

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Assembly Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, March 27, 2002
1:00 – 3:30
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Wilbert Ahern (chair), Vernon Cardwell, Shawn Curley, Scott Ferguson, Steve Fitzgerald, Christina Frazier, Gretchen Haas, Frank Kulacki, John LaBau, (Naomi Scheman for) Christine Maziar, Carol Miller, Tina Rovic, Kathleen Newell, Marsha Odom, Martin Sampson, Mary Ellen Shaw, Mary Sue Simmons, Craig Swan

Absent: Patricia Cavanaugh, Geri Malandra, Karen Seashore, Douglas Wangenstein

Guests:

[In these minutes: (1) committee business; (2) calendars for 04-05 and 05-06, including discussion of the Twin Cities calendar vis-à-vis the State Fair; (3) report from the Civic Learning subcommittee; (4) update on accountability riders; (5) remaining agenda items; (ACEP) (1) continuing education students not appearing in day classes; (2) the Twin Cities campus calendar; (3) report from the ROTC subcommittee]

1. Committee Business

Professor Ahern convened the meeting at 1:00, reviewed the agenda for the meeting, and announced that Professor Sampson would be chair in 2002-03.

There have been minor changes in the Crookston, Morris, and Twin Cities calendars that need approval; the Committee voted unanimously to approve them.

2. Calendars for 2004-05 and 2005-06

Professor Ahern took up next the calendars for 2004-05 and 2005-06. He noted that on the Twin Cities campus in fall, 2004, fall semester has 71 class days and ends Thursday, December 23; in fall, 2005, the fall semester has 72 class days and ends on December 23. These calendars provoked considerable discussion.

-- Professor Kulacki said that in programs with many 4- and 5-credit courses, such as IT, these calendars are difficult for students. The University should consider starting before Labor Day; this is a university and instructional days are critical. What will be done about parking, Professor Cardwell asked? The University has long-term contracts with the State Fair for the transitway and parking lots in both Minneapolis and St. Paul. Professor Kulacki said he understood that but asked what is more important?

* 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.

-- Professor Newell said the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy, at the invitation of Vice Provost Swan, will ask the administration to look at other options for fall semester on the Twin Cities campus. Professor Ahern observed that a change in the Twin Cities calendar in future years could also lead to changes in calendars on the other campuses.

-- Faculty must submit grades within 72 hours of finals; if finals run through December 23, those 72 hours (three working days) follow immediately after Christmas. Dr. Rovic pointed out that the grades are due within 72 hours OF THE TIME THE FINAL IS ADMINISTERED, not 72 hours after the end of the final exam period. If there are many University holidays in late December, that may mean that some grades would not be due until early January.

-- Ending fall semester on December 23 is not a viable schedule for a large university when there are a lot of graduate assistants, Professor Sampson said. Does the University really expect them to stay on campus over the holiday--or pay premium airfares in order to fly home over the holiday? That won't happen, he predicted; instead, instructors will eliminate the final exam. It would be worth sacrificing a couple of class days, or parking in St. Paul, to avoid that outcome. Having finals run through December 22 or 23, however, is a bold sign to instructors not to give a final exam.

-- The Committee is worrying about Christmas but not other holidays, Professor Newell observed; is it making allowances for Christians but not others? At Ohio State, Professor Kulacki reported, the curriculum committee permanently altered the schedule so there were no classes or exams on Saturday in order to accommodate the Jewish Sabbath. Professor Sampson observed a moment later that late December is a time when many families congregate--Christians, non-believers, non-Christians; for whatever reason, they do.

-- Professor Kulacki said that in addition to canceling final exams, a late semester impairs the last week of classes as well, which compromises the benefits of semesters and erodes the effort to create a more coherent academic environment. It may be that long-term the semester will only be 12 or 13 weeks, which would be unacceptable to him, he said.

-- Ms. Haas said she had spoken with other graduate students about the calendar and the responses were not surprising: it is difficult to get grades completed for a large number of graduate and professional students and they do not want to have to pay high airfares. It also seemed to them that the State Fair was a petty reason not to adjust the semester. Dean Scheman pointed out that, while the University should not prefer one religion over others, the country and the culture do. Given this reality, when exam week ends as late as the 23rd of December, it is unreasonable for faculty to suggest that TAs delay plans to leave town until after grades can be submitted--despite the fact that TA appointments continue beyond the end of the term, presumably, in part, to allow for time to work on grading.

-- Mr. Ferguson reiterated the earlier point: whether for financial or family reasons, students do not want to be on campus so close to Christmas. Cutting class days is not a good idea, either. Last term, he commented, he had two classes in which the final exam was given the last week of class.

-- There is no reason graduate courses cannot give an exam in finals week as well, Professor Sampson said--and he lost the service of a TA because of exams. Students and faculty should not be faced with choices like this in a large university.

-- What is the difference in days of instruction between fall and spring semesters in 2004-05 and 2005-06, Professor Ahern asked? In both cases, spring is 74 days, Dr. Rovic said; fall varies between 71 and 73 days. That is a problem if one is teaching the same course, Professor Ahern responded; there could be up to three fewer instructional days in fall semester.

Is it necessary to approve calendars more than two years ahead, Professor Ahern asked? Dr. Rovic said that most institutions approve calendars four years in advance so that students can plan. D

Dr. Shaw moved that the Committee approve the calendars with the understanding that they could be amended later. Professor Sampson moved to divide the question, voting separately on the Twin Cities calendar; his motion was approved unanimously. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the Crookston and Morris calendars for 2004-05 and 2005-06. Ms. Haas moved to table the Twin Cities calendars until the next meeting of the Committee; her motion passed 9-3 with one abstention. Dr. Shaw observed, however, that the Committee would not have new information by the time of the next meeting. The Crookston and Morris calendars will be brought to the Senate for approval, Dr. Rovic said.

3. Report from the Civic Learning Subcommittee

Professor Sampson next reported that the Civic Learning Subcommittee has been meeting. He described how the Subcommittee has been grappling with the definition of civic learning (e.g., there must be an element of contemplation of involvement in discussion with the community). He said he is somewhat uncomfortable with the humanities/social science/CLA-ish direction most definitions go and the subcommittee is trying to address that issue.

The Subcommittee has also been talking with the deans, which has been very fruitful.

The final report will be rich with many varieties of civic engagement related to the disciplines. All parts of the University should think about ways to relate their mission to the community, Professor Sampson said, and they are pushing for a broader definition than the run-of-the-mill humanities/social science definition. They are also developing guidelines on ways to promote civic learning and will provide a template for curriculum committees. The Subcommittee has not talked about assessment of civic learning or about civic learning at the graduate level. If a lot of colleges do not know what civic learning means, it is difficult to make suggestions about graduate programs.

Is the definition larger than requiring a reflective piece, or is that still needed, Professor Newell asked? There are operating elements needed everywhere, Professor Sampson said; the report will contain principles, a roster of examples from across the University, and goals for the entire University.

Dean Scheman said that the conversations with the deans were a good idea; there is a need to think about how to include graduate students across the University in civic learning. One connecting link, proposed by Professor Boyte, is involvement of graduate students in the responsible conduct of

research, and moving beyond that, how a discipline fits with the community. She encouraged an ongoing relationship with research and organized communications with programs in the Graduate School. She also said that thinking holistically about civic engagement, graduate education, and research could also have benefits for undergraduate education. Holding on to the reflective moment is important; so is work on the research culture so faculty raise questions they have not raised before.

Professor Miller complimented Professor Sampson on the work of the Subcommittee. She said that civic engagement made her very nervous at first, because the American Indian community has had some bad experiences; this is the first time she has heard that the work with the community would be bi-directional.

There has been a group exploring civic engagement in COAFES, Professor Cardwell reported, and its work has been well-received by many faculty. Students, however, ask if there will be a trade-off with liberal education requirements; they do not want to see additional requirements. The college is under pressure to make the curriculum more flexible, with more electives; students would be very reluctant to see more requirements added. Professor Sampson said he personally agreed with that view; the Subcommittee has not dealt with the issue of requirements. Professor Newell said she did not see civic learning as a separate course but rather as a part of courses that already exist. It would be nice if students civic learning led students to reflect on the limits of their fields and got them into the community to learn and to realize how much they need to know, Professor Sampson remarked.

Professor Newell cautioned that this must not be a case where the University decides to DO SOMETHING to the community--but then pulls out when it is tired of the effort.

The final report from the civic learning subcommittee will be on May 8, Professor Ahern noted, and thanked Professor Sampson for his summary.

4. Update on Accountability Riders

Dr. Swan next provided a report on the status of the accountability riders that were adopted last year by the state legislature.

-- The Commission on Excellence aims to be done by July 1. The Committee could ask Vice President Maziar to talk with the Committee later.

-- The report responding to the Minnesota Extension Service rider has been provided to the legislative committees.

-- There were two reports in which this Committee was interested, one requesting, inter alia, identification of the five highest-priority undergraduate programs and one calling for a joint response with MNSCU about post-secondary planning with a focus on metropolitan higher education. Both of the final reports were in the form that the Committee last saw them.

The reports have been received by the House committees and no hearings have been scheduled. There has been one hearing in the Senate. The University tried to help the Senate committee understand why it is not helpful to try to identify five high-priority undergraduate programs; the committee seemed to understand the University's position, Dr. Swan reported.

In terms of post-secondary planning, there will be new levels of inter-system cooperation and coordination, Dr. Swan said. Much of the discussion has focused on the next steps; three have been identified: program collaboration/credit transfer/joint work, remedial/developmental education, and metropolitan area issues. He suggested that the Committee may wish a report next year on remedial/developmental education.

There has been a lot of attention paid to metropolitan higher education issues, such as collaboration and cooperation between the University and the 2-year MNSCU institutions as well as with Metropolitan State. The attention has not been exclusively on the metropolitan area; a lot of Twin Cities students go to school in non-metropolitan areas, and vice-versa. There has been a meeting of the Metropolitan Alliance--all of the MNSCU institutions--with representatives from the University to identify areas in which the institutions can cooperate (e.g., career training and advancement in programs, making the higher system more transparent, and greater focus on K-12 education).

Professor Ahern thanked Dr. Swan for his report and noted that some issues would return to the Committee in the future.

5. Remaining Items

Professor Ahern reviewed the items that will be coming before the Committee:

- Report from Professor Wahlstrom on the Technology-Enhanced Learning Council (with a focus on financial and workload issues)
- The first-year experience at Crookston, Morris, and Twin Cities
- Report from the W Subcommittee
- Retention issues and assessment of student learning
- International study (integration of study abroad in the undergraduate curriculum)
- Report from the Civic Learning Subcommittee
- Report from Vice President Carrier on the number and uses of non-tenured/tenure-track faculty and implementation of the academic appointments policy
- Report from the Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee
- Issues from Vice Provost Swan

Professor Ahern adjourned the meeting at 2:20.

* * *

Assembly Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, March 27, 2002
2:30 - 3:30
Room 238A Morrill Hall

Guests: Dr. Jack Johnson (College of Continuing Education); Professor John Adams (Chair, ROTC Subcommittee)

1. College of Continuing Education Students (not) in Classes

Professor Newell now convened the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy and welcomed Mr. Jack Johnson, Director of Evening Classes and Summer Session in the College of Continuing Education (CCE), who had been invited to respond to a concern that it seems CCE students have disappeared from day courses. One faculty member, for example, asked what happened to the non-degree-seeking students in his courses? Does this phenomenon reflect changed priorities in CCE?

Dr. Johnson said the phenomenon does not reflect changed priorities in CCE; it continues to serve non-degree-seeking adult students who want to enroll in credit-bearing evening classes. They have about 3500 students in the fall and about 3000 in the spring that they struggle to find places for; there are not as many evening sections as there were in the past (although the number is starting to increase). A number of sections are also not available to non-degree-seeking students, but it is important that there be these mature students in classes because they can enrich the classroom experience for others, they are often more motivated, and offerings to these students are an important form of University outreach. Dr. Johnson said he was sorry that these students were not getting into classes.

CCE prepares a catalogue that lists all classes beginning after 3:30 (unless a department requests that the course not be included--many of which do so, which is puzzling to CCE, because they are trying to bring in students and there is a payoff to the departments). They have an extensive publicity campaign (about \$150,000 per year for general evening classes advertising) and also provide web sites and brochures.

Dean Scheman said the reasons a department may not want a course listed (although it is hard to think of the reasons) may include because the financial benefit of a CCE student enrolling in a course accrues to the college rather than the department, as was the case in the past. That is an issue between the colleges and departments, Dr. Johnson commented, and the practices vary by college; some colleges are more precise in allocating tuition income back to departments than are others.

A reason that there are fewer evening courses, Dr. Shaw said, is that they used to be taught on an overload basis, so the faculty member earned additional income; now they are often inloaded so faculty are less inclined to teach them. Dr. Johnson agreed that the lack of the incentive is a problem.

Does CCE work with colleges or departments, Dr. Swan asked? Should a department have the option to say it will not offer evening courses if the college says it should? They will do more work

with the deans, Dr. Johnson said; some may not be aware of what is happening. There also may be more competition, Dr. Shaw said; as students try to get 13 or more credits, they may stretch their classes over a longer part of the day. This suggests colleges should be offering more classes at night to their own degree students, Dr. Johnson said, because when students work and take advantage of other opportunities, they want the option to take courses at night.

In response to a question from Ms. Haas, Dr. Johnson said that very few classes offered before 3:30 are part of CCE degree programs. Ms. Haas said she has heard that non-degree-seeking students register for day classes after open enrollment and pick up seats after other students have cancelled. There is nothing to prevent non-degree-seeking students from registering for day courses, Dr. Johnson said, and many do so.

To what extent is the question about CCE students related to separate registration systems, Dr. Swan asked? In the past, with separate systems, the students showed up as CCE students, but with an integrated system that does not occur. That may be a part of the answer, Dr. Johnson agreed.

Dean Scheman said anecdotal and impressionistic evidence suggests that in addition to a greater emphasis on graduation rates with the undergraduate population, there has been a cultural shift in classrooms: they are less welcoming than they used to be for older students. She said she agreed with the view that there are fewer such students in the classroom, and there is a difference in what it means to be in an undergraduate class at the University--it is more normative for students to be 19-22 years old. Dr. Johnson concurred that the message recently has been that the full-time undergraduate student is more important, a message driven by low graduation rates. That sends a message to non-degree-seeking students that they are not as welcome as they used to be. That is unfortunate, he concluded.

Are there economic barriers to non-degree-seeking or other CCE students as tuition rises, Professor Sampson asked? That is complicated, Dr. Johnson said. Some things do make it more difficult for non-degree-seeking students to come to the University: it is more expensive (and these students typically do not receive financial aid); the change to semesters means there are fewer class opportunities and it is a 15-week commitment rather than 10 weeks; and there are fewer evening sections offered for that audience.

Dr. Simmons commented that she and Dr. Johnson work with these students and they have heard for years that classrooms are enriched by the presence of older students. They hear from those students, however, that they are daunted by the classroom (there are few exchanges or conversation) and by the technology (one must be at ease with new technology to be a good student).

Is there anything the Committee can do to help, Professor Newell asked? It could talk with deans and departments about supporting outreach to non-degree-seeking students, Dr. Johnson said, and encourage late-afternoon and evening classes so seats are available for them. He said he believed there was a net gain to the University if those students are in classes.

Mr. Fitzgerald observed that classes that do not observe the regular schedule, plus the classrooms that will be lost in Nicholson and other places, means that utilization rates in the evening must go up in order to meet demand.

Professor Newell thanked Dr. Johnson for joining the meeting.

2. Calendar Issues

The Committee next took up a draft statement that read:

"The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy requests the administration to once again evaluate the possibility of starting Fall Semester classes on the Twin Cities campus before Labor Day and ascertaining if some arrangements can be made for the St. Paul campus to accommodate the State Fair traffic and crowds. The Committee would appreciate it if it could have a report by Fall Semester, 2002."

This a complex issue, Professor Cardwell said. Having uniform-length semesters is compromised by the State Fair. The Fair has an impact on the entire St. Paul campus because of congestion but it also affects the rest of the University because of the calendar. There is a need for uniform semesters, he said, especially for labs.

If there were a new football stadium at Oak and Washington, Dr. Swan said, there would be additional parking, but there remains a large long-term problem.

Professor Ahern commented that this is also a SCEP issue because it affects the other campuses as well (inasmuch as they try to coordinate calendars with the Twin Cities campus) and that it is appalling that a central educational policy of the University is dictated by the Fair.

It was agreed that the issues and the rationale should be elaborated more fully in the statement. Professor Curley said it should clearly reflect the grave concerns expressed by members of the Committee.

Professor Adams, who had joined the meeting at this point, recalled that he was chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee when the original discussions about the change to semesters began. One easy solution, he said, is to run the Fall Semester from mid-September to mid-January.

3. Report from the ROTC Subcommittee

Professor Newell now actually welcomed Professor Adams, chair of the Subcommittee on the Reserve Officer Training Corps, to talk about the work of the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee oversees the three military programs in the ROTC; it consists of four faculty members plus the three commanders and three students from the three ROTC programs. Vice Provost Swan serves as an ex officio member.

The Subcommittee meets three times per year; what it considers are matters such as the following:

- the credentials of officers assigned to teach in the programs (there are well-defined criteria); these are very capable people, Professor Adams said;

- the programs in which the students participate; and
- a variety of other issues.
 - Security after September 11 (the military has been on high alert)
 - Regents' scholarships for staff in the ROTC programs (the student scholarships are paid by the Department of Defense, which brings a lot of money into the University, but the staff do not have the opportunity to participate in the Regents' scholarship program; allowing them to do so would increase the training of those teaching as well as provide them the opportunity to see more of the University)
 - The need to respond to the President on the four-year graduation rate (some students, especially in engineering, have no electives and participate in ROTC programs on top of engineering requirements, so must carry heavy loads).
 - Membership of the Subcommittee (in the past, it seems that people served on it until they died, which is not a good idea.
 - Facilities issues, because the Armory is old and needs attention that will cost a lot of money, even if it is a landmark; the programs like the tradition and being in it, but its physical condition will need to be dealt with down the road.
 - Agreements that the Minnesota ROTC program has with other post-secondary institutions in the Twin Cities (with St. Thomas and a proposed agreement with St. Cloud State).
 - Recruitment of students into ROTC programs by other programs; there are a valuable source of young people to come to college officer programs and those students are often from disadvantaged backgrounds.

His general impression, Professor Adams said, is it a pleasant task to work with the faculty, staff, and students in the ROTC programs, that they are a valuable part of the University, and he believes it is good for the University to contribute to them. He said he recognized that there are different views about the ROTC programs, but the military is a part of the country; many may not be aware of the high quality of the ROTC programs at the University.

Each program has 70-80 students and each program has its own mission with an appropriate number of students (which reflect Department of Defense plans). The Minnesota programs are doing well and are well-regarded, he concluded.

Dr. Simmons noted that she works in the Armory as well and has high compliments for the ROTC program staff and students. They share resources, provide classrooms, inform each other about their curricula--and when the military was on high alert after September 11, so was her program, Dr. Simmons said.

Professor Cardwell said he has had a number of student advisees who were in ROTC programs. The challenge for those students is the amount of time needed; it was also a challenge because he did not know their workloads in order to avoid overloading students in terms of the number of credits they should take. It is difficult to get insight on an appropriate credit load because the outside time commitments are not reflected in credits. Professor Adams suggested talking with the students; in their view, they have a full-time job that goes from early in the morning to the end of the day. If they are to take more credits, they must take time from their personal time--and their academic performance is watched because of the financial investment being made in them. The student leaders in the ROTC programs recognize that they have to spend a lot of time; some do well and some just barely hang on. It would be helpful to know about the other commitments, Professor Cardwell said. It varies with the major, Professor Adams replied; some are more flexible while some have a lot of labs. Professor Cardwell suggested that an information sheet for advisors would be helpful.

What has been done about the discrimination issue, Dean Scheman asked? It is still on the table, Professor Adams said. President Hasselmo took the position that the Department of Defense policy is in conflict with the University's policy and the University would try to modify the Defense policy. In the meantime, the military operates under the Presidential order concerning gays and lesbians. The two policies are still inconsistent, although he said he was not aware of any discrimination that had occurred recently. Dean Scheman said she was concerned that the conflict continues but that the University may not be exerting pressure any more.

Professor Newell thanked Professor Adams for his report, and adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota