

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, May 5, 2004
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Emily Hoover (chair), Roxanne Beauclair, Victor Bloomfield, Vernon Cardwell, Shawn Curley, Gretchen Haas, Frank Kulacki, Scott LeBlanc, James Leger, Marsha Odom, Martin Sampson, Karen Seashore, Mary Ellen Shaw, Mary Sue Simmons, Craig Swan, Douglas Wangensteen, Joel Weinsheimer

Absent: Wilbert Ahern, Dale Branton, Michael Edlavitch

Guests: Professor Will Durfee (Chair, ad hoc Subcommittee on Evaluation of Instruction); Professor Murray Jensen (Chair, ad hoc subcommittee on teaching awards); Vice President Carol Carrier, Nan Wilhelmson (Human Resources)

[In these minutes: (1) introduction and appreciations; (2) exams the last week of classes; (3) repeating a course; (4) report from the subcommittee on the evaluation of instruction; (5) teaching by non-tenure-track/non-tenured faculty; (6) subcommittees and appreciations]

1. Introduction and Appreciations

Professor Hoover convened the last meeting of the year and began by introducing Professor James Leger from IT, an incoming member of the Committee. She also expressed thanks to Professors Ahern, Kulacki, and Sampson, whose terms on the Committee end this year. She also expressed appreciation for the contributions of the students on the Committee, Messrs. Edlavitch and LeBlanc and Mlle. Beauclair and Haas. She said she wished to offer a public "thank you" for participation and work on the Committee.

2. Exams the Last Week of Classes

Professor Sampson said that he asked the students in his 1xxx class how many were taking courses in which the final exam is given in class this week (i.e. the last week of the semester). Many hands went up. He asked students to indicate whether this was the norm in their recent semesters at the university. Again, many hands went up. He then asked them what they thought about exams happening the last week of classes as well as during exam week. The general response was positive, which one student articulated as "it is much better to have exams spread over two weeks than all squeezed into one finals week."

This correlates with what one sees, he said, in the corridors during exam week. A number of classrooms are empty at the stated exam time for that course. If instructors are choosing to give final exams but squeeze them into the last week of the semester, that has implications for Senate guidelines

* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

that assume finals happen during finals week. The Committee next year should think about this apparent divergence between policy and practice.

3. Repeating a Course

The Committee was informed that at least some units appear not to be following the grading policy provision that a student may retake a course only once and that the second grade counts. It may be that some units allow a student to repeat a course more than once. Vice Provost Swan said he would talk to the Registrar's office about this issue.

When students register online, Professor Odom said, nothing stops them from taking a course a third time. They occasionally catch it when it happens, but is it not certain. The University will catch it at graduation, but by that time it is a done deal, Dr. Swan observed. The problem is that PeopleSoft does not catch a third registration, Professor Odom said. Professor Hoover said she would track this issue with Dr. Swan.

4. Report from the ad hoc Subcommittee on Evaluation of Instruction

Professor Hoover welcomed Professor Durfee to the meeting to discuss the draft report of the ad hoc subcommittee on the evaluation of instruction.

Professor Durfee thanked the Committee for appointing the subcommittee, which was charged to look at eight areas. The subcommittee met a number of times between November and April, talked with guests, and prepared a DRAFT report for comments. The report is not done but it does reflect the sense of the subcommittee at this time; it has been distributed broadly in the University for comment. It was clear that this is a large issue, one that a subcommittee of eight members could only scratch the surface on, so there are some recommendations for additional work as well as recommendations for action. It was also clear that this is a subject on which everyone has an opinion; if the recommendations go to the Senate, the Committee should expect that there will be vigorous debate.

The areas the subcommittee was charged to look at were these: "(1) adequacy of the current course evaluation instrument, (2) who should have access to evaluation results, (3) technology for applying evaluation instruments, (4) how student rating results are used, (5) peer evaluation of instruction, (6) whether the University should provide guidance on the use of evaluation results in promotion and tenure decisions, (7) inappropriate written comments on student rating forms, (8) whether instructors should have the opportunity to respond to student rating forms."

The recommendations from the subcommittee (and comments from the subcommittee chair) are these:

- Evaluation of instruction is necessary for effective functioning of a university and student rating forms are an essential and effective means to evaluate instruction.
- The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms and process used at the University should be retained but modified to address concerns of faculty and students. Specific recommendations appear in the main body of the report.

- Every course should be evaluated every time.
- A set of core questions should be asked on every form. The core should be supplemented by an optional suite of questions from a question bank that can be hand picked by the instructor depending on particular course needs. (This is what is done at Iowa and Illinois.)
- The facilities question should be dropped from the core.
- Departments should state in writing which items on student rating forms will be used to evaluate instructors. Department heads should only receive results from those items. (They can use what they wish, but departments should make it clear what they will use.)
- Procedures for instructors giving permission to post results from the student release questions should be simplified to promote higher release rates. Student release questions should never be used for making personnel decisions. (They learned things about the Minnesota Data Practices Act during their work; they recommend that more instructors release the data, and if the Senate wishes to require that the data be released, it may do so.)
- The pilot program of web-based student rating forms should be continued and formally evaluated before a decision is made to proceed past the pilot stage. (The subcommittee believes web-based ratings are an experiment and should be treated that way--and must be rigorously evaluated before used more widely.)
- Little can be done about inappropriate comments other than instructing students and providing faculty with guidance on interpreting comments. (They could not figure out an appropriate way to respond to inappropriate comments without treading on privacy rights or squashing the system altogether. But this is an issue and the University needs to provide guidance to students on it.)
- Students should never be required to complete rating forms nor should students be given course incentives to complete the forms. Instructors should never know which students have completed forms.
- A single Senate policy should be written to replace the current three policies.
- A University administrative official should be assigned the task of being the single source of information for evaluation of instruction. (The person should provide information about where the evaluation data can be found and direct interpretations of the policy to the appropriate committee.)

Professor Curley, commenting on the third recommendation, said it is the practice or expectation in his college that evaluations are not required in classes of fewer than 10 students because anonymity in small classes can be compromised. Professor Durfee said he believed the existing policy does not call for treating small classes differently, nor does the Office of Measurement Services (OMS) do so. But the point should be clarified with respect to small courses.

Has the issue of how to store the information so it is available when it is needed come up, Professor Seashore asked? At present the reports come to the faculty member and the chair in paper form. Right now her department uses a small classroom to store all the paper. When the University puts more emphasis on student evaluations for promotion and tenure and evaluation of faculty, it needs to improve the storage. Is there a way to store the information in an accessible database so that one can review the data over a longer period of time? Some data are stored in OMS, Dr. Swan reported, but he did not know if the distributions were included, it may only be the averages, and OMS would not have the individual student comments. It would be possible to put data in each individual's portfolio, and he or she controls who sees that. The subcommittee recommends that some things go separately to the department chair, but the historical data would belong to the faculty member.

The subcommittee heard from OMS that it does not have a lot of money to mine the database, Professor Durfee said. But there could be a lot of work done with the data that exist. To put the data in the portfolios would be inexpensive, Dr. Swan said; to analyze it would cost more.

Professor Weinsheimer, a member of the subcommittee, congratulated Professor Durfee on doing a very good job with the report. He said the consensus view of the subcommittee was that students want and deserve more information about the evaluation of teaching. Now only about 10% of courses permit access to the results of the evaluations; the subcommittee believes it important to increase access. It is also important to distinguish between student evaluation information that will go to promotion and tenure committees and that which does not. Information to the promotion and tenure committees is personnel data that cannot be made public. Departments must be scrupulous in keeping separate public information that cannot be used for the promotion and tenure process. He said he hoped the Committee would promote increased access to evaluation data through the Senate or the Vice Provost.

Professor Leger said he had been struck by student perceptions that he learned about through focus group discussions. Students do not know what the information from the evaluations is used for. It could help them to know that the results are used to improve courses; right now they think it is an exercise in futility.

Professor Sampson agreed that the subcommittee did an extraordinary job. He said he found it interesting that no one looked at the data to see what they tell about evaluation (e.g., the correlation between A grades and high rankings). The University could do an internal study. He also said there are serious questions if faculty are told who filled out the forms and give additional credit in the course for doing so.

Professor Wangenstein asked about department head access to the data; the data from questions intended to improve teaching are not provided to the chair or head because they are not interested? Professor Durfee said there are three categories of data, used for (1) personnel decisions, (2) curriculum improvement, used department-wide to monitor and improve, and (3) the instructor personally, kept to the instructor, and which the instructor might feel uncomfortable circulating more broadly. The subcommittee recommends that departments should decide what to do with the information, not some central authority, and that departments explicitly state how they will use the information. That is not the situation now; faculty often do not know or are wrong about who sees the data.

Professor Weinsheimer said he always asks students what hinders their learning in his course, so there are always a lot of negative comments, but he wants the information so he can improve the course. That information, however, should not be used in the promotion and tenure process.

Professor Seashore said that as a former department chair she had two junior faculty with little experience in teaching. If she did not have access to the evaluation data, she would not have had the opportunity to encourage those faculty to get into programs the University offers. The evaluation data permitted the opportunity to have a conversation about problems and resources available to address them. Both of the individuals became excellent instructors. There needs to be a difference between untenured faculty, who need extra support, and others.

Mr. LeBlanc said this is a topic that he has been very interested in. He said that most students do not know what is done with the evaluations, do not take them seriously, and gloss over them. His view is that if more of the results are released, and students are told how the results will be used, they will take them more seriously. A number of things would happen with more data released, including better course selection by students and less dropping of courses.

Professor Curley said it is important to recognize that evaluation in general is used for two distinct purposes: one, for evaluation, for promotion and tenure and salary decisions, and two, to improve teaching. Those two purposes must be kept separate--one will not get what is needed for improvement if someone is looking over their shoulder. Student evaluations of teaching cannot be used for both purposes. Perhaps the student evaluation score should be used only for improvement and departments do something different for evaluation.

In terms of the issue of release of data to students, Professor Curley said his concern is that doing so would increase the tendency to think of students as customers, an approach that has a deleterious effect on the way things are done at the University and the atmosphere surrounding teaching. He said he was concerned about the prospect that students are consumers that instructors are trying to satisfy. The intent with the student-release questions, Dr. Swan said, is to address about the structure of the course so students can figure out if it fits with their learning style, which is entirely different from student evaluations of teaching. He said he agreed with Professor Curley on this point.

There was brief discussion of the course guide and that it seems to be of little use. Professor Leger said it was the consensus of IT student focus groups that the guides are useless because the information is so spotty. Students would like to see the syllabus (even if for the course when it was last offered) so they have some idea of what they are getting into. The problem is that courses will change. In principle, it should be easy to put syllabi on the web, Dr. Swan said, and it would need to be made clear if it were a syllabus from an earlier offering of the course. Dean Bloomfield said he occasionally receives an inquiry about his syllabus; he tells students it already is on the web or gives them a URL for a previous syllabus and tells them the course will be similar. Dr. Shaw said she would like to see people use the course guide and put in good information; why not make it an expectation, she asked? Dr. Swan said he was more sympathetic to Mr. LeBlanc's suggestion; Dr. Shaw's suggestion would be harder to implement and take more time. Students register in April and are not going to go back and look at the course guide; at that point, they want to see a syllabus.

Professor Durfee said that the question about student access to information will never go away and interest in it waxes and wanes. They did learn that the Minnesota Data Practices Act does not

prohibit the release of data. The distinction is between questions about the course (the results from which are legally permissible to release) and questions about the instructor (which are not). If there is a gray area, the results will require screening and consultation with the Office of the General Counsel.

Peer evaluation is not addressed in the report, Dean Bloomfield observed. There is interest by departments, colleges, and the University that a course serve instructional purposes and fits into the curriculum so that later instructors can build on it. He said he was not convinced that student evaluations can help in this respect, but peer evaluation could. The requirement for peer evaluations, however, seems to be honored more in the breach. Professor Durfee said the subcommittee decided to disobey its instructions in this regard and not look at peer evaluation or take a holistic view of student evaluation. They do say, however, that proper peer evaluation is essential, as is training in how to do it. Anyone who has studied evaluation has said that one cannot rely on a single data point--student evaluations, peer evaluations, etc. Dr. Swan said that with respect to Dean Bloomfield's issues, they are on the table with the Council for Enhancing Student Learning; he has suggested to Professor Hoover that the Committee should hear from the other Council working groups besides the one led by Professor Chomsky.

Professor Seashore said the distinction between evaluation and improvement is not valid for adult learning; most people learn "from a small kick in the pants," from small failures. Discussion with others about small failures is when one learns the most. There is need to be careful and pay attention to how improvements in teaching and learning can occur.

What is the roadmap for the report, Dr. Swan asked? Professor Durfee said the subcommittee will prepare a final report within two weeks and turn it over to the two committees that appointed it, this one and Faculty Affairs. Then the committee chairs will talk about what to do, Professor Hoover said. She said she has notes about the recommendations. She said she enjoyed reading the report; it was well-written. She thanked Professor Durfee and the subcommittee members for their work.

4. Teaching Award Subcommittee

Professor Hoover next welcomed Professor Murray Jensen to report on the work of the ad hoc subcommittee appointed to look at the Horace T. Morse-Alumni award criteria.

Professor Jensen noted that the Morse-Alumni award is the top teaching award at the University. Recipients are given the title "Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor of (discipline)." The award process is lengthy and ends up with thick files for the nominees. The nominating committee is given five criteria: teaching, advising, research/artistic accomplishment, curriculum development, and academic program leadership. The subcommittee was asked if the criteria should be revised.

The subcommittee looked at the history and intent of the award and concluded that the criteria are fine, Professor Jensen said. The award is for outstanding contributions to undergraduate education--it covers a very broad array of activities. When they reviewed dossiers, they wanted to make the job easier and sought more consistent data. Deans, directors, and nominators should be able to identify when data are meaningful. Dr. Swan said he asked if OMS could produce a report that would be useful, such as student evaluation data normed for 1xxx courses or large classes for the department or college. Professor Sampson said his department always prepares such data; should that

not be basic? Professor Jensen pointed out that they have representatives from Crookston, Duluth, and Morris involved, while OMS is only for the Twin Cities campus, so they have to rely on the dossiers.

The subcommittee also concluded that there are many faculty who should receive the award but who have not been nominated because of the application process. The subcommittee could not say, however, that 90% of the file should be eliminated--the nominating committee NEEDS the information. But they want it known that there are very good teaching professors who should have the award but do not. Dr. Simmons asked about the number of nominations. Professor Jensen said that in his three years on the committee, the number has declined from 40 to 30 to 18. There is work to be done in increasing the number of nominations. Dr. Simmons said there is a large problem is that the enormous amount of time required of the nominator and the nominee is not recognized or acknowledged in departments. And that is where it is prohibitive for students to nominate faculty, Ms. Haas observed. It is too much for a single student to get all the required information together. Professor Jensen said one could conclude there should be more winners or that the University has a dearth of recognition; the problem may be more with the underpinnings than the award.

Professor Sampson said that some units are primed to make nominations and have the mechanisms in place to do so. Others may not even be aware of the award. Professor Jensen hypothesized that deans set aside funds to reward teaching, which provides an incentive to identify good teachers and gives the dean a mechanism to identify what is going on in undergraduate education. If those mechanisms were routine, it would be easier to recognize contributions and make nominations. That would also mean the Morse-Alumni award were more in synch with college recognitions.

[This discussion was recessed for the discussion with Vice President Carrier, and resumed after that portion of the meeting was completed.]

Dean Bloomfield commented, apropos Professor Jensen's point that there are many faculty who should apply for and receive the Morse-Alumni award, that the phenomenon is not limited to this award. There are parts of the University where individuals are not nominated for many awards because it takes too much work. Professor Odom said that she had also served on the nominating committee and had not seen the downward trend--but she agreed, in any event, that it is important to structure the process so that each college and dean provide support for nominations. She said she would like to see the Senate encourage each dean's office to do so because it is a big project to assemble these files.

Professor Jensen reported that the subcommittee also polled people about what the Morse-Alumni award means; there is a wide range of understandings. Some understood it while others referred to it as "some teaching award." In the course guide, faculty have a tag next to their name if they have won the award--but most students do not know what that means. Their one action item, he said, is to make the tag into a hyperlink to the award criteria so students have access to the information.

Dr. Swan said that he has also asked Professor Hoover about recognizing other awards in the course guide; it is possible to add such recognition to the system. If they are to move in that direction, he would like the Committee to help establish the criteria to determine which awards will be included

and which not. In any case, the award, to be recognized in the course guide, should be given only as the result of a well-established process.

Professor Seashore suggested that they break the nominations into the constituent parts. There are five criteria; if people receive honorable mention for a subset of them, they should be recognized. If people are overwhelmed with the process, they will not even try, but if honorable mention were possible for some contributions, people could get their toe in the door. She said she served on the Graduate-Professional nominating committee and concluded she would NEVER compile a nomination because it would take two months to prepare it. Dr. Swan reported that one of the Big Ten institutions hosts every semester an incomplete list of outstanding instructors, such as the top 10% using normed student evaluations; that might be one answer.

Professor Sampson said he was skeptical that the nomination process was too onerous. There could be some who are unaware of the award, there may be some who do not want to prepare the nominations, and there is a dearth of recognition in the University. In some departments, spending time on nominations is not encouraged because research is more important.

Dr. Bloomfield said that this university, in research, is notably under-represented in national awards--because the people here do not nominate one another. He has tried to point out to the deans and others that assembling dossiers for the Morse-Alumni award and the McKnight professorships is a good start on national nominations. It is difficult to start assembling a dossier; it is not difficult to update it. Many top-ranked universities have offices and staff to prepare nominations and make every effort to nominate faculty and staff for every award possible. Many of the Morse-Alumni award winners receive it on their second nomination, Professor Jensen observed. Professor Leger reported that he spoke to colleagues at Berkeley; they use emeritus faculty as their committee. People seem not to realize how important awards are to a university.

Professor Cardwell said he has encouraged the College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences to create a college teaching award; that begins the process of building a file that can later be forwarded for an all-University award. He noted that all faculty keep promotion and tenure materials and many have lamented the difficulty in recognizing teaching. There has been the suggestion that teaching better fits in portfolios, where one can keep examples of teaching over time. The University has not done a good job of using portfolios to document teaching performance.

Professor Jensen said, speaking as an individual rather than as subcommittee chair, that many students face some difficult class that is for them a barrier to the degree (it could be math, for example). They also know that some large number of students take classes because they fit their schedule. But there is some percentage of students who really need a good teacher to help get them through a class. He saw the tags on the faculty names and thought he would take classes from them, which raises the question: Is this a teaching award? The subcommittee split on this question. There are five criteria and a number of ways to obtain the award (e.g., academic program development). One possibility is to require some minimum level of excellence in classroom teaching. Everyone agreed on the contributions to undergraduate education, but what does it mean to a student trying to get through a difficult class? He said he was confident that the Morse-Alumni winners are good teachers.

Does he have the sense that someone can be an adequate but not outstanding teacher and still receive the award, Professor Seashore asked? He does, Professor Jensen said. What does it mean to

be a good teacher, he asked? When one write a good textbook? Writes a good exam? Students think about in-class teaching. This is an argument for Dr. Swan's suggestion to expand the number of tags in the course guide, Professor Seashore mused.

Professor Sampson said there is a distinction between teaching and research: if one cannot put the research into an article, there is no research. There is an argument that teaching is the distinctive thing about the award and that there should be a minimum threshold of success as a classroom teacher. Professor Jensen said they reviewed Dean Morse's intent in creating the award, and it is clearly intended for contributions to undergraduate education, not just teaching. That could be changed if someone wished. The award is broader than teaching and linked to the five criteria. The winner of the award, however, is automatically a member of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers. Perhaps the Academy's title needs to be changed, Professor Seashore suggested.

Dr. Swan said that he and Professor Ahern (members of Professor Jensen's subcommittee) were on the side of the discussion (and both of them have served on the nominating committee for the award). They believe that teaching is more than classroom instruction. They might agree on a minimum threshold, but to write classroom teaching into the criteria in a special way could be a numbers game and lead to overlooking the other criteria. He said he did not believe there is a problem now.

Professor Hoover thanked Professor Jensen for his report.

5. Teaching by Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Professor Hoover welcomed Vice President Carol Carrier to the meeting for her annual report on the number of non-tenure-track/tenured faculty teaching courses.

Dr. Carrier began by recalling that a few years ago the University went through a process of identifying categories of academic employment, and it has taken until now to get college appointment procedures and plans in place. Three colleges do not yet have approved plans (with good reasons). The final academic appointments policy adopted after that process specified there will be certain categories in which to hire people who teach: tenured/tenure-track faculty, contract faculty, P&A staff with a primary role as instructor, P&A staff who do not have a primary role as instructor but who have a secondary role to do so, and temporary faculty (who are restricted to maximum two-year appointments). This last provision addressed the problem of the large number of T (temporary) appointments which were frequently held by people who had been at the University for a decade or more. The policy also defines adjunct faculty, both internal and external. The colleges then all decided if they would use contract faculty, P&A staff, etc. This does not include the Duluth campus, where the faculty have a contract that is very specific about teaching responsibilities and appointments.

Dr. Carrier distributed copies of a list of the college personnel plans and data about academic teaching appointments by college. Ms. Haas asked about contract faculty; Dr. Carrier explained that they are individuals who hold annually-renewable or multi-year appointments and who do work that is similar to that of tenured/tenure-track faculty. They are not eligible for tenure, however, even though they may be doing teaching, research, and outreach; the balance and nature of the work is typically different from that of the tenured/tenure-track faculty. Why is the distinction made, Mr. LeBlanc

asked? That depends on the college, Dr. Carrier said. In the Medical School, it may be that they do clinical research. In some instances, they may be used in short-term areas.

The academic appointments policy also requires that if a college or a unit within a college intends to use a fair number of non-regular faculty (any who are not tenured or tenure-track), it must submit a supplemental plan. Most colleges that submitted supplemental plans for using more than a normal amount of non-regular faculty used such faculty where they said they would, but there are a few variances. Her office is asking, in those instances, if they college must adjust its plan or its behavior.

What are they doing about colleges that are not in compliance with the policy, Professor Seashore asked? They run the report twice per year, Dr. Carrier said, in fall and spring. They decided they would make two runs of the report to give units time to meet their plans; if the college is still out of compliance after that, her office will ask what is going on. She and Dr. Swan have also talked about linking the number of courses related to the appointments (or the student credit hours) in order to understand the volume of activity in each category of appointment.

Ms. Wilhelmson commented on the P&A staff who have a secondary teaching appointment: the reports only pick up those who actually have such an appointment. Some people have appointments which call for them to teach a credit class as part of their appointment and departments give them a courtesy title--but they do not have the formal secondary appointment. They do not have a handle on those appointments and how often such people teach; they are trying to pull that information together. Dr. Simmons commented that she is one of those people.

The college plans can change, Dr. Carrier said, and if they do, they are to be reviewed by the Tenure Committee.

What is the rationale for devising plans, except for monitoring purposes, Professor Weinsheimer asked? From a sense that there were too many non-regular faculty? There were several reasons, Dr. Carrier said. In addition to the reasons Professor Weinsheimer articulated, there was a sense that in some units there had been an unbridled use of non-regular appointments. There was also a concern about the long list of T appointments, temporary faculty, who had no job protection even though they were long-term employees. It also helps to get the P&A side straightened out, because these are people who are teaching in a lot of areas and in many ways who could not be identified. The idea of contract faculty came out of the AHC and was created in order that the appointments could be monitored (the non-AHC part of the University does not use contract faculty very much).

Dean Bloomfield said he could recount some of the history because the effort started in 1998, when he served as chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee. They established a committee to look into the issues because there was both national and local concern that these non-regular appointments were undermining tenure and the number of regular faculty lines. It turned out to be a long and complicated process. Various faculty members on the committees came to realize that different parts of the University are very different in their needs and practices, but they did agree that no more than 25% of appointments in a unit could be non-regular without special approval.

Professor Weinsheimer said he was concerned about strange things happening in his college as a result of the effort to cut the number of non-regular instructors. In his department they cut way

down on the number of non-regular faculty--but did not add a single regular faculty member. There was no relationship between the reduction in the number of non-regular faculty and number of regular faculty. At the same time, they increased the number of TAs to do the work that the non-regular faculty had been doing. That seems like a good idea--they want to support graduate students--but they are now admitting twice the number of students in the Ph.D. program who will be able to find jobs. So they are increasing the number of qualified people to do teaching but will now not hire them. This is a tangled web, he concluded.

With respect to temporary employees, the University would not turn away people who had been hired for many years, but now it does so after they have been here for two or three years, Professor Weinsheimer said. He had no solution, he said, but one should not assume that students are better off because there are fewer non-regular faculty. He said he was very interested in the article about Duke, Emory, and NYU hiring "professors of practice," faculty who do teaching or research, who are not eligible for tenure but whose positions come with salary and stature comparable to the tenured faculty. This recognizes the need for faculty who teach or do research exclusively and seems fine, he said, and merits consideration here in the future. The contract faculty opens the door to that option, Dr. Carrier said, but now they insist that such individuals carry out all three faculty responsibilities. Some P&A categories require only teaching or research, Professor Seashore commented. Dr. Carrier agreed but said those appointments are different from "professors of practice."

Professor Hoover thanked Dr. Carrier for the information and her report.

6. Subcommittees and Appreciations

Professor Hoover said that there is a need to appoint subcommittees, one to develop criteria for including tags for teaching awards given by different units in the University and one to look at the policy implications of technology-enhanced/distance learning. She has not drawn up a charge for the latter group, and is working with the chair of the Committee on Faculty Affairs on establishing the subcommittee. Both the student evaluation and Morse-Alumni issues will be on the Committee's agenda early in the fall, she promised.

Dr. Swan moved to thank the chair for her service; Committee members gave her a round of applause.

Professor Hoover adjourned the meeting at 3:05.

-- Gary Engstrand