

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, February 9, 2000
1:00 – 3:30
238 Morrill Hall

- Present: Judith Martin (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Steve Fitzgerald, Darwin Hendel, Gordon Hirsch, Emily Hoover, Karen Seashore Louis, (George Green for) Christine Maziar, Kathleen Newell, Marsha Odom, Riv-Ellen Prell, Tina Rovick, Richard Skaggs, Suzanne Bates Smith, Rita Snyder, Thomas Soulen, Steven Sperber, Craig Swan
- Regrets: none
- Absent: none
- Guests: Professor Geoffrey Maruyama (Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics), Messrs. John Blanchard and Jeffrey Schemmel (Academic Counseling; Men's Intercollegiate Athletics), Mss. Donna Olson and Chris Voelz (Women's Intercollegiate Athletics); John Kellogg (Institutional Research and Reporting)
- Other: A WCCO-TV reporter and photographer (for a portion of the meeting)

[In these minutes: athletic scheduling issues; 2001-02 calendar; dean's list clarification; different grading standards for graduate and undergraduate students; authority for the Committee to issue interpretations of policy; due date for fall grades 2000; classroom technology upgrade plan; grading data to the Senate; students enrolling for more than 19 credits]

1. Athletic Scheduling Issues

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Professor Maruyama and the representatives from the academic counseling and the athletic programs. Before turning to the first agenda item, she reported that WCCO TV had inquired if the meeting was open (it is), and said that they would have staff present at 2:00 for the discussion of the policy concerning class notes on the Internet.

Professor Maruyama introduced the others who had joined the meeting and then reviewed a memorandum he had written to Professor Martin outlining schedule conflicts faced by several of the men's and women's intercollegiate athletic teams. [By Senate policy, exceptions to the policy barring student participation in University-sponsored events during study day and finals week requires the approval of the Committee on Educational Policy.] He noted that the change to semesters had affected athletic schedules both in terms of the number of missed class days during a single term and the timing of post-season competition vis-à-vis study day and finals. He also pointed out that a number of the events are in logical progression to a championship, so do not (by Senate policy) require approval, and even though the University of Minnesota has voted against the dates that these events are scheduled, it has been

* 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.

outvoted by the other Big Ten schools. (The option of not participating is unrealistic; by being a member of the Big Ten, it was said, the University commits to participating in events that have been scheduled in accord with established Conference procedures.)

Professor Maruyama reviewed and explained the conflicts for the various teams. The Committee and Ms. Voelz quibbled about what constitutes "logical progression" to a championship, and Committee members asked a number of questions about how many athletes would be affected on each team and what arrangements would be made for those students who lost study day(s) or missed final exams. Mr. Blanchard explained what his office would do to ensure students completed their academic work; in the case of several of the teams involved, it was pointed out, the student-athletes are doing very well academically. Mr. Blanchard also told the Committee that if it is deemed appropriate, a student will not travel with a team in order that he or she can devote time to academic pursuits; such a decision has been made in the past.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the exceptions that Professor Maruyama presented for action. Professor Martin thanked Professor Maruyama for joining the meeting.

2. 2001-2002 Calendar

The Committee turned next to one of its recurring agenda items, the calendar. Dr. Faulkner distributed copies of two calendars, one that paralleled the 1999-2000 calendar and one that called for an earlier start to the spring semester (i.e., cutting short the break by one week) on the Twin Cities campus. Apropos the last, Professor Martin reported that in her inquiries around campus since the alternative had been proposed, she was unable to find anyone who liked it. Ms. Snyder, who had been asked to survey advisors about the proposal, reported that the vast majority of advisors preferred the present January calendar rather than an earlier start.

The status of the Morris and Duluth calendars remained unclear on certain points; it was agreed that Dr. Faulkner would be in touch with individuals on those campuses to ascertain the needed dates. There was also a report that Veterinary Medicine wished to start spring semester on January 10, a week earlier than the rest of the campus; Professor Martin noted that such a change would require the approval of the President. With the understanding that there may be slight changes for Morris and Duluth, the Committee voted unanimously in favor of putting the 2001-2002 calendar on the Senate docket for February 24.

3. Clarification of the Dean's List Requirement

Professor Martin drew the attention of (Assembly) Committee members to a proposed clarification of the requirements for a student to be entered on a dean's list on the Twin Cities campus. Existing policy provides that "all colleges and programs shall publish each term a dean's list, consisting of students who achieved a 3.67 GPA or higher and who completed a minimum of 12 credits (including University College credits). There will be a transcript notation for each term that a student achieves the dean's list."

The Senate office recently received a call inquiring whether the 12 credits all needed to be A-F grades or if some of them could be S-N grades. Professor Martin proposed that the phrase "on the A-F system" be inserted following "(including University College credits)." The commentary to be appended

to the docket item noted, in explaining the proposed change, that absent such a provision, presumably a student could take a 1-credit course, earn an A, take 11 other credits and earn Ss, and qualify for the dean's list. This is not what the Committee had in mind when it recommended the original language to the Assembly.

The Committee approved the recommendation unanimously and without discussion for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly docket. An editorial change was also noted (University College has become the College of Continuing Education).

4. Different Standards for Graduate and Undergraduate Students in the Same Class

Professor Martin now introduced another clarification, this one of the grading policy. The Senate office had received a call from a faculty member asking if it was permissible to differentiate (in terms of course requirements) between graduate and undergraduate students in the same class. She noted that everyone "understood" that such differentiation is permitted, but a call to the Graduate School revealed that there is no policy on the matter. It is only logical that graduate students would be held to a different (higher) standard than undergraduates, because they are receiving GRADUATE credit for the course.

Associate Dean Green concurred; he said this was a central issue in the conversion to semesters and the establishment of 4-XXX (predominantly undergraduate but could carry graduate credit) and 5-XXX courses (predominantly graduate courses but in which undergraduates could enroll). He said he could not imagine the faculty wanted a situation where they could not differentiate between the two categories of students. Not do so would also affect adversely the graduate student experience, he added.

Some Committee members contended that if a class is offered at a certain level, everyone in it should be held to the same standard, and that it was unwise policy to allow students in the same class to be held to different standards. It was noted that in addition to graduate and undergraduate students in the same course, it is not uncommon to have students register for a 1-XXX and 3-XXX course that meets together as one class; students are held to different standards depending on the level at which they registered. This is a resource issue, said another Committee member; ideally, one would not mix up classes of students in the same course, but typically there are not enough students to justify offering separate courses. Will this mean a faculty member could be teaching students in [using the old numbering system] a combined 1-XXX, 3-XXX, 5-XXX, and 8-XXX class, in order to save money, asked one Committee member? This could done much more in order to save money. This will not happen, responded other Committee members.

Associate Dean Green pointed out that there are very different courses and audiences across the University, and that a notion of what fits or works in one discipline might be very different from what works in another. For example, one college he knows of would be devastated if it were not permitted to have two classes of students in the same room. Any standardized policy will affect colleges differently; it is sensible not to legislate a standard but rather to give discretion to colleges and departments in how they deliver their curriculum to their audiences. In addition, said another Committee member, if a course cannot be taught simultaneously to graduate and undergraduate students, it may not be offered at all; she teaches such a course for graduate students, but advanced undergraduates can either take her course or they cannot take a course in the subject.

The Committee agreed without debate that instructors should NOT be permitted to differentiate between different classes of undergraduate students, however (e.g., between freshmen and juniors), unless they had different registrations (e.g., 1-XXX and 3-XXX).

One Committee member expressed a reluctant "constitutionalist" interpretation, noting that this proposal seemed to imply that in order for someone to be able to do something, the something must be made explicit. Professor Martin agreed with the sentiment but said that it appears not everyone understands the common wisdom so the point needs to be clarified.

The Committee then approved the proposal with one "nay" vote.

5. Interpretation Authority

Professor Martin then called attention to a proposed bylaw revision that arose directly from the preceding two items.

The existing bylaw provision chartering and charging this Committee reads, in part, in the "duties and responsibilities" section, "to consult with and advise the president and senior officers it determines appropriate on all matters of educational policy and to recommend to the Senate such policies on educational issues as it deems appropriate and necessary." What has happened, Professor Martin observed, is that questions constantly arise about the Senate policies. As a result, the following language might be added:

"The committee shall have the authority to issue interpretations of Senate policies that it has previously introduced to the Senate and which the Senate and the administration have approved. Those interpretations shall be considered part of the policy once the interpretation has been reported for information at the next Senate meeting following committee approval of the interpretation and neither the Senate nor the president makes objection before or at that Senate meeting. The Senate may, by simple majority of those present and voting, vote not to approve the interpretation, in which case it is not part of the policy. If the president objects, the interpretation must be brought back at the following meeting for a vote by the Senate."

If the Senate were to approve the language, parallel language would be considered to have been approved for the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and would be inserted in the Assembly bylaws.

The proposed comment for this proposal read as follows:

"The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has recently been asked a number of questions about Senate policies which SCEP had earlier brought to the Senate and which had been approved by the Senate and the administration. Some of these questions really required an interpretation of existing policy, rather than an explicit amendment by the Senate.

"Rather than assume that it HAD the authority to issue binding 'interpretations' of educational policies, however, the Committee requests the Senate explicitly to grant it the authority to issue such interpretations. The Committee has no interest in making these interpretations quietly, or surreptitiously, so proposes that any interpretation would not become a binding part of the policy until after it had been

presented for information to the Senate. If a simple majority of those present voted to disapprove the interpretation it would not become effective, at which point SCEP could either redraft it to meet whatever objections were voiced by the Senate or it could drop the matter. If the president objected to the interpretation, the matter would be held over to the next Senate meeting, at which time it would be brought up for a formal vote. We assume that any SCEP chair would withdraw and revise any interpretation were there serious objections made. We also assume that before any interpretation were issued the administrative office concerned with educational policy (which always has representatives on SCEP) would have a hand in drafting it, so would find it satisfactory and thus unlikely to provoke presidential disapproval.

"This proposal is not intended to undermine the authority of the Senate, but rather to smooth the operation of the governance system. We are certain that if there were any doubt about whether a policy question were interpretation or a substantive amendment, SCEP would err on the side of calling it an amendment and bringing it to the Senate for action. At the same time, these questions of interpretation arise continually, and this seems to be a more efficient way to deal with them, in terms of the time of the Senate.

"It is also be noted that this authority only extends to policies that SCEP has previously introduced to the Senate. We do not intend, nor do we propose the authority, to issue interpretations of policies or other documents brought to the Senate by any other committee."

The Committee approved the proposed revision without discussion and without dissent.

6. Use of Class Notes

The Committee turned next to revisions in the draft policy it had previously approved concerning how students may make use of their class notes. Committee members were provided editorial suggestions from a member of the General Counsel's staff as well as copies of email comments that a number of faculty had offered and materials from outside the University that addressed the issue.

Professor Martin noted that there are a number of companies around the country that solicit students to take notes and post them on a web site. The practice came up in a number of faculty discussions, and individuals were not happy that their names were attached to the notes. About 80% of the emails she has received on the topic have favored the Committee (the University) taking some action to prevent students from placing class notes on the web; the remainder see this as a First Amendment issue and view any University action as an attempt to restrain free speech.

Her own perspective, she said, is that faculty are moving more and more to promote active learning, and note-taking is a passive form of active learning. If students obtain notes from someone else, there is always the risk that they will be inaccurate or incomplete; if such notes are distributed more broadly than a loan to another student, and placed where all can see them, then there should be a warning parallel to that printed on cigarette packages.

One Committee member pointed out that in some professional schools, there are note-takers who take notes and distribute them to students in a class, for pay. But these notes are only for students in the class. Faculty may not always appreciate this practice, but they tolerate it.

Committee members made a number of points in the ensuing discussion.

- The fact that a faculty member's name is on a web site, indicating the notes came from his or her course, does not violate proprietary rights.
- This is not really a problem, and it is unlikely that one could put a warning on web sites (the commercial web sites do carry all kinds of cautions about the class notes). Students must be taught to be skeptical of web sites, to recognize that someone else's notes may not be the best, and that they miss a lot when they do not come to class. There are other ways to be sure that students are engaged in a class, such as required in-class activities and grading based in part on class participation. The comments about the restraint on free speech are striking, and there should be value place on getting ideas out as widely as possible.
- The concern is not only about protecting students from being stupid. Faculty use materials from others, with attribution, in class; those materials then appear on a web site without attribution. That may create legal vulnerability. (Other Committee members were not sure this was the case.)
- The views that favor free speech are understandable, but the language in the draft before the Committee speaks of COMMERCIAL use of notes. One can comfortably oppose using notes for commercial purposes. Faculty are not restrained by the policy; they can permit to students to place notes on the web.
- The point of contention for many is the SALE of notes rather than broad dissemination per se.
- Any action taken under this policy would be internal University action, not litigation against an outside company.
- It should be made clear to students in the advising process that to post notes on a web site, for money, is a violation of academic integrity.
- Sharing notes has pedagogical value and should not be discouraged. "Broad dissemination" per se should not be barred by the policy.

With minor amendments to the draft circulated at the meeting, the Committee voted unanimously in favor of placing the policy on the docket of the Senate for action. The proposed policy reads as follows [the text of the Senate item extends to the next item in these minutes]:

Policy on Use of Class Notes for Commercial Purposes

Preamble

The faculty of the University of Minnesota encourage students to take notes in their classes, laboratories, and the many and diverse other instructional settings in which they participate as they pursue their education at the University. Taking notes is a means of recording information but more importantly of personally absorbing and integrating the educational experience.

It is recognized that sharing of notes among classmates occurs occasionally, especially among friends if one misses a class or if there is a shared academic project or other legitimate collaboration among students in a class. The faculty also recognize that collaborative note-sharing and discussion helps students learn.

However, the organization, preparation, and presentation of materials in a class or other instruction setting represents the intellectual effort of the faculty or instructor. Faculty have an interest in protecting this intellectual effort and in assuring the accuracy of any public representations of their course lectures. The sale or broad dissemination for commercial purposes of class notes by students without faculty permission violates these interests and is considered an offense against the academic community.

Regulations

1. Students may not distribute class notes, handouts, or other instructor-provided materials for commercial purposes, through the Internet, or for any reason other than personal study among classmates enrolled in the course, without the express written consent of the instructor.

2. The provisions of this policy are enforceable as University rules under the University of Minnesota Statement of Standards of Student Conduct, and violations may result in warning, required compliance, confiscation, probation, suspension, or expulsion.

3. If the faculty of a department or collegiate unit, as a group, or individual faculty in a particular course, have assented to or authorized distribution of class notes, such practices do not violate this policy.

4. This policy is effective Fall Semester 2000.

NOTE: Any faculty member/instructor who intends to file a complaint against a student for violating the provisions of this policy is more likely to be successful if there is a clear statement on the syllabus that notifies students of the provisions of this policy. The simplest way to provide such notice to students would be to incorporate the first two numbered items of the policy on the syllabus.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) has been made aware of various entrepreneurial organizations that hire students to take notes in classes (typically large lecture classes) and then post the notes on a web site for other students to use. A number of institutions have taken steps to stop the practice. SCEP believes that such a practice is both unethical and educationally unsound, so proposes this policy to the Senate.

While SCEP is reluctant to recommend yet additional required language for a course syllabus, the Committee was advised that if students are not given adequate notice of the existence of the policy, it is unlikely that a complaint against them would be successful if there were no notice on the syllabus. So, the Committee does not REQUIRE that notice of this policy be placed on syllabi, but cautions faculty that if they wish to prevent notes taken in their classes from being distributed on the Internet or in other ways, they should include adequate notice on their syllabus. [End of Senate docket item on class notes.]

7. Twin Cities Fall Semester Grade Deadline

Professor Martin now asked Committee members if they wished to make any statement about the proposed fall semester, 2000, grade due date for the Twin Cities proposed by Ms. VanVoorhis. She noted that Ms. VanVoorhis has the authority, under Assembly policy, to set the due date at 72 business hours after finals end, but said that she had told Ms. VanVoorhis "there will be a revolution" if the due date is December 28. Did the Committee wish to take a stand? ("You mean, so we don't get shot, too?" quipped one Committee member.)

One Committee member said he found Ms. VanVoorhis's arguments compelling, and that he has been turning in grades for many years and has always met the 72-hour deadline. Is it possible for the Committee to act to approve her decision, asked another? It was pointed out by another that in the Big Ten only Penn State allows more than 72 hours to turn in grades, and both Michigan and Wisconsin have finals that run as late as Minnesota's but have earlier due dates for grades than Ms. VanVoorhis has proposed.

Ms. VanVoorhis must recognize that this will be an unpopular decision that may be subject to change, observed one Committee member.

There is a moral force for abiding by the deadline because late reporting hurts students; the Committee should lend weight to that force and urge its colleagues to act responsibly.

The Committee wishes to take no action, Professor Martin concluded, and moved on to the next agenda item.

8. Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan

[The following excerpt from the 2/1/00 minutes of the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning summarizes the presentation on classroom technology upgrade plans by Mr. Fitzgerald. The same handout was provided to SCEP and the same presentation made.]

2. Report from the Office of Classroom Management

Professor Gudeman welcomed Mr. Fitzgerald and Dr. Swan to the meeting to report on a general purpose classroom technology upgrade plan.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted that his office had been created about eight months ago as a direct result of reports dating back to 1995 and because of specific recommendations from the Subcommittee on Twin Cities Facilities and Support Services that were later approved by the University Senate. He was hired to implement the recommendations in the reports. One of the issues that must be addressed is technology in the classroom; the problems and the identification of what lacks has been clearly documented, he said, and does not need further study. The problem is well-defined and what is needed is action.

Mr. Fitzgerald distributed copies of a set of slides and walked the Committee through them. The points he made included the following:

-- 75% of Twin Cities general purpose classrooms lack any data/video projection capability; 73% lack instructor internet connectivity.

-- The demand for technology in classrooms already exceeds supply. The problem is getting worse; demand is growing exponentially and the University is falling behind other institutions. New and current faculty, TAs, and students increasingly insist on technology; many are taking training in the use of technology, such as the multimedia development courses offered by the Digital Media Center.

-- The goals for the classroom technology upgrade are to rapidly establish (by 2004) a new baseline for classroom technology that includes an internet-capable instructor station, data/video projector capability, a user-friendly laptop interface, faculty support structure for in-class problem resolution, and funding for life-cycle and replacement costs of new equipment and systems.

Mr. Fitzgerald said that having a user-friendly laptop interface was a key part of the program. With one simple plug-in and a single push of a button, the instructor is up and running on the data projector in either a Mac or PC environment. Using a laptop instead of a permanently-installed computer is critical because of acquisition cost, rapid obsolescence, security, and most importantly from the teaching perspective, configuration control. With a personally-controlled laptop, the instructor would know the machine, its operation and content, and he or she would not be vulnerable to others using or changing it. Mr. Fitzgerald said that it is also essential that there be recurring funding for replacement; right now the University funds classroom needs primarily on a one-time basis, when the situation is critical. Increasingly, equipped classrooms will need life-cycle funding.

One Committee member said that the baseline for faculty support should be a telephone in the classroom that the instructor can use to call about problems. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed, and added that there needed to be staff to respond to the calls as well.

-- The classroom upgrade plan consists of "tech packages" that would be installed starting now and completed in all general-purpose classrooms within four years and it would include a front-end focus on mid-size classrooms (40-60 students).

-- The upgrade plan would focus now on basic teaching technology and later (2003 and beyond) on in-classroom student network connections. This will allow him to concentrate near-term classroom funding on technology support for the instructor, and will allow the emerging wireless technology to mature so that it can be incorporated into the student connections.

-- Internet connections at classroom instructor stations would be accelerated and completed by 2003, there would be classroom support positions filled to deal with classroom problems, and life-cycle costs and replacement costs would begin to be funded.

-- One upgrade package would consist of a projector, laptop interface, control system, low cost digitizer/visualizer, basic sound system, wireless mic (in some rooms), lectern, and VCR (in addition to the existing overhead). The other upgrade package (for smaller rooms) would have a lesser sound system and not the digitizer or wireless mic. Both packages include the basic

elements of data projection, laptop interface/control system, and VCR. Either could include a slide projector, additional I/O device or other special-purpose equipment.

-- The plan is to have about 300 classrooms internet and projector capable by 2003.

-- The total one-time costs for the upgrade would be \$7 million (about \$31,000 per classroom); annual recurring costs would be about \$1.3 million, or about \$4,200 per classroom. The annual costs include a "ready response" telephone hotline and staff as well as equipment replacement costs. Mr. Fitzgerald said it is important not to orphan equipment in the classrooms; once the decision is made to upgrade, it cannot be reversed, because once faculty and students start using integrated technology in the classroom, it cannot be allowed to wither. The funding does include replacement, so additional funds would not be requested (barring a decision to change to more expensive technology or upgrade further).

These costs are consistent with the 1995 report and with the recommendations of STCFSS.

Asked about the availability of funding, Mr. Fitzgerald said he understood that there is some one-time money available to start the process; the Committee could recommend that it be used for this purpose. One concern Mr. Fitzgerald expressed was about timing; it is almost getting too late to order long lead-time equipment and to schedule work this coming summer. On the other hand, as prospective students look at the University, it will not be competitive with the classrooms it now has so it needs to move ahead rapidly and take maximum advantage of summer and semester break periods.

The \$7 million is net new dollars, Dr. Swan observed; there is \$150,000 in recurring funds now available for maintenance and replacement. He agreed that it is good news that the University is finally taking this seriously, and said that the numbers are digestible--and if the University does not spend the money, it will remain in terrible shape in its classrooms. [End of excerpt from the Finance and Planning minutes]

Professor Ahern said he appreciated the plans that were being presented but pointed out that it was entirely a Twin Cities matter, even though it responded to a concern expressed by the Senate and its committees. All of the points that Mr. Fitzgerald apply equally to Duluth and Morris (Crookston is significantly more advanced than the other campuses in classroom technology). The presentation and documents refer to the Senate, and it is inappropriate to develop such a plan and framework for one campus. The office of the Executive Vice President and Provost is a central office. The Twin Cities should go ahead with these plans, but the other campuses should not be disadvantaged.

Dr. Swan noted, as did Mr. Fitzgerald, that the charter for Mr. Fitzgerald's office is only for the Twin Cities and that the other campuses do not face the magnitude of the problem that confronts the Twin Cities. The scale on the Twin Cities campus (over 220 classrooms) means that it will take years to correct. Professor Ahern pointed out that personnel is scaled to the campus, and reiterated that anything described as a Senate issue should cover all campuses. He urged the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy to take action on Mr. Fitzgerald's report, but also urged that the SENATE Committee on Educational Policy make it clear that there is a similar crying need on the other campuses.

One Committee member inquired if this issue had been presented to the Senate Committee on Information Technology; Mr. Fitzgerald said the general topic had been mentioned some time ago, but that these specific plans had not. He added that from his standpoint, it is urgent that he move rapidly and get the word out as much as possible; he does not want to see this work delayed.

One Committee member raised a question about LAN port charges. If the current model of charging is used, significant improvement of web connections in the classroom will not be possible because it will cost far too much money. Dr. Swan said that he has had conversations with Mr. Cawley about this, and Mr. Cawley recognizes that the current cost model is not appropriate. For the Twin Cities, Mr. Fitzgerald reported, the port charges would exceed \$1 million per year.

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy unanimously endorsed the resolution that the Committee on Finance and Planning had adopted on February 1:

"The Committee receives enthusiastically and strongly endorses the recommendation for the general purpose classroom technology upgrade and urges it receive the highest priority for funding and implementation at the earliest possible date."

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy then voted unanimously that it would draft and adopt a statement saying that there needed to be a common effort efforts to improve classroom technology on all campuses.

9. Grading Data to the Senate

Professor Martin now welcomed John Kellogg to the meeting. Mr. Kellogg presented a sample table with dummy data on grades awarded. The data would be presented by course designator and level and would include the total number of grades awarded, the % of grades that were A, and the "GPA" of each course level.

The Committee discussed the format with Mr. Kellogg, and agreed that the data reported should be only for undergraduates and that there should be a summary column so there would be an overall "GPA" for all designators. It was agreed that the Committee wished to see the actual Fall Semester data when it is prepared, before it is brought to the Senate.

10. Students Enrolling for More than 19 Credits

Mr. Kellogg also presented data from last year and this year (fall terms) on the number of students who enrolled for 20 or more credits. It was recalled that the Committee had been concerned that the tuition structure, with all credits over the 12th offered at half price, could encourage students to enroll for significantly more credits than was wise (or than they could complete).

From 1998-99 to 1999-2000 there was a significant DROP in the number of students who enrolled for 20 or more credits. The data for 1998-99 may be skewed, Mr. Kellogg agreed, because students may have piled up credits in order to complete degrees under the quarter system. It was also pointed out that the 1998-99 data likely include a lot of "closure": students who may have taken

Incompletes but who have now completed them; the 1999-2000 data, on the other hand, would not include those, so that information may not be comparable.

It appears, for now, that the Committee's worries have not come to pass, Professor Martin concluded. She thanked Mr. Kellogg for bringing the information and then adjourned the meeting at 3:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota