

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
March 29, 1990**

Present: John Clark (chair), Thomas Clayton, Jean Congdon, Carol Grishen, Karen Karni, Marvin Mattson, Gary Nelsestuen, Gary Parnes, Julie Peterson

Guests: Senior Vice President Leonard V. Kuhi, Dean P. T. Magee

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Clark began the meeting with reports on several items.

First, the statement by SCEP on the uniform undergraduate tuition was carried to the Senate Consultative Committee earlier in the day; the discussion which took place was generally in sympathy with the views expressed by SCEP. SCC shared the concern of SCEP about implementation although accepted in principle the idea of a level rate; it proposed a contingent approval--dependent on addressing the question of the need for increased student aid and assurance of equity in the quality of the delivery of education across colleges. SCC also concurred with the view of SCEP that the governance system was not adequately involved in the review of the report. Professor Ibele will provide a statement to the Board of Regents.

Professor Clark also reported that SCC had unanimously approved the by-law amendment which places the chair of SCEP ex-officio on the Consultative Committee.

The minutes of March 8, March 15, and March 16 were approved as written.

2. Discussion with Dean Magee about the Single Point of Entry

Professor Clark welcomed Dean Magee to the Committee to discuss the response and views of the undergraduate deans on the single point of entry.

Dean Magee began by noting that the single point of entry has not wandered from its original intent although it has wandered from its original form. The initial concept was that the common entry point would be a function of the Faculty of the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering and that there would be a common lower division faculty and that entry into the University would be into that faculty. From that entry point students would then move out to other colleges at the time they moved to upper division.

A group of faculty and administrators, after considering the proposal, believed that it would be more efficient to have the common entry point function largely through CLA and that constructing another administrative structure for the common entry point/common lower division would not be an efficient use of resources.

*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.

It was at this point that the Council of Undergraduate Deans took up the proposal because decisions would be made soon and the deans who would be responsible for implementing them would find it easier to do so if they had some say in the policy decisions. The Provost assented to their request that they be permitted to examine the proposal and make recommendations to him on how it should be implemented.

The major issues the deans wished to deal with were, first, simplifying entry to the University. The second issue was arranging for students to be able to easily explore different fields and not requiring them to make early career decisions. The third, a practice the deans wanted to be sure was implemented, was that students with appropriate credentials not be denied admission to the University because they applied to the wrong college.

The deans accepted the recommendation that creating a new administrative structure would not be a good idea, for two reasons. First, the University needs to look very carefully at its use of resources; to create a separate structure would require more money than would implementation of the common entry point within the existing colleges. Second, the deans felt strongly that there was a likelihood that students who came into this unit--unless all were forbidden to transfer to another college--would be in an Ellis Island, isolated from the experiences that students in the colleges have. It seemed to them a better idea to expand CLA and make it the college of admission for the majority of freshmen, using the resources in CLA and supplementing them.

The deans then identified the problems in implementing the common entry point given the existing collegiate structure. Several arose. One was that students who apply to one college but who may be more appropriate for another are never referred to it if not accepted to the college they want. There was thus a need to devise an admissions process which would ensure that no students fell between the cracks. The idea of the single point of application, in the Admissions Office, will satisfy this concern; there is agreement that the Admissions Office will do all corresponding with students as they inquire about applying to the University.

The deans also worked out a routing of applications based on the traditional University evaluation of applications (based on the PAR: the PSAT score multiplied by two added to academic rank; the maximum score is 259--160 plus academic rank of 99).

The deans also dealt with an issue raised by the Provost: Controlling enrollment by moving the admissions date back is letting the postman decide who is admitted. The deans decided to set an absolute date for automatic admission; they suggested December 15. Although early, application thereafter does not preclude admission; it merely means that the application receives individual scrutiny rather than be automatically processed for admission.

Applications which arrive before December 15 which have a PAR of 150 and which meet all preparation requirements will automatically be admitted to the college of their choice or to CLA if they have not specified a college.

Students who have a PAR between 135 and 150 and who request CLA will be reviewed by CLA; if CLA decides the student is inappropriate, the application will be referred to other colleges; if the PAR is below 135 the application will be reviewed by GC.

Those who apply to IT will need a PAR of 190 and some additional preparation requirements; if those standards are met and the student applies by December 15, he or she will automatically be admitted to IT. Students with a PAR between 150 and 190 will be reviewed by IT; if they decline to admit him or her, the application will be referred to other colleges for review (the student, of course, could refuse to attend a different college).

Students who apply to General College who have a PAR greater than 165 will be directed to CLA; exceptions will be students who have deficiencies in preparation requirements--those students will be reviewed by GC to determine if it is more appropriate than CLA. Students who apply to GC with a PAR of less than 165 will automatically be admitted to GC, space permitting; if greater than 150, and GC rejects the student, the application will be referred to other colleges. The application will also be referred to other colleges if the PAR is between 135 and 149 and GC rejects the student. If the PAR is below 135 and the applicant is rejected by GC, the applicant will not be considered further because it is the view of the deans that a student with a PAR less than 135 who is not admitted to GC will not succeed in another college and should pursue higher education elsewhere for the first two years.

These same PAR levels also apply to the St. Paul colleges for applications received by December 15: Above 150, automatically admit; between 135 and 149, review and possible admit; below 135, refer to GC.

Dean Magee clarified, in response to a question, that students who apply by December 15 must have planned to complete the preparation requirements by the end of their senior year. There will be an audit by the Admissions Office of the students before final matriculation; for the most part, however, the University will take the student's word. There will be random audits, however, to make sure this is a sensible approach.

The common entry point thus becomes a series of reviews by the colleges, rather than an administrative structure, to make sure that students receive as fair a hearing as possible.

It is expected that the freshman class will not be full after December 15. After that date applications will be reviewed by the colleges with respect to how they want the classes "shaped." This will be the University's opportunity to address diversity questions; if a unit wishes to have a certain proportion of students from a particular socio-economic group, and that group has not applied and been admitted by December 15 in desirable numbers, the college can "shape" its class from the applications which arrive later. The Admissions Office has assured the deans that the pool of applicants after December 15 will be amply large enough to permit this "shaping." Each college is now in the process of devising a "template," the outline of what the classes should look like. These outlines will be used in reviewing the later applications.

One advantage of this process is that places can be held open for groups such as minorities, who traditionally apply late.

Dean Magee described this process as a model for cooperation among the colleges; there is a lot of enthusiasm for it. The St. Paul colleges see it as providing them access to students they would not previously have been able to consider. This is a good plan for both the students and the colleges; it also should end the problem of "turf defense": it emphasizes that this is a university rather than a group of

colleges.

The second advantage of the plan is that rather than uprooting freshman advising from the freshman-admitting colleges and moving it to a separate structure, the University can build on highly competent advising structures within the colleges and add resources to them to improve advising. One serious problem with undergraduate education is the large ratio of students to advisors; it is felt that by building on existing advising it will be possible to improve the service with fewer resources. Each of the colleges has submitted a request to the Provost for new resources needed for advising when the common entry point is implemented; the total amount is \$350,000 less than had been anticipated in the report from the committee chaired by Jeanne Lupton. Each college has also specifically asked the advising offices if the amounts were sufficient; all have been reviewed and confirmed.

The aim is to have a student/advisor ratio of 200:1 for all colleges except GC, which will have a 50:1 ratio for fragile students and 85:1 for other students. Achieving these ratios will cost about \$350,000 the first year and \$250,000 the second year.

Dean Magee also pointed out that the colleges which do not admit freshmen--CBS, Management, Education--will be interacting with the CLA advising staff in order to ensure that students who are interested in their disciplines will be rapidly referred to an appropriate advisor in the upper division colleges even though the student may remain in CLA for a period. CBS, for example, will put advisors on the Minneapolis campus.

This set of recommendations, Dean Magee concluded, has gone to the Provost; they have every indication he is pleased with it.

Dean Magee was asked if a student who applied to IT and were not found acceptable would "sort of get a booby prize" in being told the University had admitted him or her to CLA instead. Dean Magee said this could happen; he asked if "that booby prize is worse than the booby prize of not being admitted at all." Dean Magee also reminded the Committee that IT has agreed that it will no longer give favorable treatment to students in IT in admission to upper division; if a student takes IT courses while in CLA, and achieves as IT students do, he or she will have the same options as those who entered IT. This will be made clear to students; IT has also agreed to advise about 450 students in CLA who are pointed to IT to ensure that they receive appropriate advice.

Another question was what "structural stimulants" to students would exist to encourage experimentation among fields; Dean Magee said the colleges would provide advice to students interested in doing so. There is nothing more in the way of distribution requirements to encourage students to take courses outside CLA; that is an issue that the Task Force on Liberal Education will take up. The deans did not address curricular concerns.

Compared to what is being done now, Dean Magee concurred, the PAR cut-offs are essentially the ones which will allow students who apply early to be automatically admitted but which also retain flexibility for the colleges. He also repeated the observation that applications from underrepresented groups tend to come late, which is why the December 15 date is not absolute. He added that the percentage of students of color who meet the preparation requirements has risen rapidly and is now at 75 or 80%; the one least likely to have been met is the foreign language requirement, but that is true of

students from rural Minnesota as well.

Asked if he believed the University would miss out on students, because of the early admissions date, Dean Magee said that some average students might but that it is impossible to tell until the University can determine who has applied by December 15. If a large number of talented students apply by December 15 but there are few from around the state, and those students are part of the model of the class for a college, they would then be admitted. Inasmuch as not everyone who wants to do so will be able to attend the University, however, there will be some who do not get in because they did not get their application in early.

One Committee member inquired if a student denied admission on December 15 might later be considered again. Dean Magee responded that the Admissions Office believes there will be enough applicants later that the University will not want to have a waiting list; a decision will have to await a review of the application patterns. Once an application has been submitted to the several reviews and rejected, he said, it would not serve any purpose to hold them on a waiting list.

In response to a question about the length of time it would take to review applications several times, Dean Magee said they propose to have replies to students within three weeks of the time their application is received by the Admissions Office; at present students sometimes have not heard anything for eight weeks, even an acknowledgement of receipt of application. Admissions has been considerably understaffed and behind in keeping in touch with applicants. The colleges have pledged to review applications on a daily basis so they will be turned over very fast; Admissions will respond to students within three weeks--and will tell them what the result of the application review has been rather than just an acknowledgement of receipt.

Asked about transfer students, Dean Magee said that they have not been dealt with yet. He supposed that if they applied after one year they would still be put through the same applicant review process, although the dates might be different; at the upper division level they would probably be treated like any lower division student at the University, evaluated for admission to an upper division college based on whether or not they meet the criteria for that college. The University does, he pointed out, want to encourage that path, in part because it takes some of the pressure off lower division.

Another change which has come out of the review by the undergraduate deans, Dean Magee told the Committee, is agreement among the colleges that evaluation of preparation requirements will be conducted by the college in which the student is enrolled. When that college determines a student has met all preparation requirements, all other colleges will accept the student as having met the requirements.

Dean Magee told the Committee, in response to a question, that there is no absolute cut-off on PAR scores; if below 135, GC will still review for admission no matter the score. He also affirmed that the common entry point is exclusively a Twin Cities campus function.

Professor Clark thanked Dean Magee for talking with the Committee.

3. Discussion with Senior Vice President Kuhi

Professor Clark welcomed Senior Vice President Kuhi to the meeting and informed him the Committee would welcome comments on any issues he felt it should deal with; it would also, Professor Clark said, invite his views on a number of matters which the Committee has taken up over the past several months.

Dr. Kuhi began by saying that one subject which should receive considerable attention is the Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. The improvement in the undergraduate experience, he noted, is the number one goal of the President, and he--the Provost--has been, with the assistance of Dr. Kqvavik, presenting the more detailed aspects of the Initiative to the Board of Regents.

The Initiative should be seen as a set of challenges to the faculty and staff, things which need to be accomplished. The presentations to the Board of Regents have laid out a series of issues connected with access, in particular access to graduation. Once the University admits a student, he contended, there is a clear-cut obligation to make sure that the student graduates--doing everything possible to make sure that happens.

There are many reasons why students do not graduate in a finite length of time and some of them the University can do nothing about. The number of students graduating within four years is very small, here and at many other places; the longer-term graduation rate is not particularly good, either. On the other hand, graduation rate is a measure which covers all different kinds of students; the University must look at what those different groups of students are doing.

The traditional students who work full-time on their studies and graduate in four years are becoming fewer and fewer in number. Many students who come in must work part-time; many are adults who have been out in the world who are returning to complete their degrees or adding courses or taking up different programs to improve employment opportunities; single mothers are another group; there is a whole range of groups, each of which has its own special set of problems. The University must, therefore, be careful in looking at graduation rates.

Dr. Kuhi next said he would like to review some of the elements of the Undergraduate Initiative. One goal is improvement of the entire admissions apparatus, to make it easier for students to apply to the University and to provide them enough information to make an informed decision. The single entry point is part of that effort. Improvement of advising and counseling is another goal; improvement of admissions through a single entry point is not of great moment if there is not adequate advising to meet the needs of students.

Improvement of the educational experience is also being sought, which requires improvement in the quality of the classes that are taught and trying to reduce the number of large classes--although, obviously, a smaller class is not necessarily better than a larger one, because quality depends on course content and who is doing the teaching.

Another theme the University is trying to highlight is to eliminate the barriers to graduation, to ensure that support services are working in the right way so students can have access to the right information at the right time and are able to take the steps necessary to graduate in a reasonable length of time.

There are many issues being discussed in connection with the Initiative, Dr. Kuhl concluded, which refer to activities which are ongoing; there are a number of things which are "gleams in people's eyes"; and there are some things much farther along in planning than others. The goal is to issue these challenges; Minnesota is a public institution and one of its primary responsibilities is to provide a decent education to undergraduates.

The issue is how the University gets from "these wonderful words spoken to the Regents and to the press" down to actually carrying things out. That is where SCEP, the Council of Undergraduate Deans, the admissions task force, and a host of other groups must be involved. The support of the faculty and the deans is critical; the deans are already behind the effort. The advisors must also be involved and support the proposals. A very good start has been made and there is considerable enthusiasm for the proposals. This is, however, a very large campus with a lot of students and "a built-in bureaucracy galore."

Another area where more effectiveness is needed is at those points where students must encounter "the administration" or "the University"; sometimes that meeting is a formidable one.

Dr. Kuhl next made comments on the single point of entry. Concerns which clearly arose during the last part of Dean Magee's presentation, which he shares, include a major attempt at improving the admissions process but at the same time making it clear that the University has preparation standards which students must meet before they arrive. Ultimately there will need to be a discussion of the criteria to be used in choosing incoming students. Dean Magee's point about hoping that the numbers who automatically qualify for admission will not exceed the number of places set aside for them is a concern; the University will have to be extremely careful here. The "social goals" of the University must be met--providing access to an undergraduate education to as many people as are qualified to receive it, which will include looking at a number of different factors such as affirmative action concerns, preparation concerns, areas of the State where students may not have as many opportunities to enroll in courses as students in a more urban area, and so on. This will not be easy, especially as the pressure of numbers starts to increase, making it impossible to simply use the calendar date as a cut-off; at that point it cannot be assumed that there will be enough people left in the pool to make up the student population the University seeks.

Dr. Kuhl said he could speak with conviction on this last point because they had to deal with the same situation at Berkeley (a point which Minnesota is not close to, yet). The pressures at Berkeley were enormous: They had an incoming class of about 3800 for which they had 22,000 applications, all from students who met the 3.3 GPA requirement for entrance. This means there is an incredibly rich group of students from which to choose, but how do you do it? Minnesota will have to worry about that problem as well, at some point, and the sooner the decision on how choices will be made the better.

Berkeley's affirmative action policy, he added, was very simple: If you were eligible for the University and were from an under-represented minority, you were automatically admitted. That policy worked fine when the numbers were low but not as the numbers of qualified students increased dramatically; there is no longer a majority of white students on the Berkeley campus. The affirmative action goal was to try to match the high school graduating classes to the University population with respect to minorities. With careful planning the issues which have arisen at Berkeley (charges of racism, etc.) can be avoided at Minnesota.

The common entry point will, for the next year or two, be a trial while the University waits to see how the numbers work out.

Dr. Kuhi next turned to the uniform tuition question. In his mind the single best reason for the change is simplicity; there is, he said, no better reason. If the University really wants to improve undergraduate education it should simplify the things that it can. The single rate will probably not result in cost-savings but people who spend time on tuition can certainly spend their time on improvement of other services.

One problem the single rate should address is the one of students staying longer in CLA than they should.

The improvement of financial aid is a serious issue which must be addressed because different students will be affected differently; if a phasing-in period is adopted, however, no one should be harmed significantly in the long run. The amount of money involved is not that large; with proper planning the students who will be affected should receive the financial aid they need.

Dr. Kuhi agreed that data generated after the report of the study group was issued should have been prepared while the work of the study group was in progress.

One Committee member contended that the report need not have been rushed to the Board of Regents as quickly as it was and that simplicity was perhaps not as important as "understandableness." Another Committee member pointed out that financial aid had to be repaid and those students who will have the higher burden as a result of uniform tuition will be those who will be less able to repay the loans (e.g., a CLA graduate). The high debt of some students will lead to higher default rates. Students, it was pointed out, have managed to "muddle through" with the current tuition structure, which is preferable to having an increased debt burden after graduation.

Dr. Kuhi responded that financial aid required a hard look, including the way it is announced to students. At present they receive a letter informing them of what they will receive and in what combination (loan, work, and grant); sometimes when they arrive on campus the amount they are told they will receive is different from the amount indicated in the letter. This process must be straightened out. There is also a need to obtain more money in order to increase the amount of outright grants so that loans are not such a big part of the package. Even though the federal government has been cutting down on grant money, the University has an untapped resource in that it has never aggressively pursued the alumni for raising money for scholarships. The alumni base is enormous; by mounting an annual campaign to raise funds it would be possible to help many more students than are now assisted. Dr. Kuhi told the Committee that there is a big difference between Minnesota and other Big Ten schools in financial aid packages provided to students; Minnesota only meets a certain percentage of the total need while other institutions, like Michigan, provide much more, especially for minority students.

Asked about the timing of the uniform tuition and a possible increase in student aid as well as internal shifting of funds to improve the quality of education in the currently low-cost units, Dr. Kuhi said he did not know because it has not been worked out. It will, he repeated, require phasing in order to affect students already enrolled as little as possible.

As far as the unification of honors is concerned, Dr. Kuhi said it would be desirable to have uniform guidelines. This is not an issue with which he has been involved, he noted, but that while some differences among units should be tolerated, there should be some minimal standard of performance across all units which indicates a special level of accomplishment.

On the separation of undergraduates and graduates in 5-XXX courses, Dr. Kuhi said, he had a hard time understanding the issue. If a course is labelled 5-XXX or whatever number, the content of the course and the level at which it is taught should be defined. If it has graduate students in it, so be it. It would be appropriate for SCEP to ask the faculty to adhere to the regulations about such courses but it does not seem necessary to introduce another complicated structure to solve what seems to be a simple problem.

One opinion, Dr. Kuhi was informed, is that the nature of undergraduate education is significantly different from that of graduate education; the former is more oriented to surveys and the integration of topics while graduate is more specialized and research-oriented. To mix the two, in some views, is unsuccessful, and both groups can lose. This appears, however, to vary by field. Dr. Kuhi observed that the differences among fields was important, especially where learning is sequential.

Dr. Kuhi suggested that one reason this may be an issue is because graduate students are taking undergraduate courses. They may be doing so because they haven't had the courses, in which case they should be treated like undergraduates in the course. Another reason, he said, is that some of the graduate programs may have undergraduate courses as requirements; that, he said, he did not understand.

One Committee member commented that a lack of resources may mean a department is unable to have a fully elaborated graduate program; the solution is to have overlap among the courses in order to get by. Creating a 6-XXX level might exaggerate that lack of funds, observed one; another argued it might create pressure to shift funds in order to protect the graduate programs. Those resources, it was further pointed out, would come from Dr. Kuhi's office.

Expectations about the course are another issue; graduate and undergraduate students can both be disappointed at what they encounter in a 5-XXX course. Dr. Kuhi said it may be a question of asking departments to look at their graduate and undergraduate programs and determine what they are doing. Granted that the University is under-funded, departments can nonetheless be asked to examine their programs.

It was also noted that many 5-XXX courses have limited enrollment, especially in the social sciences, but are required in some graduate programs. If 25 of 30 people enrolled are undergraduates, and the course is only offered once per year, the graduate programs are stretched out. Dr. Kuhi responded that if the course is required for graduate students, it is the responsibility of the department to give graduate students priority in enrollment.

This matter of ratio of undergraduates and graduates in a course also affects content, it was argued; the faculty member will "teach down" to the undergraduates. CLA, it was pointed out, does not permit a distinction between graduates and undergraduates in the 5-XXX courses. Dr. Kuhi said that before introducing another layer of courses, a step which has enormous resource implications, the departments

must look at what they are doing. It may be that there are too many people teaching their favorite courses and too little concern about what they themselves have established as the requirements for the degree program.

Asked how this message might be sent to departments, and with effect, Dr. Kuhl suggested that SCEP would be appropriate. There was skepticism about the impact of the Committee (one Committee member commented that "we are pretty good"), but that modesty, Dr. Kuhl said, is unnecessary. He agreed that the new Vice Provost could appropriately take up the matter as well but repeated that SCEP could be more aggressive in its requests. There was agreement that the role of SCEP could be taken up in the future; a stronger role for it, in combination with a strong administration, might be desirable.

Dr. Kuhl recalled that in an earlier SCEP meeting one Committee member had asked rhetorically why Minnesota, with a high tuition, was unable to reach the levels of accomplishment of its peers in the Big Ten. The question is loaded, he said, because other institutions are not tied to the formula established in Minnesota (where tuition must pay for 1/3 of instructional costs). At Berkeley the amount of money a student pays has nothing to do with the cost of instruction; it is not possible to judge how much money an institution has by the level of tuition paid by students. It is unfortunate that the State has the University in this 1/3-2/3 bind; if the legislature were interested in funding higher education at the right level it would, he said, abandon the formula. One undesirable result of this policy, he pointed out, is that when the legislature agrees to hold funding stable while enrollment drops, the first thing that happens is that tuition increases.

Dr. Kuhl next asked Assistant Vice President Kvavik to speak to measures of quality in undergraduate education. Dr. Kvavik told the Committee that a document would be coming out within a week which would address a cluster of issues related to assessment. The specific measures will be less important than the setting of a tone or an ethic for conducting the measurement--principles which should guide the process. One is that whatever measures are used, they should make sense to the students--they should be provided an answer which tells them quality is improving.

Measures will be both quantitative and qualitative. An increase in numbers of everything (majors, classes, etc.), in the 1960s, was deemed an increase in quality; what it led to was over-extension. With Commitment to Focus statements there has been a call for use of measures of quality--of the student experience, of preparation standards, of the quality of study space rather than its quantity, etc. 18 measures of quality have been developed; the ones to be used are still being debated and views will be sought both from SCEP and the undergraduate deans. Graduation rates and retention rates have been used, and will likely continue to be used, but as Dr. Kuhl has pointed out they must be used carefully. Time to completion can also be used, for instance, but only if it identifies barriers for students who want to finish in four years; it should not be used to judge all groups of students or create a "criteria" by which they will be judged.

The administration is also inclined, Dr. Kvavik said, to develop indicators which make sense for those who will use them for program improvements, which means the faculty and the colleges will design measures rather than receiving indicators imposed centrally which may not provide valuable information.

Dr. Kvavik was asked if the measures would help "small units," such as at the department level; could a department use them for improvements. He said that indicators would be "laid on the table" but

not mandated for use; what should be mandated is that measurement take place so that a unit is able to demonstrate that its efforts are having an impact on quality. The Committee member responded that all of these calls for improvement of undergraduate education and graduation rates and so forth is making everyone nervous; the question is how, at the unit level, assessment of improvement can take place. If a department is asked how good its graduation rates are, for instance, most probably have no idea. If the University is interested in undergraduate education there should be a way of showing what has happened; it is not clear, however, that these general indicators will be of help at the local level. Dr. Kvavik said there are really two different kinds of measures, those which make sense centrally--the more global measures--and those which are of use to the units. The global measures, moreover, should be susceptible to analysis at the departmental level. A department may still conclude the measures are not of great use and choose to design its own; the principle, however, is that measures should indicate what a unit is doing.

Dr. Kuhl observed that the real issue is to get everyone concerned about what is being done in undergraduate education, which will really come down to the human connection: The interaction of faculty and staff with students will determine what happens. The same thing is true of goals with respect to minority enrollment; everyone will have to be involved because these are not things which can simply be set down at the top. It is the faculty and department chairs who do the recruiting; they have to be concerned with these efforts.

Dr. Kuhl was asked about the uniform tuition rate: Will CLA be given more funds because tuition is increased? Not necessarily, said Dr. Kuhl. The corollary would be to take away funds from units which are currently charging higher tuition, which will not be done. The real problem is not enough money for doing things required. One result is the imposition of the 2% reallocation on units, which is causing difficulties. Two-thirds of that reallocation will go for salary increases; the remaining one-third will be flexible money which can be used for the Initiative and other programs. In CLA, for example, the administration is well aware that the student/advisor ratio is very poor and that there are not enough sections of certain classes; there has already been a lot of money directed into CLA and there will be more. But those resource decisions cannot be tied directly to the tuition proposal.

Dr. Kuhl reflected that there has been much talk about students subsidizing one another; the real issue is that the State is subsidizing a large fraction of the cost of education and the part paid by the student is relatively small. Who is subsidizing whom, he inquired; the debate should never have gotten onto the subsidization question.

Dr. Kuhl was told, however, that there are parts of the University which have traditionally been underfunded, and instructional costs in which are therefore oppressively low. In the current situation, the increase will as a result be very high. In one department, for instance, the reallocation has led to a ban on use of movies, of copying any materials for classes, and permission of the department chair for long-distance calls--so a faculty member can do nothing except lecture. Comparison with "richer" neighbors, who have such things as laboratories, leads faculty to feel bad for their students, especially when they are told their fees will increase substantially. The result is that the uniform tuition rate rubs some faculty the wrong way, so the plans to infuse funds in those low-cost units is of considerable interest. The tuition plan did not include any such plans. Another Committee member pointed out, on this same point, that the tuition plan will leave the wealthy units wealthy and provide nothing to those which are not.

Dr. Kuhi pointed out that the goal of the 2% reallocation is to try to get units to look at what they are doing. To simply put a ban on movies, copying, and telephone calls is not very creative, he observed; there are areas where enrollments are low or where courses are taught which perhaps should not be. The message to examine activities seems not to be getting across; it is easy to impose across-the-board cuts when resources are limited. The 2% cut will continue for a few years in order to free up funds; in the long run, however, it will have to come to a halt. The main issue, Dr. Kuhi emphasized, is that there is not enough funding from the State for the programs the University offers; the University will obviously argue for additional money for the next biennium but it is not clear that enough will be obtained to fund everything currently offered. That is why the 2% reallocation has been put into effect--to force units to look at what they are doing.

One topic for future discussion by the Committee, Dr. Kuhi suggested, is the MSPAN reports. There is a committee currently at work to formulate the University's views on its position vis-a-vis higher education in the state. The group has been meeting frequently to try to lay out all of the issues, including responding to MSPANI as well as issues likely to be raised by MSPANII. The objective is to produce a position paper in advance of MSPANII in order to avoid being broad-sided (as the University was, to some extent, by MSPANI). A preliminary report will be made to the Regents, probably in May; it would be very appropriate to spend time talking with SCEP about the issues in the report.

Professor Clark concurred that this would be useful; he also suggested that the briefings provided to the Regents on the Initiative are extremely useful but they never make it to the faculty. Dr. Kuhi agreed that thought should be given to improving that communication, although cautioned again that he did not want to get into a "top-down" approach, which doesn't work. One Committee member recalled the open session the chair of the Board of Regents and interim President Sauer held with the faculty and commented that it had been very useful.

Professor Clark thanked Dr. Kuhi for meeting with the Committee.

The Committee adjourned at 5:20.

-- Gary Engstrand