

## Minutes\*

### **A Meeting to Discuss Post-1993 Planning The President and Some Faculty July 24, 1990**

Present: Elizabeth Blake (Morris), John Brandl (HHH Institute), Mark Brenner (Agriculture & Graduate School), Frank Busta (Home Economics), Susan Donaldson (Nursing), Patricia Ferrieri (Medical School), Leo Furcht (Medical School), Richard Goldstein (IT), Richard Goodrich (Agriculture), Lawrence Gray (IT), Nils Hasselmo, Warren Ibele (IT), Robert Jones (Agriculture), Kathy O'Brien (President's Office), Thomas Scott (CLA), W. Phillips Shively (CLA), Dianne Van Tasell (CLA), George Wright (CLA)

Professor Shively opened the meeting at 3:30 by explaining that the purpose was to discuss further the problems facing the University and the directions the institution should be taking in the 1990s. He drew the attention of those present to a set of questions which had been prepared to guide the discussion (attached).

Professor Shively began the discussion by asking if there were better ways for the University to go about its tasks--and not just by "cracking the whip" to make people do more but rather use the resources available more efficiently. The President offered a few background comments on this subject. The question should be seen in a national context and is related to how a strong case can be made for a unique kind of undergraduate education in the research universities and justify the role of those universities in the spectrum of undergraduate education in the State. It is in undergraduate education that the University, within the State, has the most difficulty distinguishing itself from other institutions--unlike in research, doctoral education, and many graduate and professional fields. It is a fact of political life, however, that the ability of the University to make its case with the legislature hinges unreasonably on the case for a unique role in undergraduate education--no matter how much many might wish the contrary.

There was, the President continued, a misunderstanding by some about Commitment to Focus--that it somehow meant the University would get out of undergraduate education. In fact CTF had as goal improving undergraduate education as well as other aspects of the University. The question, then, is how to improve undergraduate education without a massive infusion of new faculty members. The case will be made for new faculty--and in some areas it is a strong one--but the University will also have to demonstrate that it can make more effective use of the faculty it already has in improving undergraduate education. Since time is not to be taken away from the research effort, it becomes a matter of better using the time available for instruction.

Professor Goldstein said he was not convinced that more faculty would make instruction better in many cases; there are many other things which could improve teaching. The point about the uniqueness of University undergraduate education can be clearly answered, he said, however; it is answered by groups setting up projects for students which cannot be duplicated elsewhere and by the large fraction of

---

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

students entering honors projects where they work on faculty research. The University has the tools for these activities that others do not. In addition, the University has faculty on the cutting edge of research, who are incorporated into undergraduate education; this also takes faculty time because it tends to be a one-on-one interaction with students. The University has not given enough attention to this activity.

The President inquired how it would be possible to make available more faculty effort in that area, given limits on faculty time? Professor Goldstein replied that while faculty are overloaded they nonetheless always appreciate a bright student to work with--in particular at the graduate level but also at the undergraduate level if the student can be productive both for the faculty member as well as him- or herself. Honors research projects are another possibility for increased activity.

Professor Shively suggested that one way to free up faculty time for teaching, for example, might be added clerical staff designated for faculty who take on increased teaching, and perhaps other things--support which would lighten other demands on faculty who teach.

Professor Furcht observed that faculty avoid teaching because the reward system does not reward them for teaching; at present there is almost a disincentive for junior faculty for spending much time on teaching--the people who need the most help. A positive effect would flow from rewarding those who take on more teaching; right now there is no gain or loss if one teaches a lot or a little. If a graduate student were partially funded for a faculty member or some other support were extended the situation could perhaps be ameliorated. Professor Goodrich concurred and observed that many faculty do not believe teaching counts and that only research will matter in promotion, tenure, and salaries.

Professor Gray recalled that his most creative teaching had been in programs not a regular part of the University's curriculum, such as summer honors programs, the Talented Youth Math Program--with people who have no demands about what credits they will receive. There seems not to be room for that kind of teaching in the regular math curriculum, where people are primarily interested in getting through certain sequences of courses. Is there a demand among students for creative teaching or is the demand for regular sequences?

Is there faculty time for innovative teaching, Professor Goodrich inquired. Is there enough interest to think about a structure to encourage faculty to try new methods? Can there be an impact on the quality of teaching by using the expertise available at the University--of which there is a great deal? President Hasselmo said he assumed there were a lot of faculty who would be interested in more creative teaching.

Professor Busta agreed that the University used the lecture too much and did not rely enough on active learning; using more active learning, especially with high-quality students, to help them learn from each other in courses would also help free up faculty time as well as create more enthusiasm for the learning experience.

Professor Furcht reported on the use of computer-aided instruction in pathology in medical schools, the concomitant elimination of traditional courses, and a corresponding increase in medical student board scores. Professor Shively wondered if there is less of a student clientele for innovative teaching in basic, required courses (such as calculus and pathology) and if those might not be areas where a package such as the one Professor Furcht described might work best. Most students in such basic courses probably do not want to put in the time required by a close and active interaction with faculty.

Professor Goldstein cautioned that one had to be careful about such innovations. First there is the Hawthorne effect: Any change will provoke a positive result in performance. Second, these changes usually work well when there is a champion doing it; when that champion decides to do something else there is often no one to follow through. There must be a lot of people supporting innovative teaching and care must be given to determine whether there is a long-term good accomplished. Dean Blake recalled an episode at Morris concerning the offering of alternative calculus: the offering was shunned at first but later supported when mathematicians nationally began to adopt it; the "clientele" question may not always have a clear answer.

The President agreed there are "flashes in the pan"; any changes would have to be institutionalized fairly quickly. He said he has felt that we are due for a revolution in the way student-faculty interaction is considered in higher education, especially if students come in better prepared. The President said that what he wants to do is provide institutional support to make the effort worthwhile--and go beyond the scattershot approach.

Professor Brandl agreed that there is pedagogical expertise at the University and suggested that if there were some "circuit riders" who would come to departments and provide information on developments in pedagogy--computers, small group techniques--then things might improve. Professor Shively recalled that the Campbell committee had recommended establishment of a teaching center, the staff of which would spend 50% of their time on research on higher education pedagogy and the other 50% on "internal extension" to departments disseminating information.

Professor Brenner noted that Project Sunrise in Agriculture, which included active learning, had received support, included demonstrations, and was strongly encouraged. The many faculty who became involved feel the changes were worth it--but because the entire support network was involved, not just a memo from the dean. Project Sunrise was supported by a major grant from the Kellogg Foundation (and included much more than the delivery of instruction); a full-time individual was appointed to provide assistance in instruction. Faculty who got involved in turn brought in other faculty. Professor Goodrich reported that there were frequent seminars which might focus on active learning or use of case studies or incorporation of ethics and values into teaching, etc. There were also grants given to faculty to try something new in their courses.

There is not enough focus, Professor Goodrich continued, on the faculty; the easiest way for a faculty member to teach a course is to lecture. It is much more difficult and time-consuming to use alternative methods; time must be spent convincing faculty that it is worth their time to use these methods.

Professor Goldstein agreed but maintained that a large percentage of courses would continue to be given in the lecture format for a long time. Something should be done, therefore, to help faculty improve their lectures; a lot would be interested in improving their teaching but don't know how or don't know where to turn.

Several in the group discussed the ways in which videotaping can be a useful means of improving teaching. Another possibility, Professor Shively suggested, might be grants to departments to institute training programs for their Ph.D. students--something which would not be particularly expensive and

which would begin gently moving department faculties into a greater concern for teaching.

The President observed that pedagogical efforts must come from the senior faculty and from the discipline itself; externally-imposed changes are usually not effective. Some units have made improvements, such as Agriculture; are there institution-wide efforts which could be undertaken which would be effective? Is the teaching center a good idea? There is a risk that the experts would be assembled but never become part of the collegial structure of the institution.

Professor Brenner said that a center of expertise should not work as an isolated group but should be involved in activities throughout the University. One department in Agriculture, he added, has an excellent program that requires all its graduate students to serve as TAs. There is one quarter of pedagogy, an hour per week, which includes the use of outside experts. As a follow-up, faculty members work with graduate students on the development of lectures (which are videotaped); a central group of experts could be used to ensure that activities in collegiate units are appropriate. The active participation of the departments would be essential, however, and there must be some reward or encouragement for departments to do so.

Professor Brenner also reported that in Biological Sciences there were different "block grants" to departments for salary increases--and the differences were dependent on teaching effectiveness. This sort of incentive, he said, would get the attention of the faculty.

Professor Shively noted that his department has all of its classes evaluated and that the faculty are interested in learning how students have responded to them. If students say one is not doing well that statement has a strong emotional impact. The social feedback is probably more important, he said, than any rewards which might be linked to good teaching. This feedback makes a lot of sense, he argued, and costs very little.

Professor Goodrich said he was interested by the proposal for a teaching center. There was, he recalled, a similar center in University College at one time; it failed because it did not communicate the results of experiments out to the colleges. Neither the University College center nor a new teaching center would likely elicit change in faculty, he said; reward and award systems would, however, as would visible recognition. There might not be much else, he concluded.

Another problem, Professor Shively added, is that fewer students are seeing regular faculty in 1-XXX and 3-XXX courses. Yale, he reported, has decided upon a supply-side approach to this problem: It has decided to reduce the number of teaching fellows it will employ, which will mean fewer graduate students teaching undergraduate classes. Are there ways to get more faculty interested in teaching introductory classes--acknowledging that this would not apply equally to all classes. Professor Wright reported that proposals are being considered by the Task Force on Liberal Education which would address this question; one proposal calls for \$25,000 bonuses for faculty and departments which create introductory courses for undergraduates. What, he inquired, did those present think about such an approach?

Professor Furcht said he thought such steps are necessary to get the faculty into introductory courses: Rewards are required to do it (parking, he added, might be another reward). The best faculty, Professor Goodrich said, should be in the introductory courses; almost anybody can teach upper division

courses. Professor Shively cautioned against an EDP approach to the proposal; grants to develop courses, without continuing support, produce nothing of lasting impact. Another possibility, he said, might be that any faculty member who taught two 1-XXX or 3-XXX courses in one year would receive a couple of thousand dollars in that year for travel and research expense--which ties research and teaching together.

Professor Goldstein contended that any rewards should be for good performance, not just for doing something; one example is the Morse-Alumni awards. Why not a similar award for people teaching lower division courses? But for performance.

Professor Gray said that when he teaches lower division he feels very little reward even though he puts as much of himself as he can into his teaching. Mostly, he said, he senses students want to know if the material will be on the test; only a few students are interested in going on in the field. It is a much better use of his time, he said he felt, to teach in 5-XXX courses--where people have made a commitment to mathematics. Professor Shively agreed that this phenomenon would probably be encountered across the University. Professor Ibele suggested that the problem could be obviated by unlinking courses and exams; having comprehensive competency exams at the end of each year. Others, however, expressed doubt that this European system would work very well.

Professor Jones inquired about the possibility of team teaching at the undergraduate level, which would place less of a demand on faculty time. It might also, he said, provide a more interesting learning environment.

The President said he was encouraged by the willingness of faculty to tackle these problems and the recognition that there are things which need to be done. Is his impression in this matter correct? He said he hoped that there would be some dramatic recommendations from the Task Force on Liberal Education on restructuring of the undergraduate curriculum and especially the pre-major portion of the curriculum--and also dramatic recommendations on the way we teach and the way faculty and students interact. Would the faculty participate; is it an issue they would receive well? How should it be approached?

Professor Scott said that many of the ideas sound good, and some will work better in some places than others; what will be important is the institution response and support that is provided for the recommendations. He reflected that one mechanism for responding to the concerns about undergraduate education would be to institute program reviews similar to the ones now run under the aegis of the Graduate School, including the use of outsiders. Having available people expert in a variety of teaching techniques plus use of outsiders knowledgeable about a particular discipline may be a way to tie things together.

Some, Professor Gray observed, will recall that they were trained by the lecture/recitation method and it worked fine; why should we change it now. One possible answer is that the University needs to reach new groups of people; in calculus, for example, there are people who need to know it but who will not become professional mathematicians. What will bring about the changes? One suggestion from the room was that it would be the same things that motivate Wall Street: Fear and greed.

Professor Brenner explained that the current reviews of programs include undergraduate education. The reviews are conducted in concert with the dean of the unit and the intent is to look at the entire

department. The President said that perhaps the University does not put experts in undergraduate teaching on the review panels; the practice in this respect appears to vary.

Professor Brenner said there is also need for more discussion about non-traditional methods of delivering instruction at the 1-XXX and 3-XXX levels, including, for instance, heavier reliance on video. Access must be provided to undergraduates to all the information they need--along with access to quality faculty time. Professor Ibele pointed out that study groups provide one of the most valuable ways to learn in college.

Professor Busta observed that students today are not the same as when most faculty were in college; they respond to video and represent the age of instant gratification. Another responded that if so then this is what the faculty must learn about if they are to teach more effectively.

The changes in the tenure code sent the message to faculty that they must focus on their research, Professor Goodrich contended, even though the code addresses both research and teaching. The tenure code should be re-examined. Dean Blake commented that one must think about the differences between a university and a research institute--if there is one; at times the University tends toward being a research institute rather than a university. The difference is teaching; some who go to research institutes find they miss teaching. This fundamental teaching role has perhaps been obscured, whether by the tenure code or economic pressures.

A related concern, Dean Blake said, is the role of the University vis-a-vis the private colleges and the other state institutions. If the difference is the quality of the faculty and their research responsibilities, but the students who attend the University are never exposed to those faculty--for whatever reason--they might just as well go to the state universities or community colleges. The unique part of education at Minnesota is the ability to be exposed to an exciting faculty. How, then, can the University make teaching more central and get the quality faculty into the undergraduate student experience?

Professor Shively demurred to Professor Goodrich's point; it is not the tenure code and it is not that faculty are not concerned about their teaching. Most faculty are concerned about both teaching and research. If anything, he said, there is a larger number who have stopped caring about their research than about their teaching. There is a need to keep the incentives for faculty to do research, although it is true that faculty tend to gravitate toward teaching which is most comfortable, such as at the graduate level.

Professor Goldstein argued that most of the rewards for research come from outside the university, from peer recognition. Rewards from teaching must come from within the university; there are not enough such rewards--and should include more than salary.

As far as the faculty responding to an initiative for undergraduate teaching, Professor Van Tasell said, most will say that they are "dancing as fast as we can." The change must be presented as a system of encouragements and incentives. Professor Furcht said provision of a package of pre- or post-doctoral fellowships or something similar as an incentive would work. Departments will work to their own benefit.

The President agreed with Professor Van Tasell that faculty time is being fully spent now; it is, he said, a zero-sum game. Are there ways, he asked, to make that faculty effort more effective--especially

with respect to interaction with students? What incentives and resource allocation policies should be adopted? Something will be done; the question is how best to act. He also said he wants to avoid engendering the faculty reaction that all he wants to do is whip them into shape and get all these lazy people into the classroom; that is not what he wants to do.

Professor Shively alluded next to the second question: Departments vary considerably in culture; some value and reward teaching, research, and service both financially and socially. Others do not. What can the University do to effect lasting change; how does it gain leverage over those department cultures and persuade them to consider the full range of faculty tasks? Relatedly, how can they be nudged into consider the collective good rather than solely the interests of the department or discipline?

Professor Donaldson observed that tying the budget of a unit too closely to its teaching or function or space will work against that goal. Faculty will say that if it does not benefit their unit they will not do the teaching or collaborate in the research. An alternative should be considered: At present the administrative structures of the departments and colleges are virtually unchangeable; it is nearly impossible to eliminate programs or disciplines. Given that difficulty, would it not be possible to create a central administrative team, a leadership core, of which faculty could elect to be a part--if a faculty member's interests no longer fit with the thrust of his or her department. Faculty work hard but not always efficiently. Some, for instance, have not published for a long time but are now trying to obtain research money in order to do so; in many disciplines that will be an impossible task. These people have leadership and teaching skills, however, which could be of benefit to other departments in the University. A central leadership group would be of great use.

It may, she observed, not be possible to tamper very much with department cultures without adversely affecting the recruitment of star faculty. To make the culture too odd, within the context of the discipline, will lead faculty to leave.

Professor Goldstein concurred that leadership within departments is important. That leadership, however, should be by example--one cannot lead in research unless one is doing research. Professor Brenner joined in Professor Goldstein's opinion. Rewards systems, he observed, exist at the department level--so faculty are often reluctant to act beyond the boundaries of the department, to the detriment of the University. Departments, he said, must be sustained, for reasons of stability and tradition, but rewards must be structured so that service outside the department can be recognized. Both research and teaching are now recognized, for the most part, even if they cross departmental lines. There are many more things which the University could do, though, to encourage faculty to work for the good of the institution.

Pride, loyalty, and happiness are the three key words, Professor Goodrich asserted; if those can be provided for the faculty there will be excellence and productivity. It may be necessary to do things internally to communicate with faculty, to let them know the University appreciates what they are doing so that they develop pride in the department, college, and University. It is not always money which makes the difference. There is an insufficient amount of internal public relations. Professor Shively observed that there are some departments which do exhibit all three characteristics--as a garrison, and the "rest of the University be damned."

Dollars do help, Professor Wright said, especially for faculty who have for a long time been teaching in very low-paid units of the University. Those units have morale problems; they feel badly

treated compared to other parts of the University. And within those departments, the comparatively-well-paid do tend to be good citizens. It is, however, more and more difficult for those at the bottom of the salary scale in low-paid departments to maintain a feeling of good citizenship and loyalty to the University; such feelings cannot be sustained over 20 or 25 years "unless you have people who are ethically gifted."

Professor Brandl pointed out that the University is peculiar in that it forces people to seriously consider going somewhere else in order to obtain a raise--which does little to encourage loyalty. The University has spent a lot of money to retain people who would have gone elsewhere--but it has not spent a corresponding amount of money rewarding teaching and service.

He also expressed agreement with Professor Goodrich's point about the tenure code. The University, he said, should expect people to excel in two out of the three activities (teaching, research, and service); service should be defined as a combination of teaching and applied research--one would have to be both researcher and teacher in order to succeed at the University. There would then be an improvement of both teaching and service without lowering standards.

The President recounted that the incentives for retention cases have been decreased because there are no funds retained centrally for retention; all funds are distributed to the deans for what is hoped will be "preventive retention" and creating a more rational salary structure. The University is also examining the system at Berkeley for salary distribution to determine if there cannot be a better way to distribute salary funds.

Professor Furcht reported that the pressures in clinical departments of the Medical School for basic research and scholarship that faculty are forced away from being primary care physicians. Like it or not, he said, the viability of the hospital drives much of what occurs in the health sciences. There is so much pressure being put on physicians that they stay away from patient responsibility--which will not get them grants or get them promoted. The University will have to address the reward systems which are now in place. The right reinforcements are not in place; a dysfunctional organization is created as a result of not paying attention to these reinforcements.

Professor Shively noted that there will be increasing shortages of faculty in upcoming years; if other universities make offers to our faculty, does the unwillingness to deal with retention cases mean the University is prepared to lose a lot of faculty?

As far as the collective good is concerned, Professor Busta observed, the faculty must see that their own good situation is related to the total picture and that they are not isolated. A balance among research, teaching, and service is essential to a continued good situation for individual faculty. The University hires for high ego, independence, and individuality--no faculty member is hired or given tenure because they are a good team member. Degrees and promotions are given on basis of individual research and programs; somewhere it must be shown that an individual's opportunities are based on the collective good.

Dean Blake said that people subscribe to a value system and when they consider a job they try to determine if they "fit"; it may be necessary to be more explicit, more articulated, than is presently the case. The University, Professor Shively responded, should not begin hiring faculty primarily because

they are good team players, however. Deans, according to Rosovsky, have an "Amadeus problem": Rosovsky rooted for Salieri in the movie "Amadeus" because deans must always deal with these brilliant but utterly unlikable people.

Professor Goodrich took up the second question and said that the culture of a department has to do with building esprit d'corps--and said he was not sure how one built it. Professor Ferrieri noted that some departments do better than others; in the health sciences there is a tendency to believe that they are the University. The pressures are so great on junior faculty--to obtain tenure, to establish their research--that they fail to remember that there is a University here. The opportunities to interact at many levels is limited, particularly for faculty in the health sciences; those lucky enough to have done so have a much better sense of collegiality. Mechanisms need to be established for junior faculty to have a better understanding of the University as a whole and to permit them to interact more in order to exchange ideas and resources--without compromising their time.

The President said that since the department is such a central entity in whatever is done--for better or worse--the question is what can be done institutionally to inspire the kinds of outstanding department cultures which do exist in some places. How does the University promote cultures which place values on all faculty responsibility, and not necessarily in a rigid hierarchy of research, teaching, and service--and where everybody pitches in. Not all may do everything in the same proportions but the total operation is a success. In some cases, he observed, it may have been fortuitous--the arrival of the right person who exercised leadership and built a department.

Do we know what those people did, Professor Goodrich inquired. The President said it appears that a single individual came with an agenda and was able to recruit faculty who fit into that mold and the department culture grew from that beginning. There was a strong awareness of why the department existed and of an integration of all departmental activities. The culture is personalized in those cases. In the case of Political Science, for example, however, all major decisions are decided by the faculty--which means that the faculty have had to argue about these kinds of things. The President observed that such a process works for some departments; in others it leads to a reduction to the least common denominator.

Whether or not there is or was leadership in the department, Professor Goldstein argued, individual faculty members will not be interested in the betterment of the department because of selflessness; it will be because of enlightened self-interest. Faculty will see that for their own benefit it is important that they are part of a high-quality department, one that is recognized by the rest of the world as a good department--which will make it easier to get good graduate students and grant support. That is equally true at the college level--where relatively inferior departments in an outstanding college are helped by the halo effect. So it is important that departments see that they are helped by having good departments; the idea must permeate all levels at the University. These collegiate and institutional cultures do prevail at Berkeley and MIT.

It is in building such a culture that a leadership core could help, said Professor Donaldson, especially in units where there is no turnover.

Professor Furcht observed that if it is indeed the star department heads who make such a difference in building the right culture then there should be a mechanism for a rigorous evaluation of department heads. At present such reviews are perfunctory. An individual should be given a period of time--some

number of years--and then should be questioned harshly about what has and has not been accomplished and whether or not there were impediments beyond his or her control. And in some cases, he added, the same person could be responsible both for the flowering of a unit as well as its decline--if the individual stays on too long as head.

The University is trying, the President reported, to provide heads and chairs better training--at least to the extent they are given a basic understanding of procedures and policies but also so they can get together and exchange information. There must also be, he agreed, a strong evaluation system. What else can be done? They certainly can be catalysts for departmental growth and improvement. Faculty in a department, Professor Brenner said, can learn behavior which leads them to pull together and create an attractive culture.

Selecting heads and chairs should perhaps be selected on the basis of the values which they hold and which would promote a culture of success, Professor Shively proposed--something which is probably not now done. The 1985 tenure code devalues college and university service, Dean Blake suggested, which creates a dilemma for small departments or disciplines; she looks, in tenuring faculty, for potential leadership ability because eventually the individual will have to head the department. There is nothing in the tenure code which justifies denial of tenure in part because the individual does not have the potential for leadership in the department. Such a characteristic is extremely valuable in maintaining the quality of the discipline over time.

Professor Ibele argued that the tenure code only called for everyone to be involved in research, at least at some nominal level, in order to lend vitality to their teaching. It may not be the only way to accomplish that end--sabbaticals and consulting may do the same thing. But research was seen as the primary device to keep teaching alive and current.

Dean Blake said it is also essential for faculty involved in undergraduate education to do research because they should not sit in judgment over the work of students if they are unwilling to have their own work judged by peers. Without submitting your own work to the judgment of others, she said, one can become very arrogant working with undergraduate students. Research should not be undervalued--but internal leadership within a field is important to the quality of the University. And that is not valued very strongly, at least in the written documents of the University.

Professor Goodrich said that deans and department heads would likely continue to be selected on academic excellence. The existing training for new department heads is very effective; why not make it mandatory for all department heads?

Professor Gray asked about the possibility of team-taught courses; they are usually well-attended by students, could serve to foster creativity in teaching, and bring faculty in different units together. Professor Donaldson observed that team-taught courses are routinely offered at the graduate level; there are a number of programs which cross units. It is not done as effectively at the undergraduate level, where it may be more important. Interdisciplinary courses seem to have their own lifespan, Professor Ibele commented, but that is natural; courses with themes such as those which were developed after the first Earth Day are an example; they had courses which drew lecturers from a variety of departments--people who then attended the other lectures to see what their colleagues were saying.

Such courses, Professor Wright cautioned, cost a lot of time, both for faculty and administrators; it is for this reason that the School of Cross-Disciplinary Studies finally came to an end. But the courses can be wonderful.

Following a break, Professor Shively turned the attention of the group to the fourth question, how the University can give meaning to the term quality and how everyone might desire it. The University has been promising the State that it would improve the quality of what it does; what is it and how do we get there?

Is quality the issue, Professor Goodrich inquired, or is it our communication to the people of the State? The President noted that quality is a term which is used to cover a lot of things--and it tends to be used as an opposite to access. Minnesota has done extraordinarily well in access; 87% of high school graduates enter post-secondary education within three years of graduation, a number which is 135% above the national average. At the same time, state funding per student is 12% below the national average--so the investment per student is lower than it used to be. There is, thus, a quality argument; the experience of the student is of lower quality. The University makes the case for enrollment reductions, and limiting access to some extent, in return for something called "quality" and which is presumably worthwhile. The argument is an important one to make; the University must define for itself what quality means and then tell the State.

Professor Goodrich argued that the programs of the University are of high quality and that what must be done is to maintain and improve on that quality. The President said he has been arguing that the University is over-extended and over-crowded, especially at the freshman and sophomore years, and that the experience the University could offer students at that level has suffered. That, he said, is the most concrete form of the quality issue that has arisen.

Professor Brandl reflected that the "retreat" of faculty into their departments is related to and caused by the central administration scandals of a few years ago; morale "really got clobbered." Faculty were bewildered that the State seemed to be turning against the University when they were doing their jobs--and doing them well. The skepticism persists around the state and among its politicians. The challenge to the University is to regain the confidence of the people of the State.

It is, he continued, more than communication; it must demonstrate that faculty are high quality. The quality must be measured and communicated to the State: "Kids are being taught well, good research is being done, we are doing public service." It is done anecdotally, and the University asserts that these things occur, but it is not done systematically. The University must do a better job of making the argument, and in as sophisticated a fashion as it does in other research.

Professor Busta said he approached quality from a technical standpoint: Conformity with specifications. To have an identified level of quality will require that the University define the product that it turns out; if that is education of students, what is being done must be defined, described, measured, and refined. The closer the University gets to zero defects, the better the quality. And then the University must tell people about it. This may be a foreign approach for an educational institution, he concluded, but it could be done.

That notion can be extended, Professor Brenner said, by defining what is unique about a research

university and what is offered to the students who attend. It may not all be research experience but each student will have a unique experience. One can make a list of items against which measurements can be taken, items which are regarded as important, and which cover instruction, research, and service.

Some of the outcomes, Professor Donaldson observed, are not measurable while the students are attending the University. There needs to be long-term tracking of what happens to graduates; what former students have to say is important. Those future donors and supporters of the University, if they were not served well, will forget about it when they leave and wish they had gone elsewhere. Professor Busta agreed that a strong statement from the alumni would be one of the best measures of success.

Professor Ibele inquired of Professor Brandl whether legislators have a sense of the quality of the institution in depth or if they deal with it on an anecdotal basis--what confidence did he have about legislative understanding of the University? Very few in the legislature understand the University in depth, he said; it has for years been carried by the leadership of the two houses. Had it not been for them insisting that the University be taken care of "it really would have gotten clobbered a number of times." The University also has a more difficult job, compared to a generation ago, when the legislature was dominated by older, conservative, rural, established, successful people for whom the University was very special--as compared to the present, when the legislature has large numbers of younger politicians who see the University as just one more interest group. The task is inherently more difficult under those circumstances.

Professor Goldstein agreed that while the University does have a lot of quality in its departments, the support of the state is very different. In Wisconsin and Michigan and Illinois they take pride in their flagship school and see it as a cut above all others. That seems not to be true in Minnesota; here it seems to be a "Lake Wobegon attitude that while as long as we're good or mediocre that's OK." There is little interest in having the University a high quality teaching, research, and service institution. Much of the responsibility lies with the University; there may be a need for a public relations effort which would show how a quality university is important to the state. The Medical School, he added, does the best job of promoting its excellence.

Professor Donaldson said she grew up in Michigan and agreed with Professor Goldstein's observation. There is in Minnesota an anti-elitism which will probably not be changed.

There was a discussion of the perception of excellence of the Medical School, the effectiveness of its public relations activities, and the problems which it nonetheless faces in such areas as faculty quality and inadequate physical plant. It is nonetheless true, Professor Goodrich contended, that until "we know that we are high quality, and never even question that thought in our minds, we will go downhill" because those who provide the funding will know. There must also be an attempt to stay away from catchy phrases.

Professor Shively cautioned that it is a little bit of the chicken and egg problem; in certain parts of the University a public relations campaign would fall on skeptical ears. There must also be a questioning of quality and an attempt to improve it; the faculty are too smart to buy into a campaign not founded on fact. It is important to celebrate excellence where it exists but it is also necessary to question.

Ms. O'Brien noted that this matter of perception extends to the students who attend the University.

Recent experience in outstate Minnesota made it clear that the best and brightest students are not coming to the University; the message seems to be that if you can't go anywhere else you can go to the University. "Just the University." Professor Van Tasell followed that comment by suggesting that an examination of the experience students have here should be undertaken. In terms of support services, she added, individual staff at the University are very frequently unhelpful--and students encounter that attitude a lot. Ms. O'Brien concurred; it will not matter how good the public relations are if the 17,000 kids in CLA are unhappy.

Professor Shively agreed; he suggested that the biggest single problem is CLA because there is such an imbalance in terms of numbers of faculty and numbers of students. With 400 faculty and 14 or 15 thousand students, being innovative is nearly impossible. One way it could be helped is through cooperation with the professional schools. To really improve undergraduate education would require a huge amount of money, which no one is suggesting; improvement of the student experience in CLA, however, will require different kinds of innovation than it will in other units. There is excellent teaching in CLA, he observed; his students rarely complain about what happens in the classroom. Complaints about their lives at the University are frequent; students are often treated humiliatingly or with gratuitous inconvenience--there is a common bureaucratic arrogance which is most remembered by students. There was agreement, however, that the numbers in CLA did not necessarily imply low quality.

Professor Scott commented on the analogy which might be drawn between the University and the automobile industry. The American auto industry tried for years to sell a bad product, and that didn't work--and the first response was to try to improve their marketing--"sell the same old schlock but sell it harder." Whatever the product it is, he said, it probably has to come first. The relationship between product and marketing is important, however, especially given that the University no longer commands the near-monopoly it once had. The University needs to make a careful assessment of where its high quality is and where it is not and reach some internal agreement about it. In some areas the University does extraordinarily well--grants and contracts, number of patents, defense contracts, private fund-raising, ranking of the library, attraction of graduate students, etc. Cataloguing these items would be useful at the same time the University confessed about areas that are not so good.

Professor Brenner inquired what the University was doing about marketing to students, recruiting undergraduates. There needs to be an effort there comparable to the effort put into recruiting outstanding graduate students. His own son, he related, has heard from many colleges and universities--but not Minnesota. There is a widespread impression, the President agreed, that the brightest students never hear from the University. It was pointed out by Professor Shively that then-CLA Dean Frank Sorauf had discovered there was an ideology against recruiting students in the offices with the responsibility; there were "a fair number of sort of faded 1960s flowers in various parts of the University administration, at all levels" who were against recruiting--it was unfair of the University to advertise for students in competition with all of the little schools in the state. It was unseemly and not fitting.

There is, the President assured the group in response to questions, no prohibition against the University recruiting students. Professor Ibele pointed out that there need not be a hard sell; most institutional letters acknowledge the student's performance and ask that he or she not overlook University X. The mere fact that they would be recognized by the major university in the State would be important. Duluth, Professor Shively reported, does an extremely good job in this respect.

The President reported that there has been an interesting aperiodic discussion at the Regents' meetings over the past several months. The comments have been that the University should not bother with the able minority students; it is our responsibility to take only students at risk because the other ones have plenty of opportunities to go to other schools across the country. Our responsibility is to the students at risk. The President said he has tried to counter that argument but that it illustrates some of the attitudes about the University; if that approach were taken, he added, the consequences would be mind-boggling. The University would take those who nobody else wants. There is of course a responsibility to help those who have been disadvantaged, the President concluded, but any notion that it should not seek able students is irresponsible.

The University, Professor Goldstein said, does not toot its own horn enough. There are programs which used to advertise; the University must participate in "college nights" at high schools (which it does not now do). Some of these functions, it appeared, are no longer carried out by CLA. Others agreed with Professor Goldstein's point. Professor Ferrieri said that one of the most important messages carried is by the President as he goes around the state. (She also said that the message that he cares about what the faculty are doing is one that should be communicated as well.)

Advertising, Professor Shively noted, can kill two birds with one stone; it not only sells the product or institution, it can also help build morale at the institution itself. Another bird could be obtained, Professor Goldstein observed, if the University would encourage the children of faculty to attend; there are, instead, several disincentives to intend.

Professor Furcht recounted efforts that had been spent in development of the bioengineering program. He had been astonished at the expertise of the faculty at the University--but learning about it had taken considerable effort. Most faculty do not know what is available here.

What the public, or the legislature, knows about the University, Professor Furcht added, may often depend on the views of a student who never saw a real faculty member for the first two years--or on the newspapers. The University should be relentless and aggressive in disseminating information--and with a long-term strategy in mind. The Medical School advertising has done well but there are equally impressive things occurring in other units. And this would not take a lot of money.

Professor Ferrieri reported that the Medical School has arranged for faculty and legislators to attend a dinner and show of brief presentations. She said she was struck by how few legislators showed up at one such event; she agreed that it is hard to get people over to the University.

Professor Brandl said that he intends, after his term is over (after the next elections; he is not running again), to write a letter to everyone who wins and inform them that if there is anything they are interested in that they would like to have someone from the University talk about he will arrange it. He said he would do it on his own, to begin with, and if it gets to be too big an effort he would try to figure out some way to manage it. Some of the people in the legislature will take up the offer, he said. Events must be personalized, and even then there remains a combination of awe, fear, and resentment in the legislature towards the University. But no matter how apparently anti-intellectual a legislator might be, interaction between the legislator and a faculty member--no matter how theoretical or arcane the field--will lead to mutual respect they did not have. Both will enter the meeting with resentment and condescension.

Professor Ibele recalled meetings in which he had participated when Dick Sauer was President in preparation for the biennial request. The meetings seemed to be well-attended in outstate Minnesota, including legislators and community leaders. Was there ever any assessment of those meetings? They seemed to be less successful in the metropolitan area than elsewhere. Success outstate, Professor Shively pointed out, was because of the involvement of the Minnesota Extension Service.

The President reported that initial work on the biennial request would begin soon and that it would likely consist of a small number of objectives where quality can be demonstrated and the benefits of the University to the State can be shown.

One thing that has concerned him, the President said, is how one engages the entire University community in standing up for the University; it is distressing to hear members of this community denigrate the institution. It is hard to achieve quality when there are widespread negative and defeatist attitudes.

Professor Ferrieri pointed out that this is a very complex institution and is not a University of Michigan; Minnesota is faced with trying to be all things to all people and trying to do everything well. There is a large commuter population and there are a lot of graduate and professional programs. Only the schools in New York really have greater problems; trying to pull people together, with all of the competing interests, is a very difficult task.

The President reaffirmed the need for improvement in quality of undergraduate education, graduate education, and research--and that has to be accomplished by limiting access. Improvement in quality also extends to support services; it is bothersome to see how shabby the campus appears. The purpose of this administration, he said, is to make sure that when people look at the University they will say "that is quality"--and in every respect. There may have to be trade-offs but they will be laid out before the people of the State and the choices made as palatable as possible. But the University will have to do less.

Professor Furcht next raised the question of fragmentation; there are, for example, hundreds of faculty working in biological sciences across several collegiate units. How a student makes a choice is hard to imagine. A bright student who wants to go to graduate school would likely choose a California school, where all the biological sciences are together. The University has enormous strength in these fields--but they are scattered and don't communicate with each other very much. Tremendous opportunities are being missed because of the failure to amass talents. Professor Brenner concurred and reported on some actions being taken by the Graduate School to help alleviate some of the problems, although it was uncertain that these would respond to the larger problem.

Professor Gray then told of the reactions of high school students to the University; they were impressed and well-treated but there was one element of their visit that they disliked: trying to use Walter Library. He commented that he has had the same problem--and wondered if anything would happen to improve the situation. Wilson, he added, did not present this problem. The President agreed that service is not what it should be but pointed out that the system is considerably overloaded.

Professor Goodrich then inquired if, vis-a-vis recruitment of minorities, whether or not Personnel had any plans to train employees to help ensure their success on the job, especially for the Form 18

positions. The University could increase the success rate of minorities in the system if it could ensure they were qualified for the positions they were applying for. Recent experience suggests this is not the case; the University ends up looking bad when they cannot pass probation or are forced to leave the system.

Professor Shively and the President both thanked the faculty for taking such a long afternoon and evening to meet. They were urged to inform the faculty that these meetings had occurred--they would appreciate knowing about them; it was also suggested that some sort of checklist or report be developed on what took place and action items identified that the President intended to follow up on. There was also agreement that an article by the President in Footnote explaining the meetings and what would result would be very useful.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota