

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, February 2, 2011
2:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Thomas Brothen (chair), Barbara Brandt, Norman Chervany, Sean Finn, Cody Mikl, Kristen Nelson, Alon McCormick, Peh Ng, Jane Phillips, Peggy Root, Paul Siliciano, Donna Spannaus-Martin, Elaine Tarone, Michael Wade, Cathrine Wambach
- Absent: Joseph Kirchner, Robert McMaster, Henning Schroeder, Jessica Schroeder, Alfonso Sintjago
- Guests: Suzanne Bardouche (Office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education), Ingrid Nuttall (Office of the Registrar); Associate Dean Darryl Hamamoto (School of Dentistry), Associate Dean Kathleen Krichbaum (School of Nursing), Cindee Quake-Rapp, Director, Center for Allied Health Programs, Associate Dean Charles Taylor (College of Pharmacy)
- Other: Tina Falkner (Academic Support Resources)

[In these minutes: (1) policies on credit for nationally-recognized exams and on departmental exams for proficient or credit; (2) classes during breaks; (3) degrees with distinction; (4) cancelling "audit" registrations; (5) evaluation of instruction in the Academic Health Center; (6) new items of committee business]

1. Policies on (1) Credit for Nationally-Recognized Exams for Undergraduate Students, and (2) Departmental Exams for Proficiency or Credit for Undergraduate Students

Professor Brothen convened the meeting at 2:00 and turned to Ms. Bardouche to present two policies.

Ms. Bardouche explained that she and Ms. Nuttall are presenting two policies, the last ones to be dealt with after the 39 policies were reviewed earlier. There is at present one policy that deals with two matters, credit for nationally-recognized exams and departmental exams for proficiency or credit. They have divided the existing policy into two policies in order that it is clearer to whom each applies.

Ms. Nuttall reviewed the current policy and explained that with the new policy template, they have proposed definitions and FAQs for the new versions. They have also made it clear that both policies apply only to undergraduates.

In the case of the policy on Credit for Nationally Recognized Exams for Undergraduate Students, the policy simply says that the University recognizes AP, IB, and CLEP tests. The policy provides a link to the standards.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

In the case of the policy on Departmental Exams, C- was the minimum required for credit to be awarded. The colleges wanted more discretion. The decision will now be up to the colleges and departments.

The big question, Ms. Nuttall said, is who can take the departmental exams. Some want to know if they can take the exam before they have enrolled, but that seemed not to be appropriate. The policy requires that students be enrolled before they may take a departmental exam. Professor Siliciano asked why students who have been admitted but have not yet enrolled are not allowed to take departmental exams. Because it is a way for students to shop around and get more credits and a bigger bang for the buck, Ms. Nuttall said. That is not treating these exams as they are intended. Is there a way for a student to take a test to see if he or she could get into 3-xxx courses immediately, Professor Siliciano asked? Ms. Nuttall said that AP and IB apply to incoming freshmen; CLEP can be done any time. Or students will contact departments directly to review syllabi and speak with someone—that would provide the student more information. The policy does not prevent a department from giving a test informally, Professor Siliciano said. It does not, Ms. Bardouche said, or a test that the student could take and score himself/herself. Proficiency tests and examinations for credit are different, Ms. Nuttall reminded the Committee. Departments do not charge for proficiency exams, but exams for credit are different.

Professor Chervany said he would like the Committee to revisit the idea why students should not be able to know where they stand before they come to the University. If the University does not present enough value so the student wants to choose it, these departmental exams won't matter; if it does, the credits will be dessert. Why cannot the student know in advance of enrolling here? Ms. Bardouche said that students do know about the AP, IB, and CLEP credits. They would know that as a high school senior. The issue is taking an exam for a course that the University offers, and then deciding not to come to the University. The policy requires that students matriculate here because there is a lot of faculty and staff effort involved in creating and administering a departmental exam. Students should not be able to just shop around, because the University is not a credit factory for students who want to take tests, get the credit, and then go to school elsewhere, Ms. Bardouche said. Ms. Nuttall said that the policy states that a student must go to the college and see if there is an exam for a course that would count toward the student's intended degree, so there is a check on who can request a departmental exam and under what circumstances.

Ms. Phillips followed up on Professor Chervany's question and inquired about transfer students. They may not know what courses count, but the programs want the students to know. How far in do they have to be? Enrolled, Ms. Nuttall said. If they have been offered admission, isn't it reasonable to allow them to know what courses would count, Ms. Phillips asked? Professor Chervany said that if he were a potential transfer student looking at the University of Minnesota and two other places like it, he would want to know how far towards his degree he would be if he transferred; that is a perfectly intelligent thing to want to know. The student would meet with an advisor, who could tell what courses would count, Ms. Bardouche said. What if one believes that life experience could count, Professor Chervany asked? It is a question of degree requirements, Ms. Nuttall said, and reported that at one time she worked in a department that offered a lot of these exams. There was hesitation about saying that a student was 60% of the way to a degree. If that is what is wanted, a larger conversation is needed. Professor Chervany said that allowing a student to know how far along he or she is is consistent with Vice Provost McMaster's concern about the increasing cost of college. The student

could enroll and come take the tests early, Ms. Bardouche said. The risk is all on the student, Ms. Phillips said; a student could have been out for four years and wants to find out far along he or she can be when coming back.

These departmental exams are a very small part of the transfer-credit picture, Ms. Bardouche said. Students would not earn 30 or more credits this way; the departmental exams are very course-specific. Moreover, some departments do not offer them, Dr. Falkner added, and the policy does not require that they do so. That is fine, Professor Chervany said, but if they are willing to do so, it does not feel right to not allow a student to take an exam unless he or she enrolls at the University. Professor Nelson said that if a student is offered a place at the University, enrolls, takes a departmental exam, and gets the credit, he or she could then walk away and go elsewhere to school. The student would have gotten the course credits for the \$50 cost of the exam. But what if a student in a field applies to both Minnesota and Wisconsin, Professor Siliciano hypothesized, and does not want to take the introductory course? The University of Minnesota could say it would give the test; Wisconsin might not. That is a placement test, Ms. Nuttall said, and the University does not charge students for those. But the student does not get credit. May a student take a placement test before enrolling? They may, Ms. Nuttall said. The question is receiving credit from the University versus waiving a requirement, Ms. Bardouche said.

Once admitted, and once they take the credit and proficiency exams, there could still be nothing on the students' transcripts unless they enroll, Professor Wambach said. This would give students the opportunity to see if they can get the credit, but there would be no record without enrollment. Professor Chervany endorsed this proposal.

Professor Tarone observed that in the languages, one can take a placement test, place into the second year, and after completing one course of the language, can receive retroactive credit for the first year. That is a placement test and then one takes a course, Ms. Nuttall pointed out.

The focus of the departmental exams is on the degree-seeking student, Ms. Bardouche emphasized. The student must meet with the adviser and determine if the course would meet degree requirements. This is not just for fun; the exams are offered for degree-seeking students. Part of the concern, Professor McCormick said, is that the University is taking a risk if the student could take the exam and then go away, but if the person is a degree-seeking student, that is not the case.

Do other institutions except credits by examination, Professor Wambach asked? If they do not, that would limit the usefulness of taking departmental exams in order to receive credit to go elsewhere.

Is this a risk problem or an abuse problem, Professor Wade inquired. Ms. Nuttall said that the staff members who work with PSEO and other high school students receive a lot of requests from high-school students about these exams. Professor Wade suggested that if the problem is that students can take the exam for a low fee and then go elsewhere with the credits, the University could charge a higher fee and then refund it to the student if he or she enrolls here. Professor Chervany said that Professor Wade's suggestion was acceptable; he is not troubled by students taking the exam and receiving credit if they enroll here.

These are individually-constructed tests for a specific student, Dr. Falkner said. Is the faculty effort worth it if the student does not come to the University? Professor Wade asked how many such exams are offered; the number was not available at the meeting.

If a student takes the exam but does not pass, must he or she still pay, Professor Brothen asked? They must, Ms. Bardouche said, but there is nothing recorded on the transcript unless the student has passed the exam and credits are awarded. They cannot tell how many students are charged for these exams. Ms. Phillips suggested asking the units.

Professor Nelson said it is a business decision what to sell. She said she was not interested in the business of selling credits by test. She said she sees this as a service to current students. It is a recruiting tool, Professor Siliciano said. Ms. Bardouche suggested Professor Siliciano was over-estimating the value of departmental exams as a recruiting tool; it is the AP, PSEO, CLEP, and IB credits that are the recruiting tools.

Professor McCormick suggested that instead of awarding credit, the unit could award a waiver of credit. Ms. Bardouche said that Regents' policy requires a student to have 120 credits for a degree and the units cannot waive that requirement.

Ms. Nuttall said that she heard from the discussion that there are questions that need answering and that there may be a need for procedural changes. Professor Brothen asked if Committee members felt strongly about the issues. Ms. Phillips said that while Ms. Bardouche focused on freshmen, her concern was transfer students. They must accept and confirm enrollment before taking a departmental exam for credit, Ms. Bardouche said. Ms. Phillips said they should be able to take the exam before they enroll. This is a philosophical question, Professor Chervany said, not a procedural issue: If the University will allow students to know, if they accept admission, what they will receive credit for.

Ms. Nuttall said she would find out whether it is possible to allow a student to take an exam before enrolling and not put the result on a transcript unless the student enrolls. If that is not possible, she will return to the Committee. Ms. Bardouche pointed out that this would still entail a small amount of financial risk because the student could be accepted, take the test, enroll, get the credits, and still not pay for the exams.

What is the cost the student pays to take the test, Mr. Finn asked? It is \$50 per test or per credit, depending on what the department chooses, Ms. Nuttall said.

Professor Tarone said the Committee needs more information on the procedure before it can vote on the departmental exams policy.

Dr. Falkner asked if, for a transfer student, the student takes the exam and fails it; will that be a negative factor on enrolling? It might be, Ms. Phillips said, but this is supposed to be for students; if they find out they can get done faster at another institution, that is appropriate.

The Committee agreed it wished to hear back on the departmental-exams policy but voted unanimously to approve the policy on credit for nationally-recognized exams.

2. Classes During Breaks

The Committee concluded it would propose no amendments to the Class Scheduling for Undergraduate and Graduate Classes" policy to make it explicit that classes may not be scheduled during University breaks. Instead, Vice Provost McMaster's office will craft an FAQ indicating classes are not to be held during breaks and will bring it to the Committee for comment.

3. Degrees with Distinction

The Committee agreed to revisit the proposed change (requiring that 54 of the 60 University credits needed for a degree with distinction be on the A-F grading system) until Dr. Falkner could provide more information about what the current college practices are.

4. Cancelling Audit Registrations

Professor Brothen introduced an item referred from the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), a proposal to allow instructors to cancel Audit registrations when the student who has registered for the class with "audit" status does not show up for the class. FCC had received the following comment and referred it to this Committee for response:

A faculty member should have some way of cancelling the grade of "audit" when the student does not attend "enough" classes (as specified in advance by that faculty member). When "audit" appears on a transcript, a student looks more well-rounded than otherwise would be the case. As things now stand, a student may come to two or three classes and then drop out. Still, the transcript shows audit. I have wanted to cancel these audits on the Registrar's electronic grade sheet but have been unable to do so. The Registrar tells me that no such provision exists.

I know of a department in which graduate students are encouraged to sign up as audit for certain low-enrolled courses, so as to make them appear fuller. The graduate students are neither required to, nor expected to, attend regularly.

Dr. Falkner said there could be concerns about refunds; a student who is auditing a course could be eligible for a refund, depending on when the cancellation occurs. Ms. Bardouche said that if there are problems auditors in a specific course, that course can be offered on an S-N or A-F basis only and thus not permit audit registrations. Some high-demand courses already do not allow audits, Dr. Falkner added.

Dr. Brandt said that this issue comes to her office. Students audit courses and don't care about their transcripts, and they can contribute to the course discussions. This has a very different twist in her part of the University (the Academic Health Center).

Dr. Falkner said she would obtain more information and suggested that the policy could require a certain timeframe for deciding to cancel the audit. If a student takes a course A-F and does not attend, he or she will likely receive an F; this change would treat this group of students differently.

5. Evaluation of Instruction in the Academic Health Center

Professor Brothen now welcomed Associate Vice President Barbara Brandt to the meeting, along with colleagues from some of the Academic Health Center (AHC) colleges, to discuss the use of CoursEval, the online course-evaluation system the Committee voted several years ago to approve for the AHC as an exception to the general policy on student ratings of teaching.

Dr. Brandt distributed materials on CoursEval, including a table indicating how it is used in each of the six AHC schools. The first few paragraphs of the report to the Committee provided the essential background information.

Executive Summary

In March 2007, the AHC schools received a five-year exception from the University course evaluation policy in order to use CoursEval as the preferred evaluation system. (Appendix A: SCEP meeting minutes) The AHC schools use CoursEval because it provides customization and flexibility related to the professional schools' accreditation and professional standards. The professional schools are required to assess and evaluate specific criteria regarding faculty, preceptors, traditional courses, didactic courses, competencies, clinical rotations, and externships and report these outcomes to their respective accrediting bodies. Additionally, some AHC courses and rotations have varying stop and start dates that are not in line with the University's academic calendar; therefore, the AHC schools utilize CoursEval to accommodate these varying schedules. Many courses in the AHC schools are taught by multiple faculty members and CoursEval provides the capability to evaluate not only the course but also the multiple faculty members. In summary, CoursEval supports the highly specific and critical evaluation needs and accreditation requirements of the AHC schools.

Background

On March 27, 2007, Barbara Brandt, AHC Associate Vice President for Education [and representatives from the AHC schools] attended the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) meeting.

The purpose of their attendance was to request an exception from University Senate policy regarding course evaluations in order for the AHC schools to meet accreditation requirements pertaining to course evaluations. The AHC schools planned to use the evaluation system CoursEval. The members of SCEP voted unanimously to grant the AHC schools a five-year exception from the University Senate policy "with the understanding that the AHC representatives would return to the Committee in three years with the details of implementation." Questions to be answered include: 1) how things are going, 2) what the AHC schools have learned, and 3) how the AHC schools have adjusted their practices.

Overview of CoursEval

CoursEval functions as a data collection and analysis system used by the AHC schools to fulfill accreditation requirements. In 2006, the AHC Office of Education led discussions across the health science schools to facilitate an AHC policy on evaluation of instructor, courses and curriculum that was consulted widely across AHC schools. This policy was approved by the associate deans and deans councils. (Appendix B: Policy) In 2007, the Office led a technology evaluation and negotiated individual school vendor contracts. Each AHC

school manages its own CoursEval system, tailored to the varying accreditation requirements and professional standards for course and instructor evaluation. Due to accreditation, AHC schools are required to evaluate and assess courses. Course assessment and feedback is an integral part of professional training and part of a professional obligation. The electronic data also assist with longitudinal assessment and is shared with accrediting agencies by mandate.

After receiving a five-year exception from the University Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) regarding evaluation, the faculty and administration of the AHC schools chose CoursEval as the preferred evaluation management system. CoursEval is a web-based software product created by Academic Management Systems, a company that designs academic software and support services and is used nationally by many health science schools. CoursEval functions include instructor evaluation, course evaluation, mid-semester and end-of-semester evaluation summaries, and longitudinal analyses. CoursEval allows the AHC schools to evaluate and assess not only traditional courses and faculty, but also clinical rotations, externships, and didactic courses. Additionally, many courses in the AHC schools are taught by multiple faculty members who specialize in an area relative to the course; this system allows each faculty member in the course to be evaluated.

CoursEval use is governed by faculty oversight in each school and implemented at the staff level. Questions included in the evaluation system are created and approved by faculty governance committees and curriculum and educational policy committees. An AHC CoursEval user group listserv is utilized to share software update information and the user group members are convened twice yearly by the AHC Office of Education to discuss evaluation issues. The AHC CoursEval user group includes faculty and staff from across the AHC schools plus representatives from the Law School.

Dr. Brandt explained that in 2005 some of the AHC schools faced accreditation site visits; one had no course evaluation information, required for accreditation. Accreditation in the health sciences requires a comprehensive outcomes assessment plan, a part of which is student evaluations of instruction. Accreditors want to see that institutions have a plan to collect data and that faculty use these data to continuously improve the programs. Some accreditors review specific data that are linked to accreditation criteria.

The AHC has many courses, multiple instructors, at multiple teaching sites in practices (about 1500 in Minnesota) about which it must obtain feedback. They developed a policy, faculty and administration together, and brought it to this Committee, recommending the adoption of CoursEval. The site license costs \$31,000 per year, Dr. Brandt said, and the annual cost for the license is distributed to the schools and programs. A user group is in communication to support each other, ranging from specific tips on using the technology to more substantive issues regarding assessment.

Those programs that use CoursEval have a high response rate to the evaluations. Some AHC colleges hold grades until the student fills out the evaluation; others do not, Dr. Brandt related. Others do not hold grade but the culture of assessment is embedded in the school, and students want to provide feedback. The faculty set evaluation benchmarks for courses, and if a course does not meet the benchmark, there are conversations in the schools to address specific issues. They are very pleased with the data and use of CoursEval has been a good experience, she concluded.

Associate Dean Taylor from the College of Pharmacy related that his college was the most recent AHC school to go through accreditation; he highlighted their ability to review data and make changes in courses, even during the semester. The Accreditation Council on Pharmacy Education commended the school for their assessment program implementation. Associate Dean Krichbaum from the School of Nursing noted that the system allows each school to customize questions; they use both the University questions, in the general policy, and also conduct a separate evaluation of courses. Each faculty member is provided a report he or she can use, and they also receive aggregated course-rating data, which is very impressive. Associate Dean Hamamoto said that the School of Dentistry uses the CourseEval to track the competencies that students must master; they were the first AHC school to use it, and the Commission on Dental Accreditation was impressed with the implementation.

Ms. Phillips asked if the AHC is asking that the exception be continued (they are) and if CourseEval is about the evaluation of faculty members (it is). She asked if it violates University policy to withhold grades until the evaluation is completed; Professor Brothen explained that the AHC was granted an exception to that policy provision. Students have the option to say they do not wish to fill out an evaluation, which counts as participating in the system. That meets the policy standard. Dr. Brandt reported that it is quite rare for a student not to fill out the evaluation forms.

Holding grades requires a lot of staff time, Dr. Falkner observed. Professor Siliciano said he thought it was a legal question—can the University withhold grades? It does so, Dr. Falkner replied. The culture is such that this is not an issue, Dr. Brandt said; they have high response rates and have discussed the issue at a number of levels. Professor Root and Dr. Krichbaum reported that Veterinary Medicine and Nursing do not require that students fill out the forms; Dr. Krichbaum said that they have seen an improved response rate over time and receive very useful information. She indicated that a practice in the School of Nursing and in other AHC schools is to list the changes to courses that have been made in response to student feedback. This helps students, who move through the curriculum in cohorts, understand that their opinion/feedback is valued and will be considered.

Professor Nelson asked about the age range of the students. In Nursing, Dr. Krichbaum said, they have an undergraduate program, so the age range is 18 on up to Ph.D. students, and they also have adult learners. Other AHC schools have fewer undergraduate programs than elsewhere in the University; however, the age range in all programs (professional, graduate, continuing education and certificate) typically range from 22 to adult learners.

Professor Nelson said that they have had the system in place for long enough that they can look at patterns over time. What challenges have there been and how have they overcome them? Professor Root said that in Veterinary Medicine, they have students who rotate through practice clinics of the CVM faculty every two weeks, and it took a lot of time to get students and faculty trained to use the system. Dr. Brandt explained that CourseEval is only one system in use in the health professions. Most clinical teaching rotations in the College of Veterinary Medicine occur in the University's veterinary hospital. The other health professions schools that administer clinical rotations find themselves relating to national standards for rotation evaluation software. For example, in pharmacy the national standard is a product called EValue, which incorporates a sophisticated web-based management system that includes evaluation of preceptors and students. Because the University of Minnesota students share preceptors in Minnesota practice sites with other schools of pharmacy (e.g., University of Iowa, North Dakota State University, University of Wisconsin), it is imperative that the College of Pharmacy use the same system.

Associate Dean Taylor said that the key to success is access to data and quick analysis. They could not use a paper system; the data allow them to act on them, and they must be sure that students know and appreciate the changes that result. They do not require participation but they have seen rates increase because students appreciate the effects of the evaluations.

Professor Chervany reviewed the major elements of the exception the Committee had granted and inquired if there were any other dimensions of it that the Committee needs to understand. He said he envied what he has heard about and seen done in the AHC and said the practices should be followed throughout the University.

Professor McCormick asked how they handle student response they regard as confidential, and how do they share results with students? They share high-level themes, Associate Dean Taylor said, but not the specific data. Access to the data is very restricted. But they do tell about the themes and ask students for feedback.

Dr. Brandt provided an example from a new initiative and course, the Foundations of Interprofessional Communication and Collaboration, in which 750 students participated during the fall semester. This course is a component of the AHC's IHealth Initiative to meet national standards for redesigning health care and teaching teamwork and communication. This course began with, "Day One" at Northrop Auditorium in which Twin Cities, Rochester, and Duluth students participated either in person or via Interactive Television. Within weeks, CourseEval provided important information from student evaluation. . The administration and faculty who were involved thought it was phenomenal; they soon discovered, however, that students thought Day One was too long and less than stellar. After reviewing the data and comments, faculty are actively making changes based upon the student comments. Next year's course dates are selected and it is anticipated that over 900 students will be taking the newly redesigned course. But they do not discuss with students information about specific courses; only the themes are discussed, and specific comments are not public; if there is something significant about a course that shows up, the issue is taken up at the department and school level. Professor McCormick said they need to have student buy-in and provide information, although not what should not be provided. They could ask questions and share the results with students. They could, Dr. Brandt said, and the data allow analysis and actions to improve courses.

Associate Dean Krichbaum reported that a theme the faculty hear is that the School of Nursing requires too much work and reading per credit, and the complaint is not isolated to a single course. They can address the issue in a faculty meeting and with the department chair, and then on the syllabus they will say that "based on student suggestions, we made these changes." The AHC schools do course evaluations separate from instructor evaluations. Generally students rate the courses highly. The associate deans also discuss course evaluation management issues periodically at their biweekly meetings to learn about common issues, Dr. Brandt reported.

How does it work in promotion and tenure when different schools use different questions, Professor Wambach asked. The rest of the University uses the core questions in the policy because that allows consistency. If each school uses a different set of questions, it can be difficult to provide the context. Each school handles that differently, Dr. Brandt said. Several have peer evaluation of teaching included in the dossiers; they summarize the evaluations and tie them to the 7.12 statements.

Committee members discussed with the guests the extent to which the AHC colleges use the standard University student-rating questions; some do and add questions pertinent to their disciplines, some do not.

Professor Wade noted a map that Dr. Brandt had provided showing the location of affiliation agreements with locations around the Twin Cities and around the state and commented that the CoursEval system was the only way the AHC could unobtrusively measure student experiences. They are also driven by professional associations, Professor Chervany said, which in the health sciences are at the front of the movement to defining competencies and outcomes. Even without the exception granted by the Committee, the AHC would have to use something like CoursEval. Dr. Brandt agreed and explained that she served on the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education Board of Directors. Accreditation agencies themselves are accredited by the U.S. Department of Education, which sets the expectations for outcomes and assessment criteria for higher education. These requirements include the Higher Learning Commission's accreditation of the entire University of Minnesota. The University was cited during the last HLC visit for the need to improve its student learning outcomes assessment. Vice Provost Arlene Carney's work in this area is very important. The difference is that most schools and programs in the University are not as close to these issues as those in the professions, including engineering and law.

The Committee voted unanimously to extend the exception for the AHC for another five years.

Professor Brothen thanked Dr. Brandt and her colleagues for joining the Committee and making their report.

6. New Items of Business

Professor Brothen reported on matters that have come to him.

-- Vice Provost Carney and Dr. Gram in her office are working with the Center for Teaching and Learning on mid-semester evaluations and are testing items. This is for information.

-- One item that must come to the Committee: The low response rate of online evaluations has led to a proposal to change the rule that the evaluations must be delivered before the last day of classes. Such a change could increase response rates.

-- There will be a proposal to follow the practice at the University of Illinois, where the top 30% of instructors are identified on the basis of responses to four faculty-related items on their student rating forms. The system has been modeled here and it can be done; faculty members would be asked if they are willing to be identified. The expectation is that students would be willing to give up the student-release questions, which few faculty release the results from.

-- There has been a proposal from CAPA to include P&A staff in the University-wide teaching awards. He told them he would consult with the Committee on the idea. There was a plan to create a P&A teaching award, but it never came to fruition.

Professor Wambach said it was unfortunate the University could not create the additional award. There are great P&A teachers, but it is difficult to compare them with regular faculty, who have multiple duties; P&A teachers may have no responsibility other than to teach. The Morse-Alumni Award could turn into the P&A teaching award. Ms. Phillips agreed that could be a concern but expressed doubt it would happen.

Dr. Brandt reported that the AHC created its own award and they have an Academy of Excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. A number of faculty members who teach in AHC schools are clinicians in health systems and/or P&A faculty members not eligible for the University-wide awards. The AHC opened academy membership to these groups. There are nine members of the Academy who have varying appointments in the schools. Several are internationally renowned in their fields and recognized for their excellence in scholarship in teaching and learning. They have faculty at Hennepin County Medical Center who have received it, also P&A staff who are internationally recognized, as well as faculty in the AHC. They opened their award to everyone and it has worked out.

Professor Chervany said it would help him to be able to identify people in his own unit who teach but who are not eligible for the awards. And if they are not, but are great teachers, then the rules are wrong, he opined.

If the Committee approves a change, it would double the size of the eligible pool, Professor Wambach said, so if there will not be a separate award, perhaps it would be possible to increase the number of people who can receive the award each year. Professor Ng said that the Committee would need to consult the Alumni Association about increasing the number, because the Association provides part of the funding. So the first question is whether the right people are eligible for the award, Professor Chervany said, and the second one is budgetary. Those must be answered before the Committee can respond to a proposal. Professor Root commented that if one is a good teacher, one should be eligible for the award regardless of status. Professor Nelson agreed with Professor Wambach: If the entire assignment of a P&A staff member is teaching, those individuals could reasonably win more of the awards. She suggested that there is a group that should be recognized and that perhaps the pot should be split. The award is for contributions to undergraduate education, Professor Brothen observed, not just teaching. Professor Chervany said that separate is not equal and a separate award could have negative connotations.

Professor Brothen suggested that Vice Provost Carney should weigh in on the budgetary issues, and said the Committee would return to the topic at a later meeting. He adjourned this one at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand