

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, April 26, 2000
1:00 – 3:00
238 Morrill Hall

Present: Judith Martin (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Leanne Baylor, Steve Fitzgerald, Darwin Hendel, Emily Hoover, (George Green for) Christine Maziar, Kathleen Newell, Marsha Odom, Riv-Ellen Prell, Tina Rovick, Richard Skaggs, Suzanne Bates, Rita Snider, Thomas Soulen, Rachel Sullivan, (Linda Ellinger for) Craig Swan

Regrets: Steven Sperber

Absent: Charles Henderson, Gordon Hirsch, Karen Seashore Louis

Guests: Professor John Adams (chair, ROTC Subcommittee)

[In these minutes: Report on ROTC programs; second-tier admissions standards; discontinued registration due to extenuating circumstances; uniformity of policy; interdisciplinary minors]

1. Report from the ROTC Subcommittee

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 1:10 and welcomed Professor Adams to present the report of the ROTC Subcommittee. Professor Adams distributed copies of his written report (attached to these minutes as Appendix I) and reviewed its contents for the Committee.

Several points were raised in the discussion.

-- What kind of courses are taught in ROTC programs? Many deal with leadership issues and with national security matters. They also include military history and current events as related to the services.

-- The current members of the ROTC Subcommittee have not requested that they be replaced and the subcommittee should be able to continue as is.

-- Should minors in Military Science be available to non-ROTC students? (Should a physics major be able to minor in military history?) This is being looked at. Is there any reason it should not be considered, Professor Adams asked the Committee? It is the view of the ROTC programs that since they are already on campus, are paid with tax dollars, and are teaching the courses anyway, they see no reason why other students should not be able to take a minor in military science.

One issue is professional qualifications, said one Committee member; most of the instructors in the ROTC program have bachelor's or master's degrees, not Ph.D.s. Another issue is a collegiate home for the minors; who will sponsor them?

* 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.

-- The services have summer programs (basic camp and advanced camp); is it appropriate to think about awarding credit for these camps, akin to credits earned for internships or service learning?

Is there a legitimate academic component to these programs, asked one Committee member? Credit is given for an internship not for the work done but for the paper or other academic product that must come from the internship.

Another Committee member recalled that during the Vietnam era, when anti-ROTC sentiment ran high, one rationale for ROTC being on campus was that having it in an academic environment would mean it was not cut off from education and that the University could humanize the military. Giving credit for summer camp and offering minors for non-ROTC students do not accord with that rationale. Another Committee member took issue with the claim about the minors and said that the purpose WOULD be served if ROTC courses included non-ROTC students--that could make the classroom less homogeneous and the discussions more diverse. In no event, however, should summer camp be awarded academic credit, it was said.

-- On the question of Regents' scholarships for ROTC staff, one Committee member pointed out that the cost of the scholarships are paid by a small percentage assessment on the employee categories. If the staff are paid through the University, perhaps they could be included in the assessment. If they are paid directly by the Department of Defense, then it could be a trickier matter. It does seem likely, however, that the University might end up with higher quality staff if it could offer the Regents' scholarships.

Professor Adams said he thought the programs were working well, that the students are getting good instruction, and that he is glad they are on campus.

One Committee member inquired if they do any surveys of students who have completed the programs to see what they think about their participation. Professor Adams said he did not believe they did but that he would make the suggestion.

Dr. Ellinger noted that the reporting line for the ROTC programs will change on July 1 from the Office of Student Development to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Professor Martin thanked Professor Adams for his report.

2. Second-Tier Admissions Standards

Professor Martin next turned to a number of items that need discussion by the Committee, the first of which is second-tier admissions. One Committee member inquired what "second-tier admissions" refers to; Professor Martin explained that they are standards that a department (or college) might impose in order for a student to gain entrance to a major (for example, a department may require a 3.0 GPA for admission, or may require that certain courses have been completed, and so on). She noted that the Committee has discussed this issue on several occasions. The POLICY, for the Twin Cities campus, is that NO second-tier admissions standards are permissible unless approved by the dean and by the Provost. (There is no University-wide policy on second-tier admissions standards so the other campuses can choose to have them or not, as they wish.)

Dr. Ellinger reported that there have been lengthy discussions with colleges about second-tier admissions standards. The Provost's office approves without much reservation curricular standards or a requirement for a portfolio in the arts, for example. On the other hand, GPA requirements were getting out of hand and departments were setting standards without data just because they thought it would be better to have better students. The Standard Undergraduate Practices approved by the Campus Assembly, however, called for keeping these standards to a minimum in order that students with a 2.3 GPA--students in good standing--have choices of majors.

Asked how many majors were constricted, Dr. Ellinger said that about two-thirds had imposed GPA requirements before the policy was adopted. CLA had the fewest; almost all others had GPA requirements by department or across the college.

The Provost's office has spent a lot of time reviewing requests for second-tier admissions, Dr. Ellinger reported. They are not being draconian about denying the requests; some programs are "wildly oversubscribed" and need a standard (e.g., nursing, some clinical programs, some IT programs). CLA has tried to hold the line and requested only two standards, both also in heavily-subscribed programs. In some cases there are other requirements, such as a portfolio for Art or a performance requirement for Dance, but those are related to the curriculum. She concluded that there are still second-tier standards but that they have been scrutinized, and the colleges have made good-faith efforts to open as many majors as possible.

Asked if prerequisite coursework needs approval from the Provost's office, Dr. Ellinger said that technically it does not but that they would appreciate knowing about it because it helps to have the record. It is most important that the requirements be in the bulletin so that there is full disclosure and not behind-the-scenes requirements.

What about a student who wants to change colleges, asked one Committee member? The initial look at second-tier admissions was at departments; no one looked at college barriers. Vice Provost Swan is looking at that now. A student in the University trying to change colleges is as subject to department and college requirements as a student coming in from outside the University, commented one Committee member. Getting in the University does not entitle one to get around requirements. Colleges might be more lenient with internal transfers, Dr. Ellinger surmised, but in the oversubscribed programs no one with a 2.0 GPA will get in whether they are from a private college or another University college.

The goal of the policy, Professor Martin observed, was idealistic: to make all parts of the University accessible to all students. The reality of demands for space require limits.

One Committee member inquired about a department that has a second-tier admission standard of a 3.0 GPA and space for 150 students; what happens when 300 students with a 3.0 GPA apply? How does it decide? That varies by department, Dr. Ellinger said; some use other standards and she knew of none that take only the applicants with the highest GPAs. They look at things like work and internships as well. In response to a question, Dr. Ellinger said she was "fairly" convinced that second-tier standards are based on an academic rationale rather than trying to achieve a specific number of students.

Another Committee member pointed out that date of application is also a standard, one that is non-judgmental. One can decide by date of application or by lottery. One could be more comfortable

with second-tier standards if they are based on a sound academic rationale--and that all who meet the standard are then admitted by a non-judgmental standard such as a lottery. The question is how best to deal with the situation of having more qualified applicants than spaces. There is, said another, a difference between undergraduate and graduate programs. Graduate programs are based entirely on merit while at the undergraduate level this is a land-grant institution. At the undergraduate level there should be a lottery for qualified applicants.

Dr. Ellinger said there are extremely few programs at the University that are oversubscribed after adoption of a GPA standard and a few defensible non-GPA requirements. But those programs are high profile, it was said, and will be where the principle is important.

Professor Martin reported that some Faculty Consultative Committee members expressed concern with expansion of the freshman class recently there will be a bulge when those new students try to get into majors. Dr. Ellinger said she did not believe that would happen. In addition, said another Committee member, there is a continuing flow of transfer students from MnSCU. One Committee member said one must assume that colleges, as they plan, take into account the number of students they expect and the resources they will need for majors.

Committee members discussed the matter for a short additional while and then asked that it be provided data next year on where the barriers to admission to majors are, especially with respect to transfer students. It was agreed that Vice Provost Swan would talk with the Committee about this issue.

3. Discontinued Registration

Ms. Rovic noted that a question had been raised whether there is any policy about permitting students to discontinue their registration due to extenuating circumstances (e.g., serious illness, accident, etc.).

Dr. Ellinger reported that the University does permit a retroactive cancellation due to extenuating circumstances if the student can demonstrate a problem. The student must petition for the cancellation and there can be financial aid consequences. Students who want to make this choice are counseled seriously about it beforehand. One Committee member observed that there would be a set of Ws on the transcript, indicating withdrawal; is that a problem?

One Committee member opined that no graduate or professional school admissions committee would hold such a set of Ws against an applicant if there were a reasonable explanation. One problem might be, it was said, that no one would ask, and a group of Ws would be taken as a signal the student cannot complete work. Attaching a one-paragraph explanation of a one-term event would mean that no committee would hold the Ws against a student. Disclosure is better than leaving it a mystery subject to inferences that may not be warranted. The problem, again, might be that undergraduates would not know to include such an explanation--or would not believe an explanation would make any difference.

The Committee concluded that it needed to take no action. It also agreed that students could not request a retroactive cancellation later than a year after the term because that would require changing grades--and grade changes are limited to one year, once the recently-adopted Senate policy is approved by the administration. The Committee concluded it would issue an Interpretation of the Senate policy limiting grade appeals to clarify that a change from a grade to a W is a grade change.

4. Uniformity of Policy

Professor Ahern explained that after the last meeting he had exchanged emails with Professor Martin and the author of these minutes about whether colleges and campuses can adopt more exacting standards than set by all-University policy: are the Senate policies minimum standards or are they to be followed exactly? He was told, he related, that more stringent policies are not acceptable. In the case of repeating a course, for example, all-University policy (until the change adopted at the last Senate meeting) allowed a student to re-take a course as often as he or she wished and called for the last grade earned to count in the GPA. Morris, however, required scholastic committee approval for a student to re-take a course. Is that a violation of Senate policy? This is not a burning question, he added, but it is one that ought to be addressed because there are natural variations between units.

Senate policy is for the whole University, said one Committee member, and if a campus or unit wishes to deviate from the policy, that must be addressed. Some policies are clearly a floor (e.g., admissions), but course repeats does not seem to be of that type. It is not Senate policy if a unit can decide to apply it only if it wishes. Another Committee member also spoke in favor of uniform application with the understanding that a unit could appeal for an exemption if it had a rational reason for doing so.

Senate policy is for ALL campuses, said another Committee member, which should mean that the policy applies to the campus unless they obtain an exemption. This may be an issue that FCC should discuss, Professor Martin suggested. It may also be appropriate to review existing Senate policies and determine if there are those which require adherence as written and those which could be seen as floors. It may be that the Senate in the future will have to be clear about which policies are floors and which are to be applied exactly as adopted.

Did this question arise, for example, asked another Committee member, in the context of the recent change in repeating a course? The new policy provides that a student may repeat a course only once and that the second grade earned will count in the GPA. What about a student who obtains a grade below a C- in a required course; would that prevent the student from graduating? It would, it was said, but the dean would have the authority to waive the college or department policy concerning the course.

5. Interdisciplinary Minors

Professor Martin noted that the Senate had received a question about whether there is policy governing interdisciplinary minors. There is not, she said, but Dr. Ellinger can speak to the point.

Dr. Ellinger explained that there are only a handful of interdisciplinary minors. The Provost's office has established a one-page set of guidelines to be followed in establishing such minors when they cross college lines (attached to these minutes as Appendix II). A few minors have been approved; some are in development. A college follows its own guidelines when a cross-disciplinary minor is entirely within one college.

It was agreed that there was no need for the Committee to take any action in this area.

Professor Martin adjourned the meeting at 2:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * * *

Appendix I

26 April 2000

To: Senate Committee on Educational Policy

From: John S. Adams, Professor and Chair, Department of Geography
Chair: SCEP Subcommittee on ROTC Programs

Regarding: Subcommittee Annual Report

Background on ROTC Programs. ROTC programs at the University of Minnesota include: Dept of Aerospace Studies (Air Force ROTC); Dept of Military Science (Army ROTC); and Dept of Naval Science (Navy/Marine ROTC). Programs centered in the Armory. The University has contract with each service (Air Force, Army, Navy) to host programs. Each service assigns a senior officer to head each program. Senior officers hold the rank of Professor. Junior officers join their commanders in teaching ROTC courses and are appointed as Assistant Professors. Each service has one or more enlisted personnel and/or civilian office staff.

Subcommittee Duties. The SCEP Subcommittee on ROTC Programs reviews all proposed appointments to teaching posts, and makes appropriate recommendations to academic administration prior to their appointment to the faculty. Officers remain on teaching faculty for tours of two to three years.

Subcommittee monitors all academic aspects of the ROTC programs, responding to issues brought to its attention by unit commanders, and brings University issues to the committee as need arises. Subcommittee meets three or four times per year. Besides commanders and subcommittee members, meetings usually include three to six student leaders holding command positions within their units.

During the past year, the following issues were addressed:

1. Questions raised by SCEP in Spring 1999 Subcommittee Report:

How many credits may an ROTC student earn in ROTC classes that can be included in the 120 (180 under quarters) needed for a degree?

-Depends on the number of free electives available in the student's major.

How does the number vary by college?

-Depends on space in the major.

What are the rules for an ROTC minor?

-Navy and Air Force have none. Army has minor in Military Science through University College.

How are ROTC courses reviewed?

-Each service receive tasks, which determine curriculum. Curriculum is fixed by appropriate command (Dept of the Army, Dept of the Navy, etc.). In past, when changes were made in ROTC curricula, they were sent to chair of SCEP for approval.

Were there any problems with semester conversion?

-No problem; ROTC courses are usually defined for a semester-based system.

How do ROTC scholarships affect student choices of where to attend college?

-Navy scholarships are applied for and awarded centrally from Pensacola, and are portable to school that accepts the student (academic program + ROTC program).

-Air Force has a combined system: most scholarships awarded centrally from Maxwell AFB, but local commander at U of M has a local board that can award 2 scholarships per year.

-Army competition is all local, with local commander running the board that awards a certain number of scholarships allocated to the U of M program each year.

-University of St. Thomas has a separate Air Force ROTC program and scholarships. Army and Navy programs at U of M include cadets/midshipmen from neighboring colleges and universities.

-National Guard members receive 61 percent of tuition and fees. Guard members are all locally based.

What kind of service obligations do ROTC students incur upon graduation?

-Formal obligation is 8 years for all.

-Term of active duty varies.

-Scholarship students usually have active duty obligation longer than non-scholarship students.

-Active duty varies from 3 to 5 years; not all go active duty.

-This year: Army commissions about 15; one-third go to Army Reserve or National Guard; two-thirds will go active duty in regular army. Air Force, 9 to 11 to be commissioned, all will go active duty; total unit membership is 63. Navy, all will go active, 8-9 commissioned in May, another 2-3 in December. There are 61 or 62 midshipmen in the unit. Numbers dropped a few years ago when the unit was scheduled to phase out, now recovering. Sophomore enrollments: 16-17, plus 22 Marines. Fall freshmen enrollment 10 certain, 20-25 likely. Freshmen year free of commitments; contract comes later.

What are majors of ROTC students?

-Navy: strong in IT majors

-Air Force: many IT majors, many CLA.

-Army: various, many colleges.

2. Qualifications for appointment of instructors to ROTC programs.

SCEP policy adopted in 1993 requires ROTC instructors to hold a masters degree or be qualified to enter a masters program at the University. Policy did not specify that the instructor was required to actively pursue a masters degree in order to be appointed to teach.

Committee raised a question whether present rules were working satisfactorily. ROTC commanders reported that in almost all cases where instructors lacking masters degrees had been appointed, they had been admitted to appropriate programs and were pursuing degrees. Holding a graduate degree is an important credential for officers hoping for advancement to field grade (major/lieutenant commander, lieutenant colonel/commander, colonel/captain).

-Committee raised question whether the Assistant Professor classification (9403) is appropriate for junior ROTC faculty, and that perhaps Instructor classification (9404) would be more appropriate for those lacking a graduate degree. Committee is pursuing analysis of these options with the provost's office. Reason for raising the issue is to avoid unnecessary precedents, and to align appointment classes with academic qualifications and with duties attached to each appointment.

3. Subcommittee Membership.

SCEP established the membership structure for the subcommittee in 1998.

-Questions were raised during the year regarding expanded student membership. The committee decided that present student participation was satisfactory and saw no need for changes.

-A question arose about committee representation for the Air Force ROTC unit at UMD, headed by Lt. Col. Carol Wolosz. In the past, the UMD unit had a member on the committee. Col. Wolosz would like to sit in on committee meetings. Craig Swan is exploring with Duluth colleagues whether that participation would in any way be a problem.

4. Leadership Minors.

On 10 Dec 1999, the Regents approved an interdisciplinary minor in leadership for undergraduate students, a collaboration between the Office of Student Development, the College of Education and Human Development, and the HHH Institute. The minor includes a freshman course, an intermediate course, and a credited internship. ROTC courses not part of the package.

-The CLA Bulletin states (p. 11): "A minor is an approved concentration of 15 to 25 3xxx and 5xxx credits in a single department or program. It is not a requirement for graduation, but rather it is an option available to all but B.I.S. candidates and to degree candidates in other colleges who wish to complete an area of concentration outside their major. CLA allows up to 20 percent of minor credits to be taken on an S-N basis or earned through directed study, directed instruction, or independent study." Minors are listed on p. 10 (ROTC programs are not on list).

According to University rules on minors, it would appear that there is no obstacle to ROTC programs establishing their own minor programs.

-Program commanders raised the idea of Military, Aerospace and Naval Science Minors. During a TRI-Service meeting they discussed this with Jane Canney and she thought it belonged in the ROTC Relations area.

-This question is being pursued.

5. Other Academic Issues.

Another issue that Cadet Command believes is important:

-academic credit for summer ROTC Basic Camp and summer Advanced Camp

6. Parking Fees.

-Cadet Command's position on parking fees is that military personnel instructing University courses are not paid from University funds, yet they bring dollars into the University. Therefore the argument that they should not be treated differently from other faculty and staff and therefore must pay for parking fails to hold. Military personnel are different because of the dollars they bring into the University for salaries and for tuition scholarships.

7. Regents Scholarships for ROTC Instructional Personnel.

Commanders requested that we examine the possibility of including the CIC, specifically the faculty/staff teaching the leadership minor. Second, in view of the recent clarification exempting ROTC Faculty from the Regents Scholarship, request a committee finding to support University administration action on appropriate U of M graduate school tuition assistance for ROTC faculty. This would be a "win/win" situation as described last year in a point paper to OSDA.

- ROTC faculty is salaried by DoD, and the University of Minnesota gets their services without payroll cost.

- If enrolled here ROTC faculty will spend their Federal tuition assistance (TA) here. But, due to annual cap, federal TA is insufficient to cover all annual tuition if degree completion is attempted in the two to three years of their assignments. Result is substantial out-of-pocket cost to complete degree.

- Some ROTC faculty have chosen (due to cost) to enroll in other local area postgraduate education and to spend their Federal TA elsewhere. U of M enrollment is potentially better for them (quality/commuting) and for our U of M students (faculty hours available on UofM campus, and added U of M class advisor/counseling insight).

- ROTC faculty work generates significant revenue for the University (documented/reported to OSDA in a 1998 study).

- University encourages ROTC faculty (and in one case has required) to pursue post baccalaureate degree at U of M (if not already held), as a condition of University acceptance for assignment here by the DoD.

- While not always voluntary, the Services try to assign these individuals based on their preferences. U of M "competes" with other institutions for the "best" nominees "who want to be here." Many factors are significant in attracting nominees. Other than their basic allowance for housing, ROTC faculty income is not adjusted by DoD for the location of an assignment. So, in addition to (1) location of their extended family, and (2) quality of the institution, their out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., family medical expenses, parking, recreational sports facilities are all "high" costs in Mpls/St Paul and on TC campus), including the cost of postgraduate study, are significant factors. Some (but not all) other institutions (including some state colleges/universities) do provide some tuition assistance to ROTC Faculty.

The Subcommittee is continuing to work on this issue.

-Perhaps ten officers would be involved at any one time.

-Marginal cost per registration would be low.

-Such a program would help attract the best officers to teach here.

-Majority of colleges and universities hosting ROTC programs around the country do offer some type of tuition assistance (treating ROTC instructors as faculty members; as in-state residents; etc.)

-Office of VP for Human Resources office has concerns regarding exposure to other initiatives if this kind of assistance were provided, for example, other "Contract Faculty" (formerly known as "non-regular," i.e., non-tenured and non-tenure-track) whether full-time or part-time.

Appendix II

General Guidelines and Information on Designing an Interdisciplinary Minor

The purpose of these guidelines is to facilitate the development of interdisciplinary minors to serve students' educational needs. The guidelines are intended to provide a minimal level of oversight to assure that minors are of high quality and that someone is responsible for managing and overseeing them.

For the purposes of these guidelines, *interdisciplinary minors* are defined as those that include courses from two or more colleges. (A college may offer a minor that is interdisciplinary but entirely within the college. Such minors are controlled by the college and do not fall under these guidelines.)

Interdisciplinary minors will comprise a minimum of five courses, for a minimum of 14 credits. At least two of the courses should be considered core courses, required of all students in the minor. The remainder of the courses may either be specified, or may be chosen by the student from a list prepared by the advisory committee in charge of the minor.

Each interdisciplinary minor should be proposed by a lead college. That college will be responsible for assembling an advisory committee comprising faculty representatives from participating colleges. In the event that the minor includes courses from a large number of colleges, each college need not be included on the advisory committee, but faculty from those colleges should be invited to suggest courses that are appropriate to the minor.

It will be the responsibility of the lead college, working with the advisory committee, to notify the Office of the Registrar and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education when an interdisciplinary minor is created. It will also be the lead college's responsibility to assure that advisers are informed and that the minor is incorporated into the APAS system.

In general, students declare minors rather than applying for them. Students may declare a minor retroactively (i.e., after the student has completed the required courses, but while the student is still enrolled as a degree-seeking undergraduate student at the university).

The attached form should be used as notification of the creation of an interdisciplinary minor. This form does **not** replace the required Regents' approval process.

Notification of Creation or Change of an Interdisciplinary Minor

Name of Minor _____

Lead college (college assuming primary responsibility) _____

Other participating colleges (please list): _____

Members of faculty advisory committee:

Brief description of minor:

Structure of minor--
Core courses:

Other courses (attach list if appropriate):

Total courses required:_____ Total credits required:_____

Has this minor been approved by the curriculum committees of the lead college? ___Yes ___No

If no, will be reviewed on the following date: _____

Please send this notification form to Linda Ellinger, Office of the EVPP (for dissemination to colleges)
and to Sue Van Voorhis, Office of the Registrar.