Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 31, 2011
11:30 – 2:15
262 Mondale Hall

Present: Kate VandenBosch (chair), Melissa Anderson, Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Chris Cramer, Nancy Ehlke, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Caroline Hayes, Russell Luepker, Jan McCulloch

Absent: Shawn Curley, Janet Fitzakerley, Jeff Kahn, George Sheets, Michael Oakes

Guests: Associate Vice President Donna Peterson; Provost E. Thomas Sullivan, Vice Provost and Dean Robert McMaster, Vice Provost and Dean Henning Schroeder

Other: Michele Gross (Policy Office)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Associate Vice President Peterson; (2) statement on policies, compliance, and risk; (3) update on scale, scope, and mission (enrollment management); (4) discussion with Provost Sullivan]

        Professor VandenBosch convened the meeting at 11:35 and began by extending congratulations to Professor Cramer for winning a Morse-Alumni Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education. Committee members gave him a round of applause.

1.   Discussion with Associate Vice President Peterson

        Professor VandenBosch welcomed Associate Vice President Peterson to the meeting to discuss what has been happening at the legislature, what could happen if the legislature and governor disagree, the possibility of a government shutdown, and several related issues.

        Ms. Peterson said that it has been fabulous to work with the two faculty legislative liaisons, Professors Boyle and Hayes.

        The Committee also discussed with Ms. Peterson about the way the University can and should respond to blogs and news articles and comments. Professor Cramer commented on the rapidity with which responses are needed in the 21st Century; there is a need both to tamp down fires and to provide positive statements and accurate information. Committee members discussed the extent to which data and information persuade people, other tools that can be used to convey information, the value of individual or faculty-based responses, the possibility of a log of activities of a cross-section of faculty members, and the need to listen to legislator concerns.

---

        [*] These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

The Committee agreed that it should hear about the data from the Delta Project (which purport to show state funds per student at major research universities across the country; the number for Minnesota was quite high compared to some of its peers). The data compare apples and oranges and in a number of cases may be demonstrably inaccurate. [It was later agreed that the Committee on Finance and Planning will hear about the data and report to the Committee.]

Ms. Peterson said the $5-billion deficit is driving every decision; the University is swept into the view that government is too big and its employees have benefits that are too good; and there is a sense in some quarters that the University can absorb the cuts and find a way to deal with them. It is not that legislators do not value the University, it is that they must cut $5 billion, will not raise taxes, and K-12 education is a priority and there are other demands on the budget—so higher education falls down on the list of priorities.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Associate Vice President Peterson for joining the meeting.

2.   Statement on Policies, Compliance, and Risk

Professor VandenBosch turned to Professor Chomsky for a review of the statement on policies, compliance, and risk.

Professor Chomsky said that the Committee's statement is a response to discussions it understands have taken place as part of the normal administrative review of policies. There were two issues of concern to the Committee. One is whether policies need to be "monitored" and what it means to have policies monitored—is it constant oversight and being sure the policy is being followed, or can it be simply periodic attention to make sure the policy is still appropriate? If a policy is not subject to constant oversight, is it not really a policy? The Committee thought that certain matters need to be in policy, even if they are not monitored closely, but that can instead be reviewed occasionally to be sure that they are what the institution wants.

The second concern has been the requirement that people at the University know all the policies that apply to them. The Committee has learned that there is such a requirement in the "Establishing Administrative Policies" policy: "Employees and students are responsible for knowing, understanding, and complying with administrative policies that relate to their position or employment or enrollment at the University." Because it would be difficult for employees to know all the policies that might apply to them under varying circumstances, the Committee was concerned about mandating such knowledge and sanctioning failure to comply.

Professor Chomsky reported that she and Professor Sheets disagree on what should be said about the requirement. She is of the view that the Committee statement should say the requirement should not be in the policy; Professor Sheets believes the Committee should not challenge the requirement but simply note its concern.

Professor Chomsky next suggested a number of edits to the draft statement that had been circulated to Committee members. Others made additional suggestions.

Professor VandenBosch asked Ms. Gross if she wished to make any comments. Ms. Gross explained that policy owners are responsible for their policies and processes. It is intended that policy

requirements be reasonable and important enough to the institution that they should be policy. If something is important enough to be a policy requirement, then the policy owner ought to know how compliant the audience is, and that is accomplished through monitoring. Monitoring frequency depends on the risk. The monitoring, in some cases, might only be once per year to determine whether the requirements are still appropriate; if additional communication or training is needed; or if the policy language needs to be clearer. She said she understood that educational policies may be unique (although even some of them may be monitored, such as the class scheduling policy recently approved by the Faculty Senate). Part of the effort in completing a comprehensive review of all policies is to ask policy owners to be sure they have the right rules at the right levels.

Professor Cramer said that some policies make value statements that may not be monitored. There is a difference between a value and a requirement, Ms. Gross said. There is a requirement that every class have a syllabus, Professor Chomsky observed, but units may or may not have an enforcement mechanism; if students complain, the department will respond. That is passive monitoring, Ms. Gross said, and that may be a way to monitor some policies. Comments were made that it would be helpful to have a definition of "monitoring." That can be coupled with a new look at policies based on risk, Ms. Gross said; the higher the risk, the more rigorous the oversight should be.

As for the requirement that everyone needs to know the policies that pertain to their work, Ms. Gross said that supervisors are responsible for making sure their employees know which policies apply to their work, much like faculty are responsible for letting students know what is expected of them in the course. Saying one doesn't know what the expectation is is not a sufficient response, from an employee or a student.

Professor VandenBosch said that following further revisions, the Committee would vote on the statement by email.

3.   Update on Scale, Scope, and Mission (Enrollment Management)

Professor VandenBosch welcomed Provost Sullivan and Vice Provosts McMaster and Schroeder to the meeting to discuss the work of the Enrollment Management committee.

Vice Provost McMaster began by noting that the EM committee had divided itself into three groups, one focused on undergraduate education, one on graduate education, and one on professional education—although, he said, there is not always a clear boundary between graduate and professional education. He started with a report on the activities with respect to undergraduate education, but noted first that the Enrollment Management committee developed a set of general principles for all levels of student. Those general principles are these:

1. Admit for success. The University should admit to colleges and programs those students who will benefit from the curriculum and who have a strong probability of graduating in a timely manner. To do so, admissions should conduct a holistic review of student records, using primary and secondary factors.

2. Support student success. The University should direct resources to help ensure that students who are admitted to its colleges and programs are adequately supported to be able to complete the programs and graduate in a timely way.

3. Incorporate ethnic, social, economic, and geographic diversity. As a land grant university, the University is committed to enrolling and graduating a broad, diverse spectrum of students, especially from Minnesota. The educational experience of all students is enhanced when they can interact with students from a variety of other states and countries. The University serves as a magnet for bringing talent into the state

4. Provide a high quality education and student experience. The University needs to adjust enrollments to its fiscal, intellectual, and physical resource capacity. Enrollments should be adjusted according to our ability to provide a high quality education to our students.

5. Emphasize signature strengths. The University needs to give highest priority to its strongest and most distinctive programs while at the same time striking a balance between existing and emergent disciplines. It needs to continually nurture new and promising programs.

6. Maintain adequate tuition revenues. The University should adjust enrollments, programs, and tuition to maintain revenue to adequately support student needs, academic priorities, and program quality.

7. Give highest priority to degree-seeking students.   While the University serves many different types of students, those pursuing undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees are our highest priority. Enrollment of other students needs to be managed as an important, but secondary, priority

8. Consider state, national, and global workforce needs. University enrollment planning must be attentive to the workforce needs of the future for the state, the nation, and the world.

9. Maintain affordability. The University must remain affordable to a broad cross-section of students from Minnesota, from across the United States, and from all parts of the world.

They also developed specific principles for undergraduates, graduate students, and professional students:

Undergraduate Principles

10. Maintain opportunities for transfers. Educating Transfer students is an important and integral part of the University's mission. The University should enroll a balance of new high school students and transfer students who can benefit from completing a degree program at the University of Minnesota.

11. Partner with other state systems but retain our unique mission. The University should partner with other higher education systems to advance the state's common agenda, but maintain its distinctive mission within the state to provide its students with the opportunities and benefits of attending a world class research institution.

Graduate Principles

12. Support graduate students adequately from initial enrollment through graduation. The University should admit only enough graduate students for whom it can provide adequate support to take full advantage of its educational and professional development opportunities. Departments and colleges

should re-examine their enrollment numbers annually to determine the ideal number of students that can be admitted to a program based upon current infrastructure and support.

13. Maintain sufficient numbers of graduate students to support teaching and research within individual colleges and programs. Employment as a teaching or research assistant within the student's field of study is an important part of professional development for many graduate students. Graduate student participation as teaching and research assistants is essential to the advancement of the University's mission and fostering a collegial environment between students and faculty.   The numbers of graduate students should be sufficient to support the University's teaching and research missions.

14. Provide graduate students with sufficient stipends and benefits. The University should be able to provide graduate students with enough support to complete their studies as full-time students with mechanisms in place to cover tuition, stipends, and health insurance.   Graduate student stipends should be on par with peer institutions and re-evaluated annually to ensure graduate students are not economically disadvantaged.

Professional School Principles

15. Maintain strong support for our nationally-recognized professional programs. This support should be both fiscal and academic

16. Create new professional programs to meet workforce needs. The University needs to be aware of the needs of the state and national workforce for high level post-graduate professional preparation.

17. Ensure that new professional programs are consonant with existing academic programs and faculty. New professional programs should take detract or take resources from academic programs.

18. Require that new professional programs have business plans (tuition and other support) that will make them self sustaining. New programs have to make their own way

19. Ensure that professional education focuses on areas where the University can be a leader in the field. Both new and old programs should be in areas where the University can provide an outstanding education.

20. Require that new professional programs should have some tenure and tenure track faculty (not be taught by all P&As). There needs to be an academic/research component in our professional programs

The Provost asked them to address questions of scale, scope, and mission, which is a better description than "enrollment management," Dr. McMaster said.

They have formulated some preliminary recommendations on undergraduate education for the Twin Cities campus, Dr. McMaster reported.

1. Maintain total undergraduate enrollment at current levels: 30,000, plus or minus 1,000. They recommend only modest growth (perhaps 200-300 students) in a few programs that can accommodate additional students, because the size of the faculty and staff, the number of labs, etc., has

been scaled to the number of students on the campus. There has been an uptick in undergraduate education in the last few years that was planned because some colleges could accommodate more students and because the retention rate has increased. Undergraduate enrollment in 2000 was 26,972; it has risen, more or less steadily, to 30,519 in 2010. (Graduate enrollment has risen from 10,051 in 2000 to 13,946 in 2010; professional-school enrollment has risen from 2,626 to 3,638 in the same period.)

The University needs to balance "the principles of providing a high quality education and student experience with that of maintaining adequate tuition revenue," Dean McMaster said, and because the campus is geared to serve the current number of students, increasing enrollment without increasing resources would likely degrade quality (if there were significant increases in enrollment). It appears unlikely the state will be providing additional resources.

2. Maintain a 2:1 ratio of new freshmen to transfer students. They recommend affirming a strong commitment to transfer students; recent increases in community-college enrollment means the potential market is growing. The campus has not, however, controlled transfers adequately; the decisions have mostly been made by the colleges. The University needs to get a handle on transfer because admitting hundreds of students in one college has effects on other colleges. The University has more transfer students than its peers.

The number of transfer students fluctuates by several hundred each year, and sometimes colleges may use transfer admissions to balance the books, Dr. McMaster said, which is not a thoughtful strategy for dealing with transfer students. The number of transfer students in 2000-01 was 3,051 (including both internal transfers between campuses and from outside the University); in 2010-11 the number was 3,084; during the decade, the number ranged from 2,784 to 3,877.

What are the criteria to transfer in, Professor Luepker inquired? They vary by college, Dean McMaster said, and each has its own metrics. The most common metrics are major, GPA, and the institution from which the student is transferring (and the measure of the last varies by college as well). Some colleges know good pipelines. And some majors have higher bars to transfer admission than others, Professor Cramer pointed out.

Professor Brothen asked how the University is bound by the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum, the agreement with MnSCU. If a student completes requirements elsewhere, they will be considered by the University to have been completed, Dr. McMaster said, but completing them elsewhere is no guarantee of admission to the University, as has been the case in California.

Dr. McMaster reviewed a graph comparing Minnesota with its peers on the number of freshmen and external transfer students. Except for the California schools (where transfer is automatic), Minnesota-Twin Cities is high compared its peers in the number of transfer students it has. Wisconsin is at 17.1%, Washington (an institution very much like Minnesota) is at 23.1%, Minnesota is at 31.6%. (Michigan is 13.0, Penn State is 5.7, Illinois is 14.6, Texas is 25.0, and so on). They are not recommending that this pattern be reversed but are saying the University must be mindful of it, so they call for restricting the number of transfers to half that of new freshmen. They also urge looking at the curriculum for transfer students, because the data suggest that transfer students are less satisfied with their experience than are new freshmen.

3. Increase the number of students in the STEM fields. One of their principles is to be responsive to state workforce needs, Dr. McMaster noted, and workforce analyses suggested continued growth in fields related to science, technology, engineering, and math. The University has seen a remarkable increase in the number of applicants to STEM fields in the last few years. The average ACT score of the applicants is over 30; the average for CS&E honors students is 33.8—these are students who could go to college anywhere they want to.

The question that CS&E faculty have, Professor Hayes said (herself a CS&E faculty member), is how they are going to teach them. Classes are already enormous. Part of the plan, Dean McMaster said, is that the students will bring in tuition dollars in order to add faculty; there has to be a budget plan to back up the enrollment expansion, he agreed. They are thrilled to have great students, Professor Hayes said, but. . . . Labs are the pinch points, Professor Cramer said, so it is wise to have a plan. They want the University to have the resources to teach well, Dr. McMaster said; the pity is that the University is leaving a lot of very good students out because it does not have the capacity to accept them. CS&E and CSOM, for example, are VERY selective in who they accept.

Professor VandenBosch commented, in response to Dr. McMaster's point that there must be a budget plan behind the increase in students in a college, that yield rates make that somewhat of a game of roulette. Dr. McMaster agreed, and they also must watch the metrics, so that they stop admitting students when the metrics of the incoming class would decline if more were admitted.

Dean McMaster reviewed other recommendations that the committee is considering but that it has not yet made final. One is to reduce the difference in graduation rates between whites and students of color. Another is to maintain minimum levels of 60% of new freshmen from Minnesota while encouraging more enrollments from outside the Midwest (there has been success with international students, whose numbers have increased from 2% to 6% of enrollment). Another is to gradually raise the ACT of incoming freshmen even further (it is now 27.2) and keep it there (Illinois and Wisconsin, for example, are at or above 28). Another is to maintain the central honors program at 550-600 students and at current preparation levels (ACT-C average of 31.6 and average high-school rank of 96.8). Final other recommendations have to do with ATS (Access to Success, for students with promise but who may lack some requirement for admission; making it part of enrollment in all colleges), PSEO, financial aid, transfer-student support, and housing and campus life. With respect to PSEO, is the current number of 500-600 too low? Is it a good fit with the undergraduate program? With respect to financial aid, the University needs to be mindful about it if it increases enrollment. With respect to housing, the campus has more sophomores who want to live on campus than it can accommodate, and the campus has the fewest beds in the CIC except for Iowa (e.g., Michigan State has 16,000 while Minnesota has 6,000).

On the last point, Provost Sullivan observed that part of the issue is that this campus is in an urban area and there is housing capacity in the surrounding area. There are six major private housing projects around the campus, so they have to grapple with the priority of capital bonding for residence halls when much is being done by the private sector. One question is whether private residence halls have higher rent such that it is increasing student debt. The data so far suggest not.

Professor Campbell inquired if there is a plan to identify at-risk students, assuming there is such a group the University wishes to recruit, and help them. There is, Dr. McMaster said; that is the ATS program, which admits 475 students per year and is operated through three colleges, each of which has special programs to help students. How is it doing, Professor Campbell asked? It is in its third year and

has shown very promising results thus far. If there are best practices associated with ATS, they should get the word out, Professor Campbell suggested. They are "remodeling" the program, Dr. McMaster said, and believe it should be offered through more than just three colleges—it should reach across the campus. What are the criteria for admission to ATS, Professor Campbell asked? The students must meet certain standards in high-school rank and ACT, Dean McMaster said, and the admissions office does a holistic review to see if the student has other characteristics that suggest the student would be successful at the University.

Professor Boyle commented on the issue of transfer student support and unhappiness: There is not the best interaction with the honors program for transfer students. She also observed, about PSEO students, that she has the sense that some come to the University but are skipping high-school classes that would be helpful, and they sometimes seem not to have the same fundamentals. Too many PSEO students may not be a good idea. Dean McMaster agreed.

Dean Schroeder next reported on the work of the graduate-education subcommittee. The University is at the top of the range, vis-à-vis its peers and the CIC institutions, in the number of students it has enrolled in graduate and professional programs, and there has been an increase of 3895 graduate students in the last ten years. The University has programs that are highly-ranked and some that are not, and the question is whether the institution is over-extended.

The subcommittee is focusing on research degrees, Dr. Schroeder said, and the enrollment-management strategy for graduate education is completely different from that for undergraduate education. At the graduate level, enrollment is the result of the aggregation of program decisions. There is huge variation in the tests that are used (they can use the GRE as a threshold, but it does not predict whether someone will become a producer of knowledge, so a growing number of programs use previous research experience as a criterion for admission). There is in broad terms an optimum size for a graduate program: It requires a minimum number to create an intellectual community, but if it is too large, faculty-student interactions suffer.

The central principle they are using is that program quality is the most important factor to maximize, Dean Schroeder said. The subcommittee believes a two-stage process would be best: Protect programs of high quality, and over the long term develop resource-allocation mechanisms that right-size programs and help programs improve quality.

Dean Schroeder said he has spoken with ten of his peers about what they are doing about quality criteria; most use a scale metric (e.g., the number of Ph.D.s produced) or administrative metrics (time to degree, number of dropouts, etc.). Very few use scholarly output as a measure, the contributions of faculty and students to their field. He said he believes the evaluation process should use toolbox metrics, should be iterative, it should allow observation of trends, and reward for programs should be based on multi-year trends. It should be a collaborative process, not the University and college alone deciding on the metrics of success for each program, because the programs must endorse the metrics. It is important to make decisions that are data-informed and data-driven but not data-obsessed. For example, a program in trouble should be allowed to develop a plan to remedy the problems.

Dean Schroeder mentioned possible metrics that might be used to evaluate graduate programs: time to degree and graduation rates, student fellowships (percent funded by external funds—the message from the NRC rankings was that Minnesota is not doing well on first-year student support), student

productivity (are they visible in their field while they are at the University?), placement (this is a long-term variable; a student's first job may not tell the whole story).

Professor Hayes asked how Dean Schroeder would propose to count company-funded graduate students, and those who attend part-time. Those are probably in the category of professional education, Dr. Schroeder responded, which is quite different. The metrics he has discussed are geared to research-intensive degrees.

Professor VandenBosch, who is a member of the graduate-education subcommittee, said there are several ways the University may wish to use metrics, such as comparing programs with others in the University and at other institutions as well as looking at the programs over time. If there is a widely-used metric in a field, the University will probably want to use it even if it is not perfect. It appears that graduate deans are moving to a consensus on at least some metrics.

Dean Schroeder agreed, and said he was amazed at how far from a focus on quality some schools are in their mechanisms to allocate resources—and some of these very good schools, such as Michigan and Berkeley, use scale-oriented measures. They are considering a proposal that would be based in part on scale metrics and in part on quality metrics. The data are out there and will be used, and can be helpful, but they must be interpreted the right way.

Provost Sullivan asked if the metrics would be ready next fall for the next recruiting cycle. Discussions are doing on with the deans, Dr. Schroeder said, and he is meeting with them to identify metrics and variables applicable to their fields or schools. He said he was not sure they could be in place by next fall; they will know by this summer the extent to which they will be able to adopt quality metrics. Peer institutions have quite a mix of metrics, so before they come to any final model, they should spend time making sure they get them right—and recognize that they may need to change over time. One question is which ones can be University-wide (e.g., completion rate, time to degree). And some metrics could be more prominent at one time and less so at another.

Would they vary by discipline, Professor Hancher inquired? If they are University-wide, there could be distortions by field. For example, students in the humanities tend to publish later rather than earlier. There would be program metrics, Dean Schroeder said, and they are discussing how to handle special situations, such as the humanities. Tracking journal publications by graduate students would be more salient in the natural sciences, less so in the social sciences, and least in the humanities, Professor Hancher observed. Dean Schroeder remarked that they would not take just a snapshot but would consider longitudinal data. There are citation indices in the humanities, he continued, but it is very clear and should be taken into consideration that the humanities approach to publishing is different. Nonetheless, Professor Hancher said, measuring publication before the PhD. would be less appropriate in some areas than in others.

Metrics would be used in different ways, Professor VandenBosch said. If there are discipline-specific metrics, they would not be used across the campus, but it would be possible to evaluate a program over time and in comparison with peers.

Who would disagree about the need to use quality measures, Professor Luepker asked? But there could be problems with finding placement, for example. A program may have a large number of bright students with many publications who can't find jobs. If there are no jobs in a field, should the University

be training students in it? Dean Schroeder commented that if students get good jobs outside academe, they should count as a success. For NIH training grants, Professor Luepker said, if trainees are not in academic positions, the program will not get funding the next time. The government is investing money and will not do so if the students go into the private sector. One of his colleagues argues for focusing solely on placement, Dean Schroeder said, and while it is important, they also need to look at what the student is doing while in the program. If a student publishes nothing, it is unlikely he or she will find a job, Professor Luepker said. Professor Bitterman observed that virology was a vanishing field—and then came HIV. The demand is now staggering, so one must be careful about following the market.

        Professor Bitterman went on to comment that he had an opportunity to look at graduate education at several peer institutions, measured by NIH-sponsored institutional training grants that provide funded positions for pre- and post-doctoral trainees in health-related disciplines (designated T32 grants). Using round numbers, at Michigan there are 65, at Washington there are 60, at North Carolina there are 55, at Wisconsin there are 45, at Minnesota and Colorado there are 40, Iowa has 30 and Ohio State has 15 (data from the NIH REPORTER DATABASE at the end of March, 2011). Among the University of Minnesota's 40 T32 grants, they are held by faculty in seven colleges, including four in CLA. There are well-defined criteria for reviewing and awarding these competitive, peer-reviewed grants. If one receives a T32s, there are stipends for the student salaries and academic expenses. The University mandates paying each student more than the NIH stipends, so the more successful one is, the more one is financially punished (on the order of $3000 to $5000 per student). In addition, there is no automatically-funded released time for the PI, so the more successful one is at getting many paid positions per grant, the more the PI is punished. Based on the merit of the faculty and the students, the University could probably double the number of its T32s, but there would be obvious financial danger and penalties for the department and college that does this. He suggested that as the University administration looks at the quality metrics for funding graduate education, they build in money for the student salary gap and the PI effort on T32s, with the first dollars allocated from the graduate education pool, since these awards have already been stringently reviewed and won in an open national competition. Dean Schroeder said there is indeed a deficit incurred by a unit with training grants and a burden on the PI; the graduate-education financing task force was formed specifically to address this problem.

        Professor Campbell commented that undergraduate education has been more centralized and graduate education decentralized. He said that Professor Bitterman's point about graduate programs served the needs of the graduate faculty; if that is changed, they need to provide rewards for faculty, who can make the University look good but punish themselves in the process. Most institutions have a central mechanism to address the deficits Professor Bitterman talked about, Dean Schroeder responded, and his office has a line item for training-grant deficits. The University should want to provide incentives for faculty to bring in MORE money, Professor Bitterman urged. They are aware of that, Dr. Schroeder said.

        The graduate-education finance task force is looking at why students are so expensive (for NIH training grants), Dean Schroeder explained, and what the potential solutions are. Are they more expensive than what NIH will pay? It sounds like there could be a central remedy, but they do not have the funds. Or it suggests a longer-term look at the way the University packages tuition and compensation, so the task force was charged to identify recommendations on how to change student compensation so the deficit on NIH training grants and for NSF Fellows could be eliminated. The University's students are more expensive when they begin and significantly less expensive when they are taking one credit later in their educational career. So in some programs students are encouraged to take whatever courses they can

in their first two years, in the tuition band, and take their preliminary exam and get their thesis credits completed, so they become cheaper. There are two consequences from this behavior, Dean Schroeder said: The time to degree is longer since they get on research grants/projects late in their programs and the students can't take a course they want towards the end of their educational career.

Dean Schroeder said he believed the tuition model should follow educational goals. Students should be allowed to take thesis credits earlier when they can—if they are research-ready. Students should be able to take courses whenever they need them. These changes would spread out the cost, so they would have more of a flat-rate tuition model. This would increase the incentive to fund students on federal grants early in their program and not only toward the end. They are running models for the colleges based on these proposals.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Vice Provosts McMaster and Schroeder for their reports and commented that there is a great deal of depth to the topics. She asked that the two of them return to the Committee when the report is close to final.

4.   Discussion with Provost Sullivan

Professor VandenBosch next reported that Provost Sullivan had reported at the last Board of Regents' meeting about the fruits of the blue-ribbon committees around the University, and she asked him to focus on them at this meeting as well.

Provost Sullivan recalled that about 18 months ago, he asked the deans to establish blue-ribbon committees to look at four areas: size and scope with respect to the mission of the college (what it can continue to do and what it should not continue to do—to look at reductions and expansions); revenue-generating possibilities; cost-containment/cutting/efficiencies; and investments (where they should continue, where new ones should be made).

Now that he has received all the committee reports, he can see trends, and he has also just finished all the academic compact discussions, so has the deans' recommendations based on the blue-ribbon committee reports. Provost Sullivan summarized the recommendations from the various colleges, both for program reductions/eliminations and for expansion. In terms of revenue generation, many units are looking at e-education, professional Master's programs, and making investments where success will grow revenue and reduce costs. In terms of cost-cutting, all units are seeking to reduce square footage of space.

Professor VandenBosch said she has been hearing a lot about growing programs to increase revenue, and they just heard from Dean Schroeder about the importance of quality in graduate programs. How do those come together in professional Master's programs? Will they be based on demand or will there be limits based on quality measures? They will use the same decision-making criteria that were used in strategic positioning, Provost Sullivan said—comparative advantage, centrality to mission, supply and demand, etc. When deans bring ideas to the compact discussions, those are the criteria they use.

Professor Cramer commented, apropos of professional Master's degrees, that there is the very rosy viewpoint that there must be a lot of people who want them—but there has not been much market research to demonstrate that is so. Provost Sullivan agreed there are very few data, and they will ask for them before they approve the degrees. But quality remains important, he said, and the University will not

invest in programs of only modest quality. They will ask about quality, comparative advantage, and what the market data suggests should grow—those conversations must take place before programs will be approved.

Professor Luepker commented that "compact" is only a few letters from "contract." Does what the Provost said actually happen? There are many details to work out. Provost Sullivan agreed and said that some things are happening now and some remain to be taken up; the decisions will be data-driven. One example of an exciting investment in a new program: The Humphrey School has been planning a Ph.D. program for two years and the faculty have spent a lot of time thinking about a high-quality program. It is almost ready to go but needs a $1.5-million of new money. They have deferred the decision because of the budget but that conversation will continue. It is a very credible proposal with great upsides for the School; it is highest-rank school of public affairs without a Ph.D. program.

It was agreed that Provost Sullivan would return to the Committee in the near future to talk about how the compact process went.

Professor VandenBosch thanked the Provost for his report and adjourned the meeting at 2:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota