Three-unit course modules imply a full-time student course load of five courses a semester and 40 courses for graduation. Four-unit modules imply four courses a semester and 30 courses to graduate.

DISTRIBUTION AND MAJOR REQUIREMENTS

Decisions about distribution and major requirements reflect difficult choices about areas of inquiry and knowledge that should form a common core of any undergraduate degree and the recognized need to allow students the opportunity to explore other areas of special interest and competence, including the concentration of effort appropriate to a major. Should the University move to a semester system, consideration of the structure of new requirements might start with the presumption of a two-thirds adjustment of distribution and major requirements to preserve their relative importance. As the faculty considers specific requirements, they will need to examine the resource implications of decisions to deviate from a two-thirds adjustment.

DEPARTMENT-SPECIFIC CURRICULA

Currently, departments supply a given number of faculty contact hours and serve a given number of students. Repackaging a year of offerings into two 15-week semesters instead of three ten-week quarters does not by itself change the ability of departments to supply faculty contact hours. Neither should a conversion to semesters have a significant effect on the number of students attending the University, their willingness and financial ability to take classes, or their choice of majors. In short, the conversion to semesters, by itself and across the University, should not have a major impact on the number of students or their selection of majors.

If the move to a semester system includes a four-unit semester course module and if there is to be no change in the number of faculty or average faculty workload, units will need to adjust their curricula so that total course offerings are reduced by one-third. The conversion of a three-quarter sequence to a two-semester sequence includes the one-third reduction. Similarly, the conversion of a one-quarter course offered every quarter to a one-semester course offered every semester also includes the one-third reduction.

Conversion of one- and two-quarter sequences is perhaps more difficult. Units will need to consider whether courses should be eliminated, expanded to one or two semesters, contracted into one semester or restructured. For example, a sequence of one-quarter courses on individual, but related topics, authors, periods, could be restructured into semester courses, each of which covers more than one topic, author or period. Specialized low enrollment courses can be maintained with alternate year scheduling.

Special care must be taken when courses are expanded from one quarter to one semester or from two quarters to two semesters to avoid the suggestion that the University is simply inflating student credit hours. Semester student credit hours represent fifty percent more work on the part of students and a fifty percent increase in faculty commitment as compared to student credit hours under the quarter system. The greater time commitment of students and faculty must be accompanied by greater depth and/or breadth of course coverage. If material now covered in a single quarter is simply covered at a more leisurely pace under the semester system, we will be shortchanging both students and taxpayers.

With a four-unit semester course module, most departments should expect that the total of individual course enrollments, measured in terms of students, will decline from current numbers based on the quarter system, although enrollments in particular courses, especially ones that reflect collegiate distribution and departmental major or prerequisite requirements, may not decline. The decline in head count reflects the fact that a full-time student would be taking eight rather than twelve courses. It should also be remembered that each four-unit semester course would allow for fifty percent more contact as compared with a four-unit quarter course. For example, a department that enrolled 100 students in each quarter of a three-quarter sequence would show an annual total of 300 students and 1,200 student credit hours. Under a semester system, the department might enroll the same 100 students in each semester for a total of 200 students and 800 student credit hours, although the 800 semester-based student credit hours would be equivalent to the 1,200 quarter-based student credit hours.

Conversion Model A essentially maintains the current quarter curriculum and might be expected to have the smallest impact on enrollment patterns. Other models that involve restructuring of course offerings, introduce a greater degree of uncertainty regarding semester-based enrollment patterns. Many curricular decisions will have implications for other units. Prerequisites, distribution requirements, and supporting programs are areas where departments and colleges have an interest in the curriculum of other units. As many colleges and departments might use the opportunity afforded by conversion to the semester system to reexamine their whole curriculum, the conversion process should allow the necessary time for appropriate interdepartmental and intercollege consultation.

GUIDELINES FOR CONVERSION

The adoption of a model A, adjusting the pace of current courses, would be largely a technical exercise. Courses meeting three times a week for ten weeks could meet twice a week for 15 weeks. For courses meeting one, two, four or five hours a week, the arithmetic does not work out so easily. Adjustment to a semester calendar would involve either a little more or little less contact time. In these cases, there would need to be an appropriate adjustment of course material. The University of South Florida used model A and allowed the following adjustment of unit credit:

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|--------|---|---|--------|---|
| Quarter Units | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Semester Units | 1 | 1 or 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 or 4 | 4 |

Iowa State followed model C and issued the following broad guidelines:

Departments are strongly urged to develop semester curricula that require no more than two-thirds the number of credits now required on the quarter system and in some instances slightly fewer credits should be considered to reduce the pressure on students.

Each department's total semester credit offering should be two-thirds of its present total quarter system offering.

The Iowa State guidelines strongly discouraged the direct numerical conversion of courses described for South Florida.

ALTERNATIVE SEMESTER CALENDARS

In selecting alternative semester calendars for discussion, one of the overriding concerns was to avoid a semester that would be split by the Christmas holidays. This concern necessitated a beginning in late August if a 45-minute class period was to be continued. However, if the class period was lengthened to a 50-minute period, we could begin immediately after Labor Day and end before the holidays. Because of the presence of the State Fair adjacent to the St. Paul campus until Labor Day, it seems essential that any proposed calendar for the Twin Cities be one that commences after Labor Day.

Attached are two alternative semester calendars, one with a 15-week semester and the other with a 14-week semester. The first model is a typical early in - early out semester calendar based on 45-minute class periods.

The second model is based on the calendar which has been used at the University of Michigan for several years. It utilizes 50-minute class periods and it provides for an early start in the fall but not until after Labor Day. The second semester begins shortly after the first of the year and ends very early. The second semester is followed by two seven-week summer terms to accommodate two types of students: those interested in the early summer term are generally regular year students, while those in the second summer term are the kinds of students who often attend summer school, often from the public schools.

We have also attached alternative daily class schedules illustrating 50-minute class periods throughout the day starting at 8:00 a.m. and at 8:15 a.m. Since our information shows that very few classes are ever scheduled for the ninth hour, we have omitted it from the models.

Another item of information in this section is a table that shows comparative class contact time under the quarter system with 45-minute periods and under the semester system with both 45-minute and 50-minute class periods.

Attachments

Model 1

PROPOSED TWIN CITIES CAMPUS CALENDAR

1984-85

(15 week -- 45-minute periods)

This calendar is constructed so that there is an equal number of Mondays, Tuesdays, etc. within each semester.

Fall Semester 1984 (15 M T W Th F)
(6 days - Final Exams)

| | | |
|----------------|----------|------------------------------|
| August 27 | Monday | Fall Semester begins |
| September 3 | Monday | Labor Day -- Holiday |
| October 16 | Tuesday | Classes Excused |
| November 21-24 | Wed-Sat | Thanksgiving Student Holiday |
| December 14 | Friday | Last Day of Instruction |
| December 15 | Saturday | Study Day |
| December 17-22 | Mon-Sat | Final Examinations* |

Spring Semester 1985 (15 M T W Th F)
(6 days Final Exams)

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-------------------------|
| January 21 | Monday | Spring Semester begins |
| March 18-23 | Mon-Sat | Mid Semester Break |
| May 10 | Friday | Last Day of Instruction |
| May 11 | Saturday | Study Day |
| May 13-18 | Mon-Sat | Final Examinations* |

1984-85 Holidays:

Wednesday, July 4, Independence Day
 Monday, September 3, Labor Day
 Thursday, November 22, Thanksgiving
 Friday, November 23, (Civil Service Floating)
 Monday, December 24, (Civil Service Floating)
 Tuesday, December 25, Christmas
 Monday, December 31, (Civil Service Floating)
 Tuesday, January 1, New Year's Day**
 Tuesday, January 15, MLK's Birthday
 Monday, March 18, (Civil Service Floating)
 Monday, May 27, Memorial Day

*Grades would have to be reported three working days after final exams are given.
 **If it becomes state required holiday, teaching calendar is not affected.

Model 2

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN TERM DATES

1984 - 85

(14 week -- 50-minute class periods)

FALL TERM, 1984

| | |
|---------------|----------------------|
| Classes begin | September 6 |
| Classes end | December 12 |
| Study days | December 13, 15 - 16 |
| Exams | December 14, 17 - 21 |

WINTER TERM, 1985

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Classes begin | January 9 |
| Spring Break | 7th week (February 18 - 23) |
| Classes end | April 24 |
| Study days | April 25, 27 - 28 |
| Exams | April 26, April 29 - May 3 |

SPRING - SUMMER TERM, 1985

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| Classes begin | |
| Spring half term | May 8 |
| Classes end | |
| Spring half term | June 25 |
| Study day | June 26 |
| Exams | June 27 - 28 |
| Classes begin | |
| Summer half term | July 3 |
| Classes end | |
| Summer half term | August 20 |
| Study day | August 21 |
| Exams | August 22 - 23 |

ALTERNATIVE DAILY SCHEDULES

15 Minutes Between Classes

50-Minute Classes -- MWF

| | A | B |
|------|---------------|---------------|
| I | 8:00 - 8:50 | 8:15 - 9:05 |
| II | 9:05 - 9:55 | 9:20 - 10:10 |
| III | 10:10 - 11:00 | 10:25 - 11:15 |
| IV | 11:15 - 12:05 | 11:30 - 12:20 |
| V | 12:20 - 1:10 | 12:35 - 1:25 |
| VI | 1:25 - 2:15 | 1:40 - 2:30 |
| VII | 2:30 - 3:20 | 2:45 - 3:35 |
| VIII | 3:35 - 4:25 | 3:50 - 4:40 |

75-Minute Classes -- TTh

| | X | Y |
|-----|---------------|---------------|
| I | 8:00 - 9:15 | 8:15 - 9:30 |
| II | 9:30 - 10:45 | 9:45 - 11:00 |
| III | 11:00 - 12:15 | 11:15 - 12:30 |
| IV | 12:30 - 1:45 | 12:45 - 2:00 |
| V | 2:00 - 3:15 | 2:15 - 3:30 |
| VI | 3:30 - 4:45 | 3:45 - 5:00 |

**QUARTER - SEMESTER COMPARISONS
CONTACT TIME**

| | <u>Class Period</u> | <u>Number of Meetings</u> | <u>Contact Time (by term)</u> | <u>Contact Time (by year)</u> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <u>Monday - Wednesday - Friday</u> | | | | |
| 10-week quarter | 45 | 30 | 1350 | 4050 |
| 15-week semester | 45 | 45 | 2025 | 4050 |
| 14-week semester | 50 | 42 | 2100 | 4200 |

| <u>Tuesday - Thursday</u> | | | | |
|---------------------------|----|----|------|------|
| 10-week quarter | 75 | 20 | 1500 | 4500 |
| 15-week semester | 75 | 30 | 2250 | 4500 |
| 14-week semester | 75 | 28 | 2100 | 4200 |

UNIVERSITY BULLETINS

A change to the semester system would have a profound impact on the University Bulletin series. Bulletin staff produce about 30 biennial bulletins. Bulletin staff also produce University prospective student publications such as the "Viewbook," college and departmental "Briefs," and orientation handouts.

Bulletin staff felt that it might be possible to do the necessary total rewriting of the bulletins without much additional funding under certain circumstances. In a typical year only 10-40% of the bulletin text must be redone whereas under a semester conversion almost 100% would probably need to be redone. The reformatting and typesetting necessary might be accomplished if there were a lapse in the production of all bulletins. This would allow staff in departments, colleges, and the bulletin editors time to gather all appropriate new course and program information. It would allow University printing time to complete the typesetting. Funds not devoted to the production could be devoted instead to bulletin revisions.

It might be necessary to print some extra supplies of previous bulletins to carry over during the lapsed year. It would also be likely that the University should produce some kind of a reference document for advisors, colleges, and departments which could be used to track course changes from the quarter system to the semester system as was done by Iowa State and others.

Colleges, particularly those whose bulletins would be produced for the fall 1988-1990 biennium, would have to follow a very tight schedule for making decisions on course offerings and academic program guidelines so the data could be communicated to bulletin editors in plenty of time to complete the process. Time considerations are very important. Faculty will need as much time as possible to make curricular and program revisions. Time will be needed for faculty across the University to tie together programs in the various parts of the University. In addition, faculty will need to assess major and degree courses and requirements, delete old courses and plan new ones, rewrite course notes and tests, assess laboratory materials and facilities, and shift teaching responsibilities. The cost of this activity is difficult to estimate.

The Class Schedule would have to be used as a substitute for the bulletin during the lapsed period. Extra copies might be needed. Once a firm decision were made to convert to semesters, bulletins would have to begin warning students that a change was to be made. Communicating with prospective students during the lapsed period might be difficult, but could be accomplished if everyone had a clear idea of what the options were for informing students about offerings, and if departments and colleges followed a tight schedule for converting courses.

TRANSFER AND EXTERNAL ISSUES

Academic calendars at all public institutions in Minnesota are now quarter calendars. Since the primary source of transfer students at the University and the primary destination of transfers from the University are to other Minnesota public institutions, it is clear that if the University switches to a semester calendar while the others do not, we must anticipate issues related to converting transfer credits from quarters to semesters and conversely. Note that this issue is in addition to the widely cited "problem" of the University's seeming penchant for denying transfer credit for courses taken elsewhere. In addition, our calendar change would also pose problems for students wishing to transfer either way for the spring quarter. However, the proportion of students currently transferring spring quarter is small so that this presents a less pressing problem than the issue raised above.

The important issue in the legislative relations area is related to the average cost funding formula. Under this formula the starting point for determining our funding is the number of FYE students we serve. Hence, any change which, correctly or not, is perceived as an attempt to inflate our credit hour production with no change in faculty workload is bound to meet resistance. (We had such resistance when we went to the four credit module.) Any guidelines for conversion of courses from quarters to semesters must make it clear that we will not allow simple stretching out of current quarter courses to semester length with the same credit value.

We could also suffer revenue losses in two ways even if we are not accused of credit inflation. First, credit conversions that are less than two semester credits per three quarter credits will cost us revenue through the same funding formula. Second, the experience in Florida suggests that students could take fewer (converted) credits on the average to the extent that they perceive a full load in terms of courses rather than credits.

We note, though, that the difficulties inherent in both the transfer and legislative relations issues are ameliorated if other public schools in Minnesota also convert to semester calendars. The transfer issue is clearly less thorny if other schools change. Similarly, if all schools change, the average cost funding formula will have to be revamped for all of higher education; there will only be one formula rather than two; and it is much less likely that all systems will be accused of credit inflation. However, the problem of a potential reduction in the credit loads of students or of devaluing course credits in the process of converting will still remain.

COSTS AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSITION TO SEMESTER

- There are a number of costs associated with the transition to the semester calendar that have been identified by various University staff. Some departments will have an easier time making the transition than others and may experience financial savings. In some instances no particular problems are foreseen, but time will be needed to plan necessary changes.

Faculty. The extensive faculty effort outlined in the section on Bulletins would be hard to tally in terms of dollars.

Students. Some people have the perception that students will waste the first several weeks of a semester by procrastinating and that this represents a lost educational opportunity in the semester system. Student entry points are more limited under the semester system and this fact constitutes lost opportunity. Unless the transfer process is reviewed carefully, student transfer problems could represent a cost to students under the semester system.

College Student Service Offices. A number of academic units have unique systems and data processing programs which are oriented to the quarter system which may need revising. Some of these programs are internal to the units and others are run by Information Systems and Services (see below).

FINANCE DEPARTMENTS

Administrative Data Processing. ADP sees no particular problems with the switch to semesters in the fiscal area unless the fiscal year were to be changed. Extensive costs associated with student systems are outlined under Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid.

Payroll. Changing the starting and ending dates of the academic year would necessitate altering pay schedules but should not present any major problems.

Budget Office. No cost implications, only a concern involving tuition revenue estimation procedures which must be reviewed.

Research Administration. Little impact, may affect some appointment documents.

Housing. Little impact, may affect forecasting of dropouts from dorm rooms.

Accounting Services. No impact as long as fiscal year doesn't change.

Bookstores. Reduce net sales between 0 and 1/3 depending on course conversion and sequences. Might need longer lead time to order books. Sales will probably go down more than costs. However, the Bookstores will have to staff up for the rush only twice instead of three times.

Space Programming and Management. No major impact, will have to shift main moving periods.

Bursar. There could be large savings in Financial Aid check distribution. This check reduction might also help in Accounting since fewer checks will need to be produced. Group loan exit interviews will be reduced since they will have to be done in fewer time periods. Fee payment collection costs may rise since there will probably be more and extended payment periods.

MPIS. No impact other than a conceptual problem explaining to legislators and others changed enrollment and credit hour statistics.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Admissions. There will be more of a peak in Admissions applications for the second semester which may take more staff, but since there is no spring quarter, there will be more time to concentrate on fall. There could be savings if all U of M campuses are on the same uniform calendar in running data processing programs. Extensive work will need to be done to identify transfer problems and to smooth them out ahead of time as much as possible by working out procedures with the Community Colleges and the State University System. It is likely that some kinds of publications will need to be produced to communicate with advisors in other schools, high schools, and students.

Savings will occur in both the Orientation Office and College Student Personnel units if there are only two orientation periods per academic year.

Student Financial Aid. Packaging aid for two semesters would definitely be easier than packaging aid for three quarters. Aid check production, refund calculation, and other financial aid administrative tasks would also be substantially reduced. There are numerous ADPD programs which would have to be altered at an unknown cost before any cost savings could be realized. After this year all five campuses will be on the Student Aid Management computerized financial aid system. This system will be organized around a quarter calendar.

Registration, Student Records, and Scheduling. This is the area of largest impact within Student Support Services. Virtually all student and course record activities would need to be revised. There are approximately 200 ADPD programs which would have to be totally rewritten or modified. The changes to the programs would vary from changing title references from quarters to semesters to major revisions to some systems that are dependent on the quarter structure. All of the program changes may not be required at the time of implementation. Some may be phased in later. If a decision is made to use the semester system, a more complete analysis will have to be made to determine the time and costs involved. Most forms will need to be scrapped and recreated. Some of the programs which would need revision include:

- Official University and HEGIS statistical report programs
- First Day and Second Week Class Lists
- Student Rosters
- Major Advisor Lists and Reports
- Grade Reports
- Grade Slips
- Numerous Registration Programs and Reports
- Registration Status Notices
- Transcripts (Official and Operational)
- Course Inventory Reports used by MPIS and Colleges
- Degree Programs and Lists

Registration, Student Records, and Scheduling is also responsible for the quarterly Class Schedule. It would need rewriting and revision. Whether only needing two schedules per year would save would depend on the number of courses and sections which would have to be incorporated in the publication. Editing costs would eventually be lower.

Information Systems and Services. This department is a service department for the three operational departments listed above in Student Support Services and would be involved deeply in the changes listed above. ISS is also responsible for coordinating new computer developments. There are a number of ongoing developments which will be in the process of being programmed and implemented in the next few years. Some of the major ones are the following:

- A New Admissions and Prospective Student System
- An Extension Student Data Base, Extension Student Registration System,
Conversion of Extension Student Payment Processing to \$AR
- Final Automation of the Student Financial Aid System
- A Revision of the Course Inventory System
- The Likely Development of an Automated Degree Progress and Graduation Clearance System

The change to semesters might stall the development of many of these systems since it will require Administrative Data Processing to spend time revising current production programs. Developments could be delayed the better part of two years. The degree of delay will depend on whether program changes required by the conversion to semester will be phased in or whether they must all be completed prior to implementation.

ISS is also responsible for college bulletins. In the long run there could be savings in bulletins if there are fewer courses overall.

Continuing Education and Extension. No likely savings. CEE is already on both the quarter and semester system. No major system changes would seem necessary apart from course revision. CEE has estimated the cost of rewriting Independent Study courses under the four credit module to be \$350,000. CEE is also worried about the costs of decreased student access opportunities.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Mechanical Engineering
125 Mechanical Engineering
111 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

February 19, 1985

Professor Jack Merwin, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
424 Morrill Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Jack:

Had Mr. Keller not suffered a loss of peripheral vision (temporary I trust) during the debate on Prof. Swan's motion I would have made the following points:

- 1.) The Senate and the University are indebted to Professors Swan and Turner for having done the necessary hard work required to diagnose the weaknesses in the University Senate structure and its conduct of business. While most found the remedy proposed extreme, that should not cause the issues raised to be set aside. The Senate and its committees should consider these issues with the purpose of improving faculty discourse and strengthening the faculty voice in educational policy.
- 2.) Few quarrel with the notion that the University is a community but it is one whose parts often show widely varying interest in, and attach markedly different importance to, a particular issue. Currently we have no simple way to gauge such differences with precision. The vote on the Swan motion is a case in point. The vote tally was 125 opposed, 42 in favor. Miss Ward's office indicated that the roster showed 122 faculty and 60 student senators in attendance. Assuming all students to have voted nay, 65 (125-60) faculty voted against. Total faculty vote was 107 (65+42); the faculty dividing on the issue 39% for, 61% opposed. The aggregate Senate vote was 3:1, the faculty vote 1.55:1, opposed. The division of the Senate on this issue made clear the separate student and faculty views but there are a number of issues in the course of the academic year which would also be constructively illuminated by recording and reporting the faculty vote and student vote separately. I ask therefore that the Consultative Committee consider presenting such a motion to the Senate.

It would be unnecessary for routine motions having to do with approval of minutes, appointment of committees, accepting reports, and the like to be treated in this fashion. Rather it would be sufficient to have the Faculty Consultative Committee exercise its judgment about which issues should be so voted on. (Similarly, the Student Consultative Committee may wish to exercise its discretion in so designating issues). Issues to be accorded this voting procedure could be marked by an appropriate symbol in the agenda.

Perhaps by a series of small steps, none of earth-shaking importance, we can develop a governance system better able to deal with the problems before us and

and to communicate with greater clarity our views.

3.) I understand and appreciate the work which the Consultative Committee has done on some of the points raised by Professors Swan, Turner and others. The change in the bylaws of the Senate regarding matters which will be discussed in meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee with the president is welcome. I trust that yet other improvements will be forthcoming. In particular, I believe that all faculty members would welcome the delegation of additional functions to the faculty Senate although I appreciate that the negotiation of such delegations may prove difficult.

4.) There remains the general issue of eliciting from the faculty its sense about the important issues before us. Two current examples come to mind:
1.) The costs and benefits of changing from quarter to semester terms and
2.) Mr. Keller's proposals for sharpening the focus of the University ("A Commitment to Focus"). Perhaps some experiments may be in order: The Consultative Committee may wish to recommend that the faculty Senate address certain questions arising from these issues, or it may urge the appropriate Senate Committees to hold open meetings for their consideration, or it may consider taking a leading role by sponsoring faculty forums for their discussion. I am confident that yet other possibilities will present themselves as the general need is considered for improving faculty communication.

I would be negligent if I failed to acknowledge the good work of the Consultative Committee particularly during those times when apprehensions rise. Should the suggestions prove useful in some small way my concern will have been more than repaid.

Sincerely,



W. E. Ibele
Professor

WEI:mez



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Student Senate
240 Coffman Memorial Union
300 Washington Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2414

TO: Senate Consultative Committee
FROM: Cathy Birk
DATE: January 18, 1985
RE: Student Subcommittee work on improving
governance

The student subcommittee met twice, once on December 18, and again on January 10. Enclosed you will find the minutes from both meetings and a copy of the Student Senate Amendments that will be ready for action at the February 14 Senate meeting.

If you have questions regarding this, please feel free to contact me.

wsn



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Student Senate
240 Coffman Memorial Union
300 Washington Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(612) 373-2414

SSCC Subcommittee on Swan Motion

January 10, 1985 MSA office

Constructive ways to improve student participation.

Members Present: C. Birk, B. Emanuelson, C. Farrell, J. Bates,
J. Pearson, D. Shope, P. Schulte, J. Jodl, M. Richter.

Seven Major Areas of Dispute About
Student Participation in the Senate

1. Are issues of Senate relevant to students?
2. Student attendance and quality of participation.
3. Changing demographics - do students work more and not have time?
4. Is the Senate too large to be effective?
5. Do faculty have a voice in current structure?
6. Which issues belong where?
Faculty Senate
University Senate
Student Senate
7. Should Consultative meet less frequently and FCC and SSCC more often?

SSCC Subcommittee Meeting on Swan Motion

(of the SSCC members)

Dec. 18, 1984 MSA office

Examining the Real Problems in Governance

**Members Present: C. Birk, B. Emanuelson, J. Bates, J. Pearson,
M. J. Plunkett.**

Category I

**Faculty voice
Student access to adminis-
tration
Student vote as bloc
Faculty concerns..**

Category II

**Orientation
Size of Senate
Attendance
Filling student positions
Transient nature of students**

**Each problem in either group relates to the other. Solutions
lie not in obtaining a separate solution to each of the above,
but in a blanket solution to address all the problems in both
categories.**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: A COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

To strengthen its identity as an international research university, a land-grant institution and a metropolitan university, the University of Minnesota must take steps during the next two years to sharpen its focus -- to decide what it does best, to concentrate on that, and to leave the other higher education institutions in Minnesota to concentrate on what they do best.

To that end, the following recommendations, if adopted by the Board of Regents, can be seen as the University's proposal to the state of how the University can emerge as an even better institution; stronger in its programs, more responsive to the needs of the state, and an even greater contributor to the nation's well-being. It can also be seen as an effort to help the public better understand the University's planning process.

But to be successful, the University's effort must be met by changes in the state's approach to funding the University, which creates counterincentives to some of the efforts outlined here. Many of the proposals deal with correcting the seriously out-of-balance ratio of undergraduates to graduate students by allowing undergraduate enrollments to decrease, but the University's efforts would be self-destructive as long as average cost funding directly links state appropriation to the number of students enrolled. Similarly, the proposals tend to call for reduction in the size of low-cost undergraduate programs, which have been subsidizing higher-cost professional and graduate programs under the rigid requirement that tuition fund 33 percent of instructional costs.

The following proposals -- which are programmatic rather than budgetary -- deal with four major elements of the University system: undergraduate education, professional education, coordinate campuses, and Continuing Education and Extension. This is not a plan for budgetary retrenchment.

I. Undergraduate Education

- Eliminate two-year degree programs in all colleges and at all campuses except Crookston and Waseca.
- Eliminate degree and certificate programs from General College.
- Eliminate the University Without Walls program.
- Unify and increase entrance standards across all Twin Cities undergraduate colleges (except General College), Duluth, and Morris.
- Coordinate lower division education across Twin Cities units.

II. Professional Education

- Reduce by 50 percent undergraduate class size in the School of Management.
- Reduce undergraduate class size in the College of Education.
- Reduce undergraduate class size in the School of Nursing.
- Cap undergraduate engineering enrollments in the Institute of Technology.

- Reduce doctor of veterinary medicine program in College of Veterinary Medicine.
- Consider reductions in other professional school class sizes.
- Consider reductions in size and scope of medical residency programs.

III. Coordinate Campuses

Crookston and Waseca: To make these campuses the focus of two-year agricultural education in Minnesota, the following should be done:

- Transfer similar programs from other state higher education systems to the Crookston and Waseca campuses.
- Phase out non-agricultural programs and activities at Crookston and Waseca.
- Incorporate Crookston and Waseca into the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics.

Duluth: UMD should function as the land-grant university serving the northeast region of Minnesota and should undergo the same narrowing of focus in its undergraduate programs as those suggested for the Twin Cities campus. This calls for:

- Attention to the needs of the region and increased activity in research, outreach, and service programs.
- Elimination of associate degree programs.
- Establishment of entrance standards identical to those proposed for Twin Cities campus undergraduate programs.

Morris: Instead of being a smaller version of the University's College of Liberal Arts, the Morris campus should work vigorously to become a small liberal arts college by taking advantage of its size to develop an integrated core curriculum. Such a curriculum could be based on multi-disciplinary courses, staffed by faculty in several disciplines. Students could take this common set of courses and augment them with electives in areas of particular interest. To move in this direction, support for Morris must be based primarily on the need to maintain program integrity rather than on student enrollment.

IV. Continuing Education and Extension

- Increase utilization of University expertise in Agricultural Extension.
- Shift Continuing Education offerings to reflect University curricular strengths rather than market circumstances.
- Consider setting admission standards for credit offerings in CEE.
- Coordinate Extension activities with other higher education systems.
- Anticipate and exploit new technologies for instructional delivery.

A COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

REPORT OF
INTERIM PRESIDENT KENNETH H. KELLER
TO THE
BOARD OF REGENTS

FEBRUARY 8, 1985

A COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

In November, I outlined my views on the general directions that the University should be taking, building on our planning of the past few years and moving with a sense of purpose through this period of transition and into the future. It was a set of views based on the identity of the University as an international research university, a land-grant institution, and a metropolitan university. It was a statement that presumed our commitment to setting priorities and to making choices; in short, a commitment to focusing our activities to preserve and enhance our quality.

The response to that statement has been positive and supportive and because of that response and enthusiasm, I believe it is appropriate to expand upon it and to suggest how I think we should implement it. There are other reasons as well for taking this next step of making clear how our commitment to focus translates into actions for program enhancement and program curtailment. Here are two in particular:

First, in submitting its request to the Legislature this year, the University has made a strong case for both the restoration of adequate funding to carry out its mission and the flexibility to exercise its own judgment as to how best to use those funds to support its various programs. The Governor and the Legislature have both agreed that the Board of Regents is the proper body to make programmatic choices for the University. Still, there is no doubt that the support of public officials for our requests can be enhanced by a better understanding of our strategic plan for the future of the University.

Second, in the era of limited growth that lies ahead, the health of Minnesota's several systems of higher education will depend upon the thoughtful coordination of their missions. I believe it is appropriate that the University take the first steps toward that coordination by defining its programs with a clear sense of its own identity and with a sensitivity to the capacities of the other systems. By so doing, we will set the stage for the healthy evolution of complementary missions for each of the systems, an important step in assuring the maximum return on the State's investment in higher education.

The following set of proposals grows out of the concepts and priorities set forth in my November report. Let me emphasize that these proposals are programmatic rather than budgetary in nature. They address a redirection of efforts; the release of faculty from certain involvements to allow them to be more effective in other activities more central to our mission. They will not result in reductions of faculty although, to be sure, over time the programmatic redirection may result in gradual shifts through normal turnover in the numbers of faculty in various areas. In short, this is not a plan for budgetary retrenchment.

While the proposals rely heavily on the Board's Mission Statement and our institution-wide planning activities they must, at this stage, be viewed as my personal recommendations. In the next month, I plan to invite discussion of them within the University and, of course, I expect this Board to examine them carefully. However, to the extent that my suggestions are acceptable, it would be useful for the Board to take early action on them.

Let me summarize some of the key points I made in November. The University, I maintained, should pursue the realistic goal of being among the top five public institutions of higher education in the country. To achieve that goal, it must maintain the quality of its best programs and improve the quality of those programs which most directly serve to enhance its role as an international research university, a land-grant institution and a metropolitan university. That multifaceted role requires a balance; a balance among graduate, undergraduate, and professional education and a balance among teaching, research, and service activities.

With respect to its educational program, I suggested, the University is seriously out of balance. The ratio of undergraduates to graduates is so high that our resources cannot support high quality comprehensively at either level. Since it is unlikely that our graduate student numbers can grow, given the limited national pool of applicants and our limited physical space, it seems to me best to allow our undergraduate enrollments to decrease as the size of high school graduation classes diminishes. I believe that we should then focus on:

- . improving the financial support of graduate students to maintain their current numbers (or to increase their numbers in certain fields) and to increase their quality;
- . recruiting high-ability undergraduates who can best benefit from the University's programs; and
- . improving the quality of our undergraduate programs.

In addition to these general thrusts for improvement, the University must also be selective in programmatic terms. As a land-grant institution, our primary obligation is to respond to the needs of society both in this region and in the broader community that an international university serves. Our primary resource for dealing with those needs is our scholarly capacity. For a program to have a high priority, not only must it carry out research at the leading edge of knowledge, but the research should be stimulated by the needs of society and the results should be transmitted to society through active teaching programs, through outreach and service activities, through technological transfer. In short, such programs should engage the community and the society. This is true not only in the traditional connections of our agricultural programs and rural society, but in science and the arts and in the metropolitan community as well.

Within the context of these long-range programmatic directions, the University must set immediate priorities as part of the budgetary process. Since these priorities will change from year to year, it does not seem appropriate to discuss them in this report. However, they will be the subject of separate proposals in the near future.

The University must also define its role among the institutions of higher education in the State. Here, clear directions emerge for preserving our identity, serving our land-grant mission, working toward a position of excellence among research universities, and complementing the activities of the other public systems. In terms of research and service activities, we are clearly unique, and in graduate and professional education we are substantially so. Our activities are driven by these responsibilities although

we can still be selective, recognizing that neighboring states provide opportunities for Minnesotans in certain graduate and professional fields. At the undergraduate level, where many other opportunities exist in Minnesota and its adjacent states, we should fashion a role to fit our strengths and contract our programs to achieve a new balance of graduate and undergraduate activities. In doing so, however, the limited availability of other opportunities for four-year public education in the Twin Cities area must be kept in mind.

IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

In the next several sections of this report, which are of key importance, I am recommending a number of specific programmatic shifts that I believe will help us to reach our institutional goals. The shifts deal with undergraduate education, professional education and the coordinate campuses.

I. Undergraduate Education

In any discussion of the contraction of undergraduate programs at the University, the important issue of access arises and, with it, a concern that the contraction may represent an undesirable elitism. The concern is understandable and might be valid under certain circumstances. I, however, do not think that it is elitist to ensure that there are public undergraduate programs of the highest quality -- the kind possible only at a research university -- available to Minnesotans regardless of their economic status. Further, I cannot accept the notion that access is effective when quality must be sacrificed to preserve a breadth of programs for which adequate funding does not exist. Finally, we must not forget that in 1851 when the

University was founded, there were no other opportunities in the territory for public higher education, while in 1985 there are many such opportunities. To ignore them would be anachronistic and might even be criticized as arrogant.

In other words, access is important, but I believe that it must be carefully defined. At the undergraduate level, we must offer programs that are consistent with our broader mission, our standards of quality, and our distinctiveness, and we must make them available to all who can reasonably benefit from them. We should encourage rigor in our programs, but welcome all who seek the challenge of such rigor. Above all, if access is to be meaningful, we must assure that the nature of our programs, our expectations, and our entrance requirements are clearly understood by prospective students so that they can prepare for them adequately and enter them knowledgeably. With these considerations in mind, I have the following recommendations:

- Eliminate two-year degree programs in all colleges and at all campuses except Crookston and Waseca. At the undergraduate level, the focus of the University should be on four-year baccalaureate programs. The community colleges of the State, including those in the Twin Cities, offer appropriate opportunities for associate degrees. Before effecting this change, however, the University should ensure that transfer of credit to a community college will allow a University student to earn an associate degree when it is not feasible for the student to complete a four-year program at the University.

• Eliminate degree and certificate programs from General College. The General College has a proud history of providing an open access point to the University. The original goal of the College was to assist certain students in making the transition to the various four-year disciplinary programs in the several undergraduate colleges. In recent years, however, the College has taken on additional activities that diffuse its primary focus. For example, the associate degree programs and the certificate programs offered by the College are not consistent with its original mission since they serve as terminal degrees short of the baccalaureate degree and provide only limited contact for those students with the other programs of the University. Eliminating them will help us to emphasize that our ultimate goal for students entering General College is a four-year degree.

The College's baccalaureate programs answer a need for certain non-traditional students, but they, too, are not central to the mission of the College. While no two programs are ever identical, Metropolitan State University's programs have very similar goals to the College's two baccalaureate programs. Thus, in eliminating the College's programs, we will not reduce the opportunities for students; rather, we will free up excellent faculty who can contribute to the University in other ways.

With the elimination of these degree programs the College can return to its earlier, valuable mission of assisting students under its open admission policy and helping them to correct their deficiencies in preparation so that they can move on into our four-year programs in

disciplinary areas. The College can play a particularly important role in the coordinated lower division discussed below. It can become the focus of all of our special developmental programs. Indeed, with that in mind, I also recommend the relocation of the Student Affairs Learning Centers to the College so that our academic help activities can be most effectively administered.

• Eliminate University Without Walls Program. This University College program has served a small number of non-traditional students well through experiential learning and individualized programs. However, like the General College baccalaureate programs, the UWW activities are similar to those offered at Metropolitan State University. If we eliminate the University's program, the UWW counselors would be able to combine their efforts with those of General College and CEE counselors to create an expanded advising service for other traditional and non-traditional prospective and enrolled University students. We could serve a significantly larger number of students in this way and improve access to the University markedly. These counselors could also work with Metro State students to help them to develop a University component of their individualized programs, where that seems appropriate.

• Unify and increase entrance standards across all Twin Cities undergraduate colleges (except General College), Duluth, and Morris. At the present time, the individual entrance standards used by each college and campus lead to confusion among prospective students, advisors, and parents. By unifying entrance requirements and ensuring that they are appropriately rigorous, the University can play a useful role both in

encouraging high school students to enrich their programs of preparation and in encouraging school boards to increase the availability of appropriate courses. It is important to note that while I believe that higher standards should be set in terms of minimum course preparation, I do not believe that increases in grade point average (GPA) standards are necessary or appropriate. As in the past GPA may well have to play a role when spaces are limited, but decreasing undergraduate enrollment may mitigate that problem.

• Coordinate lower division education across Twin Cities units. With the likelihood of decreased undergraduate enrollments, the opportunity exists to improve the quality of our lower division education. By coordinating lower division activities, we can provide increased flexibility to students to move from one college to another and increase the availability of special opportunities now offered only within individual colleges. These may range from honors programs to developmental programs. Increased attention to lower division in an organized way can also lead to improvements in the quality of lower division instruction. I suggest that over the next two years we consider alternative administrative arrangements for carrying out this coordination, including, but not limited to, a totally integrated lower division (drawing its faculty from the collegiate departments), a model similar to our Graduate School.

II. Professional Education

While there are some similarities between graduate and professional education, there are also important differences that allow us to make decisions about the size and scope of our professional programs on the basis of a more restricted set of considerations than must apply in graduate programs. Graduate students, for example, collaborate with faculty in their thesis research; they also promote the quality of undergraduate education through teaching activities. Thus, increasing our graduate student enrollment improves our ability to serve several aspects of our mission and decreasing the enrollment works in the opposite way. In contrast, professional students do not interact as closely either in research or undergraduate education and these need not be considered in determining the size or number of our programs.

On the other hand, there are financial connections that link all of our activities. Clearly, the quality of a professional training program can be enhanced by increasing the resources we invest in it, but those additional resources would not then be available to improve other aspects of the School's mission, to improve graduate or undergraduate education, or to enhance research and service activities associated with all of our educational activities. If we could achieve the same enhancement of quality by decreasing enrollments, the additional resources that might otherwise have to be committed to professional training would be freed for other uses.

To determine the feasibility of achieving improved quality by reducing enrollment in professional schools, it is necessary to consider the demand for trained professionals, the availability of similar training at other regional schools, the minimum class size for cost-effective education, and

the cost of quality. With these factors in mind, I have the following recommendations:

- Reduce undergraduate class size in School of Management. Undergraduate business programs are now available at most of the State University System campuses as well as through their extension classes in the Twin Cities area. The primary focus of our School of Management is, and should continue to be, its graduate programs, research activities, and outreach. By reducing the undergraduate class size, we can assure programs of outstanding quality, usefully linked to our graduate programs. The School should consider how best to accomplish this shift, but the final result should be a class size no larger than half of the present enrollment.

- Reduce undergraduate class size in College of Education. As in the case of Management, in many areas of professional teacher education Minnesotans are well-served by the State University System. The University, therefore, should focus its undergraduate curriculum on special programs: preparation for teachers of mathematics, science, and language; special education; and vocational-technical education. Its more general programs should be limited to model programs that will provide a vehicle for effecting the ideas developed through research and will maintain the contact with school districts essential to remaining sensitive to their needs.

- Reduce undergraduate class size in School of Nursing. Here, again, opportunity is broadly available for undergraduate training at many

State institutions. The University's essential contribution is in its advanced degree programs. Accordingly, its undergraduate program should be structured to appeal to and to serve those intending to proceed to graduate work.

• Cap undergraduate Institute of Technology engineering enrollments.

The need for additional engineering graduates by Minnesota industry has been well documented and reductions in the University's undergraduate programs cannot be justified. On the other hand, simply dealing with present enrollments will require significant expansion of facilities and faculty. I believe that the primary role of IT must be in graduate education, research, and technology transfer. Therefore, while we should maintain undergraduate engineering enrollments in IT, we should not allow them to expand. Instead, IT should cooperate in the development of undergraduate engineering programs at UMD and in the State University System, and, indeed it has already begun to do so.

• Reduce DVM program in College of Veterinary Medicine. Although there have been significant infusions of new resources into Veterinary Medicine recently, the University has not been able to provide an adequate level of per-student support in the School's professional education program (DVM). The problem arises from the increasing importance of its graduate and research programs that have required increased funding and its service programs (most particularly the Diagnostic Laboratory), which have also required substantially increased funding. Under the circumstances, it seems reasonable to consider a reduction in DVM class size. Two factors prompt such a recommendation. First, there is a widely held

opinion that we are entering an era of overproduction of veterinarians. Second, and more importantly, the University of Wisconsin has recently opened its own School of Veterinary Medicine. It seems reasonable to take advantage of this expanded training capacity to reduce our veterinary class size by the number of positions previously reserved for Wisconsin students and to eliminate Veterinary Medicine from our reciprocity agreement. Such a change would maintain the same access for Minnesota students, improve the quality of our veterinary education and relieve the burden on our clinical faculty so that they can increase their contributions to other aspects of the School's mission.

• Consider reductions in other professional school class sizes. The possibility of achieving improved quality by reducing student numbers while maintaining constant budget levels exists in each of our professional school programs. Some changes have already been made in Dentistry and Medicine, but schools such as Law and Pharmacy have not yet raised these questions in methodical ways. Over the next year, I believe we should consider the feasibility and advisability of reducing professional school class sizes by examining data on societal needs, applicant pools, and marginal costs or savings with altered enrollments.

• Consider reductions in size and scope of medical residency programs. The changes in patterns of medical care, the projected surplus in physicians, and proposed changes in financing call for a reassessment of our medical residency programs. It may well be that we should contract in at least some of those programs and rebalance our activities in basic medical research and clinical training over the next few years.

III. Coordinate Campuses

The role of the coordinate campuses in the University's mission has occasionally been questioned in recent years. Few of the questions have suggested that the campus programs should not exist, but many have implied that they could be part of one of the other systems in the State. This, it is argued, would allow the University to focus its attention on its Twin Cities programs.

I believe it is important to note that the transfer of any of these campuses to one of the other systems would not result in any significant cost savings to the State if the missions they presently serve are to be continued. For similar reasons, such a transfer would result in no financial benefit to the University's other programs. Therefore, the decision on where to locate these campuses in the State's higher education system should be based on a clear statement of their individual focus and an assessment of which system can provide optimal support for that focus. Although I believe that these campuses can better serve the needs of the State by some sharpening of focus, I also believe that the more clearly defined directions I would recommend for them can best be carried out if they remain part of the University of Minnesota. The comments which follow for each campus expand on this notion.

- Crookston and Waseca: The distinctive characteristic of these two-year technical colleges is their unmatched capacity for providing technical agricultural education. Their proximity to branch stations of the Agricultural Experiment Station, their faculty, their facilities, and their working relationship with faculty and programs on the St. Paul campus all support and enhance that capacity.

I believe that it is in the interest of the State to focus two-year agricultural education on the Crookston and Waseca campuses, transferring it from the other systems in which it is now offered. I also believe that our campuses should examine their programs and phase out those activities that do not depend upon our agricultural offerings since these latter programs can well be carried out in other post-secondary systems. Finally, I recommend that both campuses become part of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics. This could help to streamline the administrative operation of the campuses and help to achieve a fuller integration of activities to take even greater advantage of the association of these campuses with the University.

• Duluth: The size and diversity of Duluth make it, in many ways, an independent comprehensive university. Because UMD is committed to research and some graduate and professional education, its association with the University is valuable in providing its faculty access to various faculty development opportunities and seed money research grants. It is reasonable to expect the campus to function as the land-grant University serving the northeast region of the State. This implies particular attention to the needs of the region and increased activity in its research, outreach, and service programs. It also implies the same narrowing of focus in its undergraduate programs suggested for the Twin Cities: eliminating its associate degree programs, setting entrance standards identical to those proposed for the Twin Cities undergraduate colleges, restricting its undergraduate professional programs to the extent that other opportunities exist for similar training, and examining the content of its undergraduate

programs in such areas as language training, mathematics, and science, to ensure that undergraduates are challenged in the course of their studies and rewarded by the quality of the education they receive.

• Morris: The University's campus at Morris offers one of the most exciting opportunities in public education in the country; the possibility for State residents to attend a small, homogeneous liberal arts college usually available only in the private sector. The opportunity is not an easy one to maintain. In a small state college, there is great pressure to diversify offerings to keep enrollments up. This, however, leads to a diversification of faculty, which, in turn, leads to an inability to maintain a rich liberal arts program.

It is clear that Morris has been tempted to opt for "self-preservation" by seeking the diversity necessary to attract a greater range of students. Were that to be its direction in the future, I believe the campus would lose its uniqueness and it would be less obvious why it should remain in the University system. Its role as a liberal arts college, however, can be much more easily maintained within the University than elsewhere. The opportunities for faculty development and exchange, the integrated recruiting of prospective students, the possibility of developing coordinated programs with the Twin Cities are all of great benefit in carrying out that focused mission.

It is my strong recommendation that Morris should remain in the University of Minnesota system and retain and enhance its commitment to a liberal arts curriculum. Indeed, I believe that the campus must move

more vigorously to be a small liberal arts college, rather than a small College of Liberal Arts. That is, rather than encouraging individual majors, and courses chosen on the basis of satisfying group requirements, it should take advantage of its size to develop an integrated core curriculum. For example, such a curriculum could be based on multi-disciplinary courses, staffed by faculty in several disciplines, with each course displaying the integration inherent in a liberal arts program. Students could take this common set of courses and augment them with electives in areas of particular interest. It is clear that if the campus is to move in this direction with the concurrence of the University, the support for Morris must be based primarily on the need to maintain program integrity rather than on student enrollments. The interest of the State in providing a diversity of opportunities to its citizens warrants a commitment to this approach.

IV. Continuing Education and Extension

No discussion of focus within the University would be complete without attention to Continuing Education and Extension, a key component in the activities of any land-grant institution. As we focus our educational mission with respect to our on-campus activities, we should ensure that these goals are reflected in our outreach activities as well. Thus, while our outreach activities should increase in the future in recognition of our land-grant mission, they should also be structured to draw on our particular strengths. For example, we should increase our efforts to provide access to our specialized and unique programs, particularly at the graduate level. We should also ensure that all resources of the University that have potential

to meet outreach needs are tapped. Finally, we should be at the forefront in developing new organizational and technical mechanisms for delivering both informal instruction and formal degree programs to Minnesotans around the State.

In the light of these general comments, I recommend the following:

• Increase utilization of University expertise in Agricultural Extension.

The Agricultural Extension Service has a long history of using the resources of the St. Paul Campus effectively to deal with the problems of rural Minnesota. Its future development can reflect the new focus suggested in this report by expansion of its efforts in the metropolitan communities of the State, by tapping the resources of our Minneapolis units as well as our St. Paul units in meeting community needs, and by integrating our Crookston and Waseca faculty in Extension activities as they become part of the Institute for Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics.

• Shift Continuing Education offerings to reflect University curricular strengths rather than market circumstances. The delivery of credit

courses by the division of Continuing Education and Extension has been driven to a great extent in the past by market considerations. As a result, their offerings are skewed toward lower division courses, thus failing to reflect the special strengths of the University and sometimes overlapping with the Extension activities of the other systems of higher education. I recommend that CEE be funded on a budget basis rather than an income basis so that we can modify its range of offerings based on

the University's role among the institutions of higher education in the State.

• Consider setting admission standards for credit offerings in CEE.

As in the case of our regular day school offerings, access must be defined carefully to ensure that we do not use it in such a way as to limit the quality of the programs to which we provide access. For example, I believe we should consider the adoption of admission standards and prerequisites for CEE credit courses. This would have clear advantages. For example, if all students in a course have had adequate preparation, the class can be taught at a level more profitable to all of them. Further, better control of Extension admissions will ease the way for increased use of day and Extension courses in degree programs. Finally, the application of similar standards to all students would ease the problem of combining day and Extension courses. Thus, we could accomplish both our aim of enhancing the quality of our courses and our aim of increasing the flexibility of our course delivery.

• Coordinate Extension activities with other higher education systems.

As we begin to increase the range and specialization of our Extension offerings, we will certainly increase opportunity for Minnesotans, but we are also likely to decrease total enrollments. This could be offset in part if we can work successfully with other systems of higher education to ensure that we are not offering competing programs. We should be prepared to offer courses in other areas of the State in situations in which the University has some special expertise, just as we welcome the Extension efforts by other systems in fields where we believe the University

should phase out its programs. We should clearly avoid similar offerings in the same geographical areas.

• Anticipate and exploit new technologies for instructional delivery.

The delivery of courses, workshops, cultural productions, public affairs information, and other activities to a wider audience will be helped in the future by new computer, teleconferencing, and media transmission technologies. CEE should be shifting its budgetary investment and its creative energies to projects that can exploit these new technologies to allow others to benefit from the University's unique strengths. In this effort, the emphasis should be on program content rather than technical development and on programming that cannot be carried out in other higher education systems.

THE REQUISITE STATE RESPONSE

The recommendations that I have made in the preceding paragraphs offer exciting possibilities for the University to increase its value to the State and to set the stage for a new era of coordination among the State's institutions of higher education. It is not possible or appropriate in a report of this kind to deal with the details of these changes and, indeed, some must be studied further to determine whether they are advisable. I believe that, to the extent that they are adopted, we should seek to implement them during the next biennium, approving the plans for each change with the help and guidance of our new President.

However -- and it is a large and important caveat -- I cannot and do not recommend the implementation of any of these changes unless and until the current State approach to funding of the University is modified to remove the counterincentives that currently exist to focusing our activities. For under the present circumstances, far from strengthening the University, many of these changes would seriously weaken the institution's financial support.

Average cost funding, in its present form, would reduce the University's appropriation in proportion to its decrease in numbers of students. Thus, deliberately allowing a decrease in student numbers so that our funds could be used in a more focused way to improve the quality of education would be a vain effort because the funds would disappear. Indeed, the situation would worsen because such fixed costs as maintenance, fuel and utilities would remain requiring some of the instructional dollars left to be used to cover them, and, thus, leaving even fewer dollars for teaching.

The rigid 33 percent offset to our instructional appropriation that must be provided through tuition is a further counterincentive to these changes. The University has been forced over many years to charge more than the average offset to students in low-cost programs since it had to charge less than the average offset to those in high-cost programs if access and competitiveness were to be maintained. The changes I have proposed would tend to reduce the size of these low-cost programs, but doing so would certainly not be advisable if it resulted in substantial tuition increases for our remaining students as, unfortunately, it would under the present system.

Finally, these changes presume and require an increased level of cooperation with the other systems of higher education as we exchange functions in areas such as agriculture, as we work together with non-traditional students, as we sort out our roles in continuing education. I am encouraged by my preliminary conversations with the heads of other systems to believe that they will welcome this cooperation but, of course, the details remain to be worked out.

In short, to the extent that these recommendations are acceptable to the Board of Regents, I believe that they should be viewed as a proposal to the State; a proposal to work with the University to enable us to carry out these changes. If we are successful, I believe that the University of Minnesota will emerge as an even better institution; stronger in its programs, more responsive to the needs of the State, and an even greater contributor to the nation's well-being.

KHK:kb