

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Assembly Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, April 10, 2002
1:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Wilbert Ahern (chair), Vernon Cardwell, Shawn Curley, Scott Ferguson, Steve Fitzgerald, Christina Frazier, Gretchen Haas, John LaBau, Geri Malandra, (Naomi Scheman for) Christine Maziar, Kathleen Newell, Marsha Odom, Martin Sampson, Mary Ellen Shaw, Craig Swan
- Absent: Patricia Cavanaugh, Frank Kulacki, Carol Miller, Karen Seashore, Mary Sue Simmons, Douglas Wangenstein
- Guests: Susan Englemann, Billie Wahlstrom (Director of Distributed Education); Associate Vice Provost Laura Koch (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost), Annette Digre, Assistant to the Director, General College, participant in the President's Emerging Leaders Program; Dr. Thomas Stillman (Hennepin County Medical Center); Brittny Barnes (student member, Senate Committee on Student Affairs)

[In these minutes: (1) distributed/technology-enhanced learning; (2) report from the W subcommittee (on the rules for course withdrawals); (3) first-year experience on the Twin Cities campus; (4) eligibility for teaching awards; (ACEP) (1) bookstores advisory committee; (2) report from the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics]

1. Distributed/Distance/Technology-Enhanced Learning

Professor Ahern convened the meeting at 1:05 and welcomed Professor Wahlstrom and Ms. Englemann to discuss faculty workload issues associated with distributed education.

Professor Wahlstrom began by noting the AAUP "Statement on Distance Education," which notes that "distance education in all its contemporary forms invariably presents administrative, technical, and legal problems usually not encountered in traditional classroom settings." So it is appropriate that the Committee look at the issues.

She went on to note another item in the AAUP Statement. "The rules governing distance education and its technologies should be approved by vote of the faculty concerned or of a representative faculty body, officially adopted by the appropriate authority, and published and distributed to all concerned." There is a consensus that these issues are within the purview of the Committee and that it is important they be looked at. The AAUP statement goes on to provide that "before they are offered, all programs and courses for academic credit which utilize distance-education

* 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.

technologies should be considered and approved by the faculties of the department, division, school, college, or university, or by representatives of those bodies that govern curricular matters generally." All are struggling with these issues, Professor Wahlstrom said.

The Technology-Enhanced Learning (TEL) Council is of the view that all courses should meet the same standards (e.g., faculty-student interaction should not be different in different courses). The TEL Council argues that courses are courses.

Professor Wahlstrom distributed a handout and reviewed first some "framing statements" for the faculty workload issue:

- The University of Minnesota is actively engaged in a variety of activities involving the use of technology to support teaching and learning;
- There is general encouragement to develop appropriate online degree programs and degree-completion programs;
- Teaching and learning technologies are central for fostering life-long learning.

She then reviewed faculty workload considerations, which, she said often grow out of additional time commitments associated with incorporating new technologies into courses:

- the time required to create a new course online or to reformat an existing one into an online or an ITV format;
- the time it takes to enhance a traditional course with web materials;
- the additional time it takes to teach an online or a web-enhanced course; and
- the time it takes to get training in how to teach effectively in a new technology.

Other issues grow out of the following topics, she said:

- Enrollment size
- Additional compensation
- Office hours and presence on campus
- Evaluation and reward
- Training and support

Finally, Professor Wahlstrom said there is a series of questions that need to be answered. These are the kinds of questions being asked at every institution.

- What kind (if any) course release time should be given for developing and offering online courses? For ITV courses? For other hybrid courses?
 - What procedures need to be developed to determine course enrollments for online or other technology-enhanced courses? The email load for these courses is heavy.
 - How will online course development be rewarded in promotion, tenure, and salary decisions? Will criteria need to be discipline-specific? Will there need to be something in department (tenure-code-required) 7.12 statements?
 - How will we eliminate the danger of negative evaluations for faculty who are either not interested or whose courses are not appropriate for online courses? How can we avoid having faculty justify not using technology?
 - How will we compare time in regular office hours to time spent answering email? Is an on-campus presence required when a faculty member is teaching online? Is student evaluation enough to determine availability of instructors (online and in traditional classrooms)?
- Is the current student evaluation system robust enough to obtain good data for both TEL courses and face-to-face instruction?
- How can we motivate faculty to technologically enhance their courses, where appropriate? What incentives are appropriate (released time, research assistance in the use of new technologies, inventory of current teaching awards to see if they provide adequate recognition for the use of technology in teaching)?
 - How can we provide adequate technical support for faculty? What level of expertise should be expected from faculty? Should they be able to plug in their computer and connect to what they need?
 - How will we address intellectual property concerns for courses taught by many faculty from a shared set of resources? What happens when a department faculty jointly develops the 1-XXX course?
 - Should all faculty be expected to teach online or using other technologies? Should new hires be informed that they will be expected to teach online or using other technologies as part of their regular load?

One issue is to determine which issues are properly before this Committee and which should be referred to other Committees, Professor Ahern remarked.

TEL has been around for awhile, Professor Sampson observed; what has been learned about its effectiveness vis-à-vis older teaching techniques? There has been much research, Professor Wahlstrom said. One recent study suggested there is no difference between the two, but students may not learn the same things with the two different instructional methods. It is known that TEL is an effective learning tool. Faculty believe on-line education should be a permanent part of their colleges and believe it important, but some do not want to do it and some do not want to do it all the time. If

students are offered a variety of modalities, they will choose different ones--a chat line, to study, to talk with faculty, and so on.

Mr. Ferguson said that many students favor on-line learning for summer courses or where they must catch up. On-line learning would solve the 13-credit rule for a number of students, Professor Wahlstrom observed; if they have a 5-day-per-week lab and a 5-day-per-week language class, students often take courses because they fit into their schedule. On-line options would make it possible for students to take courses they want or need, rather than ones that happen to fit their schedule.

Professor Odom pointed out that Crookston has a number of on-line courses. She cautioned, however, that one must keep in mind the nature of the learners; some are not independent and unless there is follow-up built in, the incomplete and failure rate for these courses can be high. Students may think these courses will be easier; they are not and can be more difficult. There is both an education AND an advising issue with on-line courses. Professor Wahlstrom agreed that on-line courses are not best for all students. That may be why hybrid courses (partly TEL and partly traditional) may be more effective: there is more checking in and students are not required to be so independent.

Professor Cardwell commented that nothing on Professor Wahlstrom's list of questions and issues speaks to advising. Where does that come in and what are the ramifications? Professor Wahlstrom said she was not sure she could answer because the new portal system will play a role; it allows students to leave information with an advisor and get an answer quite quickly. A number of units are working on advising; the Academic Health Center is thinking about doing a lot of on-line advising. Some of the University's competitors have 24-hour advising, she noted. Ms. Frazier said that because of technological literacy some students become independent learners even in secondary education; this may be more of an issue for the faculty than students.

Professor Ahern said he hoped the TEL Council will look at who enrolls and succeeds/fails and consider whether the data reflect on the design of the course or the characteristics of the students enrolled. Professor Wahlstrom said it would; the more interaction with students there is in a course, they more likely they are to succeed. They are not now tracking the information in any systematic way; there is, for example, no requirement for on-line office hours. Some students prefer synchronous learning, some do not; there could be a requirement, for example, that some part of courses be synchronous. That would be more specific than University Senate policies are normally drawn, Professor Ahern observed, but if deemed appropriate such a requirement could be considered.

In terms of generally encouraging development of on-line degree programs, are there any goals about when, for example, the University will offer on-line degrees, Dr. Malandra inquired? There are not, Professor Wahlstrom said. The goal of the Extension Service is to have 20% of its courses on line, but those are not for degrees. The emphasis at most institutions is not to approach this in a piecemeal fashion but rather to have entire units on line rather than one course here and there. The piecemeal approach is not a good strategy for a large institution.

Dr. Swan said (1) he was impressed by the nuanced discussion presented by Professor Wahlstrom; (2) email is not just an issue for on-line courses; it has changed fundamentally the way instructors communicate with students--he communicates with a much larger percentage of students in his courses than before the advent of email; and (3) in terms of one of the questions Professor Wahlstrom posed (how will online course development be rewarded in promotion, tenure, and salary

decisions? Will criteria need to be discipline-specific?), he thought course development should already be recognized in promotion, tenure, and merit decisions; the question is whether there is something different about on-line courses in this regard. On the last point, Professor Wahlstrom said she has heard anecdotal evidence that in some units young, untenured faculty are encouraged not to get involved in technology or web courses; they should get their research in order and hand out paper for the first few years of teaching. No one will care about on-line courses and fancy web sites, it is said.

TEL is a large umbrella, Professor Ahern commented, and includes giving support for hybrid courses that include both traditional instruction and web interaction. It sounds like on-line courses are a special case. Professor Wahlstrom agreed; they are more work initially and their development will depend on the kind of reward faculty receive.

Professor Cardwell recalled his experience with another institution that has one of the largest on-line programs in the country in his field. The program could evolve and develop because it received \$500,000 in funding. To offer the program on line, however, requires a surcharge on tuition or a large investment by the University, he said. The issue of cost must be addressed. It may not be an issue for this Committee but it is significant and has implications for educational policy.

Professor Ahern said the Committee should look at the AAUP statement, which has no formal status but which may contain policy statements that the Committee will wish to consider adopting. This will have to be carried over to next year.

Professor Ahern then inquired about the dramatic increases in the cost of WebCT. That raises questions about using it versus some other program. Professor Wahlstrom said that 41,000 students at the University used WebCT, which is a lot. Companies provide these programs inexpensively at first and then get institutions over a barrel when students use it and the price is increased. The University is looking at a number of other companies; there will be no decision without faculty participation, she assured the Committee.

The CIC (the Big Ten plus the University of Chicago) is looking at open-source technology so the institutions need not buy everything. There has been no decision that will put every faculty member's work out the window (because, she observed, it takes a lot of time to get ready for WebCT). Dean Scheman commented that the faculty very much liked CLANet; Professor Wahlstrom said they were looking at it as well as other options. The University does not want to get caught again on software costs.

Professor Ahern thanked Professor Wahlstrom for her presentation and promised the Committee would be in touch again. It would be helpful if the TEL Council identified specific policy statements from the AAUP document that it believes are important.

2. Report from the W Subcommittee

Professor Ahern now called on Ms. Haas to report for the W Subcommittee (Professor Kulacki, who chaired the subcommittee, was unable to attend the meeting). Professor Ahern recalled that in several discussions, the Committee did not approve proposals to require instructor or advisor signatures on withdrawals, nor did it approve setting a maximum number of permissible withdrawals.

There was interest, however, in exploring an alternative proposal advanced by Professor Sampson and supported by others. An ad hoc subcommittee was appointed and makes its report at this meeting.

Committee members had been provided copies of the report, a summary of which read as follows:

The sub-committee was charged with drafting a revised policy on withdrawals from courses and to present its proposal at the SCEP meeting of April 10, 2002. Formal meetings were held on March 22 and April 3. Informal contact and the sharing of information electronically were maintained throughout the four weeks prior to the SCEP meeting of April 10.

Our objective has been to craft a revised policy primarily aimed at undergraduate degree programs at the University.

A proposed revised policy is attached for review and approval. Development of this policy proposal was framed by the 13-Credit registration policy for undergraduates and the objective of keeping the policy easy to interpret by students and the academic/administrative units.

The subcommittee opines that the University's goal of improving the four-year graduation rate must be supported by a linked set of policies that place the student at the center of planning his/her academic program. We simultaneously affirm the institutional value of planning and executing an academic program to assure normal progress toward the Baccalaureate Degree.

The major features of the proposed policy are:

- Unlimited drop/add of courses during the first two weeks of the semester (first week of the summer session).
- No tuition refunds for enrollment below the 13-credit limit, and no tuition refunds for withdrawals after the third week of the semester regardless of the final credits of enrollment.
- Withdrawing from courses beginning with the third week of the semester (second week of the summer session) will require college approval.
- Undergraduates will have two options to exercise, for any reason, a withdrawal at any time during their enrollment as an undergraduate at the University.

The sub-committee suggests that the revised policy be implemented for students matriculating for classes that begin in January 2003. A phase-in period for currently enrolled students should be allowed so that the current policy will not adversely affect their academic programs. We suggest that the Office of the Registrar in concert with the colleges develop and implement the phase-in process.

The actual policy change proposed read as follows:

4. If a student officially withdraws from a course during the first two weeks of classes (first week of the summer session), there shall be no record of that course registration entered on the student's transcript.

~~The W will be entered on the transcript irrespective of the student's academic standing in that course if the student withdraws from the course during the third through eighth week of class (second or third weeks of summer sessions).~~

Withdrawal in the ~~ninth~~ third or later week of classes (~~fourth~~ second or later the summer sessions) shall require approval of the college. ~~and may not be granted solely because a student is failing the course; there must extenuating non-academic circumstances justifying late withdrawal.~~ There shall be a the symbol W, withdrawal, entered upon the a student's record when the student officially withdraws from a course in accordance with procedures established by the student's college or campus.

Any student faced with an emergency during a term may request of his or her college scholastic standing committee complete withdrawal without record.

Each student may, ~~once~~ twice during his or her undergraduate enrollment, withdraw from a course without college approval, and receive the transcript symbol W, ~~after the eighth week of class and~~ at any time up to and including the last day of class for that course.

Ms. Haas said the subcommittee thought it important to support the 13-credit rule announced by the President and Provost and to return attention to the purpose of any policy: to increase graduation and retention rates. The subcommittee hopes this goal can be accomplished by limiting the period during which there is unrestricted use of withdrawals and thereby encouraging more thoughtful student planning in their course selection. The major changes are (1) that college scholastic committee approval would be required for any withdrawal after the second week of classes (at present, students may withdraw during weeks 3-8 without restriction, although during that period any withdrawal results in a W on the transcript), and (2) an increase in the "get out of jail free" card, the unrestricted W that can be taken up to the last day of classes, from one to two.

Professor Odom inquired if this change would affect the coordinate campuses, since they do not have a 13-credit rule; Professor Ahern said that it would be University-wide. It also appeared, from the discussion, that the current withdrawal policy used on the Crookston campus may not adhere to Senate policy.

Dean Scheman said the Graduate School believes very strongly that this policy change should not apply to graduate students; while there has not been complete communication with the professional schools, it appears that they also are comfortable with the existing policy. Ms. Haas said the intent is that this change would apply only to undergraduates. Dr. Swan said, however, that some of the professional schools might like this revision while some might want more flexibility; in other areas the Committee has allowed some variations as long as the Committee can review them, he said, and he urged that the professional schools be granted the same leeway with respect to withdrawals.

Professor Ahern noted that the policy language does give schools the authority to establish their own processes for granting withdrawals after the second week. Dr. Swan responded by saying that there should not be central review of individual withdrawals, but for undergraduates on the Twin Cities campus the University should be sure that all colleges "sing the same tune on the same page of the same hymnal" or the results will not be fair to students; two students from different colleges, enrolled in the same course, could face entirely different criteria and procedures for obtaining a W.

Dr. Shaw said this system could work if there were uniform standards, and if the criteria were graded over the term. Students may not know if a course is too difficult for them until later; she said she would like to see any guidelines prepared for the colleges before the Committee acts on this proposal. She also suggested that the workload for colleges be considered; if they have 5000 petitions for Ws they will be overwhelmed, especially if some of the petitions also request part-time status.

Professor Ahern recognized Ms. Barnes, who informed the Committee that she is a member of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs. She had two concerns, she said. First, two weeks is too short a period for students to figure out if the course is appropriate for them; she thought that period should be lengthened. Second, she agreed that the administrative systems could be overwhelmed with requests for Ws.

Dean Scheman agreed that Dr. Shaw's issues were important and said there are two issues on the table. First, there is a jurisdictional issue: the Council on Liberal Education does undergraduate education requirements for the Twin Cities campus. It may not be that Senate policy is the right place to consider this proposal if it applies only to Twin Cities undergraduates, and it seems to have the status of a general education requirement. Second, there are the substantive issues raised by Dr. Shaw: what the policy should be like, to whom it should apply, and the administrative difficulties it could create.

Professor Cardwell said he agreed that setting the deadline at the end of the second week is not long enough for students to identify workload and course expectations; they often do not know how well they are doing until they have taken the first exam, which may not be until farther into the term. Students can learn on an exam that course expectations were more difficult than they thought and they may wish to opt out. Nine weeks is too long, however; students who wait that long penalize themselves vis-à-vis other courses.

Professor Cardwell also suggested that the policy specify the instructional day, rather than use language about weeks, inasmuch as semesters never start on Monday.

Mr. LaBau asked what could be done to make course expectations more specific, rather than move the day for unrestricted withdrawals back? So students will know how exams will be graded? Instructors are required to tell students how the course will be graded, Professor Cardwell responded, but they cannot fully explain the expectations that will appear on an exam, unless they were to administer some kind of pre-exam.

Mr. Ferguson said he supported moving the unrestricted period for withdrawing to the end of the third week of instruction and moving the date when scholastic committee approval is required earlier than the 9th week. He said he was torn, but thought there should be a middle ground between unrestricted withdrawals and requirement of scholastic committee approval.

Professor Sampson observed that if the Committee agreed with Dean Scheman's view of jurisdiction, there is no point to discussing the merits of the issue. He said it was his understanding that the policy would be University-wide. It is fine if the Committee decides it does not have jurisdiction over the issue, but the questions still warrant thought.

The focus of the W Subcommittee was on undergraduates, he agreed with Ms. Haas, not graduate or professional programs--which presumably do not have a problem with "impacted courses" (high-demand courses in which students who drop out later in the term have effectively denied seats to students who would perhaps have completed the course). This policy tries to address the problem of "impacted courses."

Professor Sampson next referred to a table of data indicating the number of Ws taken by students in each week of the term, on each campus. He noted that on the Twin Cities campus, undergraduates drop over 12,000 courses in the first two weeks of class (the data did not indicate how many of those drops are replaced by enrollment in other courses). During the third through eighth week, there are 4200 drops (which are recorded as Ws on transcripts). Thus under the current policy most drops happen in the two weeks that would remain available for dropping courses under the new policy. Professor Sampson added that the subcommittee is specifically recommending a policy that does not envision students waiting for grades to decide which courses to drop.

Professor Sampson also noted that the proposed policy would affect faculty and graduate student teaching assistants. Under the current policy people who do poorly on early-semester tests often drop the course, the policy acting as a sort of safety valve that reduces the number of failing students TAs and faculty are asked to help. Under the proposed policy those people would be more likely to come to the faculty or teaching assistants for assistance. Not all faculty would welcome that burden--but it is part of what a university should be doing.

Professor Ahern reflected that several questions had been raised and that the issues will need more discussion, so the proposal will be carried over to the next meeting and a decision made about what direction the Committee wishes to go.

The key question is whether this is a SCEP or an Assembly issue, Professor Cardwell said. He said the coordinate campuses should be asked reasons why this should NOT be an all-University policy. Professor Ahern said that when the vice chancellors from Crookston and Morris visit the Committee on April 24, they can be asked that question. Professor Odom said she appreciated the fact that the coordinate campuses would be given the opportunity to respond. If they are not to be included, Professor Ahern observed, the proposal will have to be reworded.

Dr. Shaw said that the 13-credit policy received a lot of exposure and college responses; it also now has an implementation committee. This proposal is so new and dramatic, and is made without expression of views from the colleges, that waiting two weeks will not be enough time. She said she would like the Committee to look as well at the idea of a credit completion ratio, which can be tied to the 13-credit rule and which would not require reducing the number of withdrawals permitted.

Any questions or comments should be directed to subcommittee members, Professor Ahern said, and agreed that wide discussion would be helpful. In two weeks the Committee can determine

how it feels about this proposal; if it wishes it to move forward, then there can be wider discussions, but it is not clear the Committee supports it.

Professor Ahern thanked the members of the Subcommittee for their work.

3. First-Year Experience (Twin Cities)

Professor Ahern next welcomed Associate Vice Provost Koch and Dr. Annette Digre to discuss first-year programs on the Twin Cities campus.

Professor Koch explained that a number of programs for first-year students were developed as the result of the work of a task force in the mid-1990s that looked at graduation and retention issues. An individual was hired in Student Development to direct first-year experience programs; she (Professor Koch) was asked to look at academic programs. Together they looked at what colleges were doing, what was being done in orientation, and so on. Now the former director of Orientation has been hired as director of Orientation and First-Year Programs as the campus expands what it is doing for first-year students.

New students can receive a lot of mail from the University, some more than twice as much as others depending on their college. It is difficult for them to know what is important and what is not; as a result, there will be a new brochure for students with all the important dates and information in one place.

They are also looking at other programs, such as a commuter student advisory group. Residence hall students have a number of programs, such as living/learning communities associated with departments or programs and advisors in the residence halls; there is nothing equivalent for commuter students. They have established a task force that is surveying all first-year commuter students about programs, times, and so on.

As they try to coordinate what is being done centrally, they are also looking at what happens in the colleges. Professor Koch said she talked with a number of colleges about what they do and how they assess it; some have strong first-year programs but had not thought about assessment. She has established an advisory group with teams from the eight freshman-admitting colleges to develop a more systematic and intense programs for first-year students.

While not a lot of assessment has been done, there have been some analyses of students who enroll in first-year seminars. The data do not reveal why students take the seminars but it appears that those who take them are in the upper 40-50% (academically) of the students at the University; the seminars seem not to attract those in the academic lower half. The GPA of those who take the seminars is 3.06, compared to 2.82 of those who do not. The retention rate (after four years) for students who took the seminars is also higher, 76% versus 66% for those who did not--but since the students who took the seminars were also the better students, this result is not surprising.

The highest retention rate, 82%, is for the Residential College students, a living/learning community, who live together in the dorms and then live apartment-style.

The faculty who taught the freshman seminars were surveyed; the majority said it was a positive experience. A few were unhappy with what happened in the seminar but most were interested in teaching a seminar again. The reason for participation varies; most wanted to work with first-year students. Asked about incentives, faculty expressed an interest in having funding for travel, a party, or something outside the usual classroom experience; they also wanted a way to relieve the time pressure. Faculty saw the seminars as a good way to recruit high-ability students.

They asked about academic integrity as a topic in the freshman seminars, because a lot of them are writing-intensive. It appears from the responses that most faculty talked about academic integrity but there were some who did not.

Are there any plans to look at materials sent to transfer students, Professor Newell asked? As they look at commuter students, they will also look at transfer students, Professor Koch said; many transfer students are also commuters. She agreed that the University does not do a lot to engage transfer students and could do more. Has there been any experience with a course for transfer students, Professor Cardwell asked? As they look at alternatives to the freshman seminar for first-year students, Professor Koch said, one could be an introduction to the University and what it means to be at a research university. This information may be adapted for transfer students.

Will the commuter advisory group include graduate and professional students, Ms. Frazier asked? They are getting the effort off the ground with a smaller group, Professor Koch said. Dr. Swan said the assumption has been that graduate students are socialized into their programs; if that assumption is incorrect, and a significant number are not, the University should address the issue. It needs to know about it.

Students on the Committee, some of whom had come to the University as first-year students and some who had not, all reported that they or their friends had had very good experiences as first-year students. Those who did not come to the University as freshmen reported that they had had experiences at their institution similar to what was being discussed at this meeting.

One of the challenges, Professor Koch said, is how to get faculty more engaged with first-year students. The faculty are pulled in many directions but it is important they be involved with these students. Morris has a very successful program, Professor Odom noted; Professor Ahern said the Committee could hear about it at its next meeting, when the vice chancellors from Crookston and Morris attend.

Mr. Fitzgerald inquired if they were looking at technology as part of the first-year experience; these are very technologically-literate students, he pointed out. Professor Koch said the subject has been brought up but they are uncertain how to fit it in what they do. Dr. Swan noted that all new students receive a CD with specific information about the University, particularly campus life.

Professor Ahern thanked Professor Koch for her presentation.

4. Eligibility for Teaching Awards

Professor Ahern now welcomed Dr. Thomas Stillman, M.D., to the meeting and noted that he had inquired about eligibility for the Graduate and Professional Teaching Award. At present the rules

limit eligibility to full-time employees; Dr. Stillman asked the Committee to consider if that rule could be changed so that those who teach Medical Students (for example) at Hennepin County Medical Center could be considered. Professor Ahern read from an email from Professor Martin, a former chair of the Committee, about the award:

As I recall our discussions about the Grad-Prof award, there was some talk about who would not be eligible under the guidelines. Because this is an award to reflect OVERALL contributions to graduate education (as with the Morse it's NOT simply a teaching award), the sense was that this should reward full-time (or close to that) faculty members. There are always issues with the clinical faculty, but I think that the intent of this award is very clear -- it's for significant commitment to grad teaching and mentoring.

Dr. Stillman thanked the Committee for the opportunity to meet with it. The Graduate-Professional award is a very prestigious and sought-after award; the deans of the Medical School have been supportive of his request.

Dr. Stillman noted that he came to the University as a freshman in 1956 and earned his M.D. from the University in 1964; he has been teaching full-time at HCMC since 1970 and holds a non-tenured clinical appointment at the University. He represents a large number of individuals in a similar situation (there are more than 200 faculty at affiliated hospitals who are not salaried through the University so are not eligible for the award).

HCMC receives about \$1.4 million from the state, through the University, for instruction, about half for undergraduate education and half for family practice teaching. HCMC has a strong tradition of cooperation with the University going back to 1898 and has a significant role in training students through HCMC programs. The physicians at affiliated hospitals are actively involved in teaching at all levels and they are paid to teach; they are simply not paid by the University. He said he would like to propose that the award policy be changed so that it makes no differentiation between salaried and non-salaried individuals.

One question is how the distinction between clinical and regular faculty compare to the distinction between part-time, adjunct, and other faculty, Professor Ahern asked? How would changing the award to include non-salaried individuals affect those groups? Dean Scheman said she did not know; she thought this would be an issue more for the professional schools than the Graduate School.

What is the connection of affiliated hospitals to the University, Professor Curley asked? Dr. Stillman said he could only speak about the Medical School and said they like to believe the Medical School is a school without walls; they teach students at HCMC, and among the affiliated hospitals, HCMC is the most active. (Professor Newell noted that there are other affiliated hospitals that include groups other than physicians.) Perhaps it would be possible to recognize those who provide instruction at affiliated hospitals without opening up the Graduate-Professional Award to non-employees, Professor Curley suggested. Dr. Stillman was not sure that would be as attractive; he said he had been invited to be a candidate for the award for two years in a row but was told he could not be considered because he was not an employee.

Professor Sampson said he was glad Dr. Stillman had joined the Committee and commented that there are an insufficient number of teaching awards at the University. He said he would favor the Committee looking into either extending the award or creating a separate award. Dr. Stillman said they want to be seen as part of the family, they are part of the faculty and are doing the same kind of work.

Professor Cardwell said Dr. Stillman had presented his case elegantly and thought there might be an easy solution. Any committee or college may forward the name of candidate for the award, regardless of whether or not the individual is an employee; that nomination sanctifies the validity of the nomination. Such a nomination says that colleagues recognize the contributions of the individual. He said he would favor reviewing the language of the policy so that it said nothing about salary lines and employment. Professor Ahern said it would be helpful to know college practices, most have committees, but not all.

Dean Scheman noted that Professor Martin had spoken about the full range of faculty responsibilities, including responsibility for program development; do the faculty at affiliated hospitals participate in such activities? Dr. Stillman said they do; they are all part of the residency program and involved in the formation of classes and curriculum at the University. They want to be on the same playing field as University faculty.

Professor Ahern thanked Dr. Stillman. He said the Committee needed to pose questions to the Dean of the Medical School and to the professional schools and that he would work on doing so.

Professor Ahern adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

* * *

Assembly Committee on Educational Policy
3:00 - 4:00

- Present: Kathleen Newell (chair), Vernon Cardwell, Shawn Curley, Scott Ferguson, Steve Fitzgerald, Christina Frazier, Gretchen Haas, John LaBau, (Naomi Scheman for) Christine Maziar, Geri Malandra, (Naomi Scheman for) Christine Maziar, Martin Sampson, Mary Ellen Shaw, Craig Swan
- Absent: Patricia Cavanaugh, Frank Kulacki, Carol Miller, Karen Seashore, Mary Sue Simmons, Douglas Wangenstein
- Guests: Robert Crabb (Director, University Bookstores); Associate Vice Provost Laura Koch (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost), Annette Digre, Assistant to the Director, General College, participant in the President's Emerging Leaders Program

1. Bookstores Advisory Committee

Professor Newell convened the meeting at 3:15 and welcomed Mr. Crabb to the meeting. She recalled that there had been a question raised at an earlier meeting about whether it would be useful to have a Bookstores Advisory Committee; she also said that Mr. Crabb could provide an update on the new bookstore.

Mr. Crabb reported that the three bookstores on the Minneapolis campus would be consolidated in the one store being built in the renovated Coffman Union, where the garage used to be. He explained how this larger store would be able to do more, and achieve economies, than the bookstores can do when it is divided into smaller stores. Most institutions this size have bookstores of 50,000 to 100,000 square feet; the new store will have about 46,000 square feet and will allow the University to have an academically-oriented facility. Barnes and Noble is aimed at suburbia, he said, and steers away from academic books.

Mr. Crabb next explained the history and growth of textbook ecommerce. The University Bookstores forestalled inroads by commercial sellers (most of whom have gone bankrupt or out of business) and sells more textbooks via e-commerce than any other college bookstore. The other threat could be the electronic delivery of texts, but that has not materialized to any great degree, and some trade publishers have closed down their electronic publishing divisions.

The grand opening of the new bookstore will be in March, 2003. Mr. Crabb said the old stores would be closed; he did not know what would happen to the space they occupied.

In response to a question from Professor Newell, Mr. Crabb said that the bookstores advisory committee would be helpful--or he could come to this Committee or the Faculty Consultative Committee, as needed.

What issues would an advisory committee deal with, Dr. Swan asked? Mr. Crabb mentioned electronic delivery, direct purchases by faculty (which bypasses the bookstores). Professor Cardwell

suggested that packets and CDs could also be discussed; he said that faculty may have little idea of what makes up a good packet or what the total cost of materials for students may be. Discussion of options and delivery through the bookstores would be helpful. Centralizing the location of purchases would reduce student frustration, Ms. Frazier said.

Faculty are not required to give course packets to the bookstores, Mr. Crabb said; most do, but some do not. It would be nice, he agreed, if students could come to one place to get their course materials.

Professor Newell said she would ask individuals to serve on an advisory committee.

Dr. Swan said it would be helpful if records could be organized so that faculty could be informed that course materials have been received and what the cost to students will be. Over the longer term, the numbers should be tracked. Not all students in a course buy the books, he observed. Mr. Crabb said this information is collected and made available to textbook coordinators.

Professor Newell thanked Mr. Crabb for joining in the meeting.

2. Report from the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics

Professor Newell next welcomed Professors Koch and Digre to discuss the work of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA).

Professor Koch said she would report on exemptions from the travel policy granted to teams this year as well as other issues. She distributed a handout reporting on students who missed study day or final exams.

The events of September 11 affected student-athletes more than other students in one way: travel schedules for teams were disrupted, which had an effect on the number of class days they missed. The current policy provides that athletes may not miss more than 9 days in a semester, but the provisions of the policy about counting days are outdated because of the way students take classes. The policy provides that departing campus after 2:00 meant that day did not count as a missed class day; with students taking evening and on-line classes, however, that provision needs to be changed because students do miss classes after 2:00. (At Penn State, by comparison, the count is of missed class HOURS, not days.)

Teams vary a great deal in the number of class days they miss. Football misses very few; golf misses many and runs into problems. The same is true for track, softball, and baseball; the case of the latter two, there is a problem with exams (which did not exist when the University was on quarters). Nine of the Big Ten baseball teams have a problem with finals but no schedule can address all of them.

Professor Koch said she also wanted to stress the positive side of athletics; she recently attended the banquet honoring athletes for their academic achievements. She also reviewed the other work she does, including working with academic counseling to be sure that athletes can be students and reviewing all policies to see if changes are needed.

Mr. Ferguson commented that he is a student-athlete (track) and he tries to take Tuesday-Thursday classes. Travel schedules, he said, are set in a way to minimize the number of missed classes. Professor Koch added that students who are on the academic borderline are sometimes sent later than the rest of the team. They are looking at ways to work with students in academic difficulty in order to avoid the problem of releasing them from the University.

When a student-athlete will miss more than two days in any week, FAOCIA requests an academic plan that must be signed by the academic counselor and the coach ensuring that time will be built in for studying.

Professor Newell asked if FAOCIA has tighter control, more information, and a more considered discussion of issues than in the past. Professor Koch said the new committee structure helps, which separates academic from other issues, but it is only two years old. FAOCIA meets every other week in order to complete its work.

Some majors have classes during practice times, Dr. Shaw said; do departments schedule classes so they are inaccessible to athletes? Professor Koch said she has spoken with departments; the problem is most acute in IT (and there is little that can be done about it). The rule about practice is that athletes must be allowed to attend classes (there is a different rule for competition). Mr. Fitzgerald recalled that the Committee has talked about courses offered at non-standard times; this is another example of how such classes can interfere with the ability of students to take courses.

Is there any way that this Committee can be helpful, Professor Newell asked? Professor Koch said she would bring to it the proposed policy revisions once the review is complete. Another issue is alternative final exams: men's and women's track has competition during finals and a large number of exams need to be rescheduled. Some faculty provide alternatives but some of the options are not acceptable (take the exam at exactly the same time wherever the athlete is--which may be during competition--or make it up in the fall--which leads to an Incomplete, which affects financial aid and the student's eligibility). There are also faculty who change the time of the final exam.

Professor Newell thanked Professors Koch and Digre for their presentation.

She asked Committee members to review the letter concerning extension, to club sports, of the policy on automatic exceptions to the ban on competition during study day and finals for championship events. She also reported that she had receive a letter of thanks from Dean Skaggs, chair of the Council of Undergraduate Deans, for the Committee's comments on implementation of the 13-credit rule.

She then adjourned the meeting at 4:05.

-- Gary Engstrand