

Final Report
of
The Academy Planning Committee

XX
X
X
X
THE ORGANIZATION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION:
X
X
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
X
X
XX

University of Minnesota
December 1987

LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

THE ACADEMY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Julieann Carson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Marjorie K. Cowmeadow, Assistant Dean, General College

Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs

Russell K. Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology

Jeanne T. Lupton, Special Assistant to the Vice Presidents for
Academic Affairs and Student Affairs

Earl Nolting, Director, Continuing Education and Extension
Counseling

Kathleen F. Peterson, Associate Advisor, Biological Sciences
Student Services

Wesley K. Wharton, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture

John Wallace, Chair, and Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs

flo wiger, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Academic
Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Committee Members	
Introduction	1
Section 1: Entry and Exploration	2
Section 2: Curriculum	3
Section 3: Advising	6
Section 4: Administrative Organization	8
Section 5: What Does It Add Up To?	10
Section 6: Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues	11
Appendix: Summary of Recommendations	

The Organization of Undergraduate Education
Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota

We are moving into a complex, technology and value based, interdependent world. To generate and sustain in this environment a decent society--just in distribution of wealth and position, efficient and abundant in provision of goods and services, judicious in the use of natural resources, vital in cultural and artistic life, fair in dealings with other nations--requires people who can deliberate together to envision ambitious projects and then work together to carry them out.

Our committee has assumed that undergraduate education has an essential role in educating people to do this job. We believe that the University of Minnesota, both research and land grant, committed to the creation of new knowledge and the application of knowledge to solve problems, can provide a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

Our distinctive kind of undergraduate education will bring the research and land grant missions into the undergraduate curriculum, showing students that knowledge is not fixed, but an ongoing process of revision and growth. It will give them a first hand sense of how old knowledge is criticized and new knowledge is made, a sense of the complexity of social problems, of how institutional change can be brought about through application of new knowledge, and how change in one institution reverberates through the social fabric. The education will be liberal, freeing the students from the dominance of authorities and orthodoxies, giving them the resources to criticize, to probe for hidden assumptions, to construct new solutions. The instructional methods in the curriculum will balance lecture with discussion, reading and listening with writing and speaking, mastery of theory with application in the field and laboratory.

Students of color will find in our classrooms, laboratories, student clubs, and informal student and faculty groups a genuine welcome, respect for their cultural integrity, and appreciation of the contributions they bring from their racial and cultural experience. The full participation of students of color in the University, in numbers at least equal to their representation in the wider population, is a fundamental goal for reasons not only of social justice but also of educational quality: the richness of diversity students of color bring to the University community enhances learning for everyone, students and faculty. Furthermore, there is no better preparation for helping to build a decent society than participating in a decent university community when one is a student.

We propose in the following four sections a structure to make this vision a reality.

1. Entry and Exploration

The University's policies for entry have two goals: to show prospective students how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them and to give new students a sense of the opportunities and limits of intellectual exploration. We wanted to devise policies that provide the entering student a simple admission procedure and freedom to explore various curricular and career possibilities.

Under our current system, seven colleges admit freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. We propose that all students apply for entry not to a college but to the University. Students will normally be admitted if they have a PAR of 150 or above and have taken the prerequisite courses. They will be considered for admission if they have a PAR of 120 or above and have taken the prerequisites. Beginning in 1991 the prerequisite courses will be:

Four years of English with emphasis on writing, including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appreciation;

Two years of social studies, including American history;

Three years of mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra;

Three years of science, including one biological and one physical science;

Two years of a single second language.

The applications of students who do not meet the requirements *will* automatically receive special review. The applications of underprepared and disadvantaged students will continue to be reviewed individually, with admission decisions based on an assessment of applicants' potential for successfully completing college work at the baccalaureate level.

At the time of application, students who qualify may also apply to be admitted to designated curricular paths within one of the colleges with a lower division. If admitted to the path, a student would then be enrolled as a student in that college.

Curricular paths serve two purposes. They help provide students a sense of community, and they recognize the diversity of curricular interests while still assuring a broad liberal education. Examples of curricular paths are fine arts, foreign languages, physical sciences and engineering, and life sciences. Special paths will also be provided for students who have not completed the preparation requirements.

Curricular paths may in some cases serve a third purpose: enrollment control. *For example, the engineering and physical sciences path can be*

used for enrollment management in the Institute of Technology. Students who complete this path would be given preferential admission to majors in the Institute of Technology. We believe that this preferential policy would encourage students to explore offerings elsewhere in the University, since they would be less concerned about admission to the Institute of Technology. Students in other paths might have to demonstrate higher performance for junior year admission to majors in the Institute of Technology.

Students need not, however, apply for a curricular path. Students who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University would enroll in Regents' College. No faculty would reside in Regents' College and no courses would carry that designation. Rather, students would take courses offered by the other colleges on the Twin Cities campus and taught by the comprehensive Faculty of Arts and Sciences (described in the curriculum section below). It is essential that new funds for advising be allocated to this college so that it will be extraordinarily attractive to students as an advising resource.

2. Curriculum

The vitality of a research university derives from the dynamism of creating new knowledge, of challenging it, and of sharing it with our students. In recent years, knowledge has expanded rapidly, overlapping disciplines while establishing others. Incorporating this vitality into basic arts and science education for undergraduates is the particular challenge of baccalaureate education at our University and one to which we need to turn our attention.

Although a single entry point, a uniform admissions policy, and curricular paths will go some distance in addressing significant problems for current and prospective students, those changes can be interpreted at worst as cosmetic and at best as minor. We believe that far more fundamental change is needed in undergraduate education at the University and we call for a campus-wide reexamination of baccalaureate programs and requirements.

In thinking about the curriculum we have had in mind responding to fundamental changes in knowledge, increasing the participation of professional school faculty in teaching undergraduate courses, and increasing the coherence of students' programs.

Policies that define baccalaureate degrees, including liberal education requirements, create the framework for curricula. In considering a reorganization to improve undergraduate education, there are several basic policy questions: where does liberal education fit in the University and who sets the liberal education requirements? who sets the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree? for the Bachelor of Science degree? There are also questions of implementation. Assuming that we want to undertake a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education, who does it? In this

section we make proposals and identify alternatives for addressing these questions.

Liberal Education At present there are as many liberal education policies as there are colleges, for though every college uses the same group distribution categories, they require different numbers of credits in the categories and, most importantly, recognize different courses as meeting requirements. There should be one Twin Cities policy for liberal education which sets a minimum standard for the liberal education component for all bachelors degrees. In principle, this policy should be the responsibility of all faculty who participate in undergraduate education, a group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This group will include faculty from the professional schools; it will be the functional arts and sciences faculty, broader than the group traditionally called by that name. This group should also be responsible for admission policies for freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. In reaching this recommendation, we considered the alternative that the policy group should be the faculties of a subset of colleges: the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology (or its successor colleges), the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College. We rejected this alternative, because a main goal of reorganization is to involve faculty of all colleges in providing liberal education. The best and fairest way to achieve this goal is to include all participating faculty in the policy group.

A committee appointed by the Provost for up to a two-year term should undertake a review and reshaping of liberal education. The committee should recommend to the Provost and to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy the reshaping of the curriculum and the proper organization and operation of the curriculum policy group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In this review, the group distribution categories in the present policy should not be regarded as sacred, but up for change, possibly radical change that reflects the changing structure of knowledge. We rejected the alternative that the Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education should be asked to undertake this task because that committee is too small to include the needed range of representation and because Assembly committees do not have the continuity over two years that is needed in this case.

Bachelors Degrees Standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree presently are set in two places: the College of Liberal Arts (which for purposes of this policy includes some departments in the Institute of Technology and the College of Biological Sciences) and University College. Unless the College of Liberal Arts divides into two or more colleges, this arrangement should continue. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, an appropriate sub-faculty of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should take responsibility for the successor of the present College of Liberal Arts Bachelor of Arts degree. Standards for Bachelor of Science degrees presently are set by the faculties of the various colleges which offer the degrees; this arrangement should continue.

As a first stage in reforming the curriculum, we propose a three-year period (1988-91) of experimentation in which faculty prepare, develop, and

teach courses that constitute major changes in course content or delivery. We recommended above that the Provost appoint a committee to review and reshape liberal education. We think this committee is important. But we do not want to wait to begin experimentation until a committee with a two-year charge reports and has its recommendations debated by the faculty. We believe that the faculty are ready now to strengthen undergraduate education, and require only support to do so. One area in which we encourage immediate experimentation is "mini-core" curricula.

Mini-core curricula Students will benefit from packages of courses that (i) involve students actively in the shaping of knowledge, (ii) are integrated by a theme that challenges the student to make connections, (iii) develop skills, and (iv) support academic and career exploration. We call such packages of courses mini-core curricula. Mini-cores will address the widely recognized problems that many students lack a sense of intellectual community and that under our present curriculum, many students' programs lack coherence, especially in the first two years. Mini-core curricula will foster communities ancillary to those in the admissions tracks. For example, there might be a mini-core liberal education curriculum which treated the impact of science and technology on nutrition and health, explored the history of institutions and professions related to health and agriculture, and dealt with ethical issues in these areas.

The University should aggressively pursue the development of mini-core curricula.

We also recommend the expansion of honors curricula in the lower division and in all colleges. Our picture of honors curricula is not of more content poured into quicker students, but deeper exploration of the making of knowledge and the application of knowledge to problems by students whose preparation and motivation ready them for greater challenge. Such education provides the ideal fit between the University's undergraduate, research, and land grant missions. Development of honors curricula leads to ideas and approaches that can be applied more widely in regular curricula.

There is wide agreement that reform of liberal education, development of mini-core curricula, and expansion of honors programs are urgently needed, but there has been little discussion of how to bring about real curricular change. We make the following recommendations:

Faculty will need summer and academic year released time to design new curricula. All funds in the current Educational Development Grants Program and Small Grants Program should be redirected to this purpose. Dedicating the Bush Sabbatical Program to this purpose for several years should also be considered. Outside support should be sought as part of the Minnesota Campaign.

For mini-core curricula and improvements in liberal education to happen on a significant scale, departments will have to redirect teaching resources to new courses that become part of the departments' regular programs. Working singly and in consort, departments should create

packages and sequences of courses which achieve multiple educational goals. A fundamental policy issue is the allocation of teaching resources between the lower and upper divisions. The University must be sensitive to the educational argument that personalized instruction and active learning strategies invested in beginning students can equip them to learn effectively on their own and in large groups later on. Every department should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its distribution of effort among 1000, 3000, 5000, and 8000 level courses. Attention should be given also to the reward system. The University should recognize that faculty in different stages of their careers may want to devote more or less of their effort to undergraduate education. Departments should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its evaluation of faculty contributions to undergraduate education and its balance of rewards for these contributions and research.

The Provost should institute a comprehensive and ongoing system of planning to improve curricula. The Provost should work with deans, and deans with department chairs and heads, in an annual planning cycle beginning with agreement on goals and on resources to be committed to reaching the goals and ending with an evaluation of progress. High performance departments should be rewarded with resources. This planning should probably be on a three-year rolling cycle.

We considered recommending that a significant budget be placed in the control of an officer in the Provost's office with responsibility for lower division curriculum. This officer would negotiate with departments for contributions to the curriculum; high performing departments would be rewarded with increased resources. We believe that this approach could improve curricula, at least in the short run, but at the cost of creating uncertainty for departments that might damage their quality in the longer run. The approach might also create a group of faculty who teach only in the lower division. We conclude that continuous planning and review should be given a chance to work before the University tries fiscal strong-arm methods to improve curricula in the lower division.

3. Advising

Preceding sections have provided a vision of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus, a model of student flow into and through the lower division, and exciting recommendations for curricular innovation. Academic advising is the means by which these improvements to undergraduate education are delivered to University students. If fundamental problems in the advising system are not addressed, all of the above improvements will be at risk.

The committee has identified three major themes that need to be addressed: (1) reducing the advisee/adviser ratio; (2) changing administrative organization to improve coordination and leadership; and (3) moving to proactive advising for lower division students.

High-quality academic advising is essential for a diverse student population to make informed decisions about their education, especially in the rich context of the Twin Cities campus. To improve advising, the University must address policy resource, leadership, and organizational issues. Advising is an area that cries out for campus-wide leadership and coordination.

A key policy issue is who is responsible for advising lower division students. Advising systems need to be articulated that respond to student and collegiate needs and incorporate all of our resources--i.e., faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers.

Present resources for advising create an advisee/adviser ratio of about 460 to 1 in the College of Liberal Arts. This ratio should be seen in comparison with the following national standards recommended by the National Association of Academic Advisers:

- fragile, high-risk, special populations--1 adviser to 100 students.
- exploring options, uncommitted, undecided--1 adviser to 200 entering students.
- committed, declared majors--1 adviser to 300 students.

This shortfall in advising resources is so severe as to rise to the level of policy. Funds should be provided to make good advising possible, with advisee/adviser ratio goals being the starting point.

We recommend the creation of a University Advising Office, administered by a Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which will be charged to provide leadership for advising on the campus for such issues as the following: roles and responsibilities of advisers, advising loads, advisee/adviser ratio, annual goals, a Twin Cities campus advising philosophy and mission statement, evaluation scheme for advising officers and advisers, coordinating existing advising resources, providing training and professional development for advisers, being responsible for disseminating information critical to the advising process.

We recommend, as a model for improved advising, the concept of "advising clusters" that cut across collegiate lines. In this model each freshman will be assigned to a professional adviser who coordinates teams, or clusters, which include professional advisers, faculty advisers, graduate teaching assistants, and peer advisers. The student will benefit from the special skills and perspectives of the various members of the cluster; the members of the cluster will benefit from being able to concentrate on contributing their particular strengths to a cooperative advising effort. Advising clusters are also a way of creating a community for students who are getting started at the University, for the office of a student's professional adviser will be a home base for both the student and the advising cluster.

We further recommend the immediate development of a computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking. This is the first step toward providing students with the accurate and personalized information needed to take advantage of the rich resources this University has available for undergraduate education. It will free student and adviser time for more meaningful dialogue. The implementation of a common entry port and the academy structure supportive of academic exploration make the computer-assisted advising program critical to the necessary educational planning. To be most effective, this system should include courses taken through Continuing Education and Extension. Therefore, the conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base should proceed.

As a rule, where possible, the new advising structure should use the expertise of current advising staff and the current advising strategies and schemes that have proven effective.

4. Administrative Organization

Given our path to this point, we necessarily view administrative organization in the context of the needs for strengthened curricula and improved advising discussed in earlier sections. We want strongly to insist on a principle of economy: administrators should not be multiplied beyond necessity. We have held the number of new positions we recommend to a minimum compatible with new functions we believe must be served. We urge that serious consideration be given either to eliminating existing positions or to recasting them to provide for the new administrative needs.

Our basic observation is that there is a set of functions that need to be brought under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority in the Office of the Provost; for convenience of reference, we assume that they will be the responsibility of a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This position is distinct from any issues of reporting of deans to the Provost's Office. The functions for which this officer will be responsible include entry into the University, curriculum, and lower division advising matters discussed above. They also include functions which have to do with bringing students into the University and supporting them while they are here. These additional functions all have the feature that they directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions. It is essential that this position be regarded as part of the President's cabinet and that the holder of the position attend meetings of the Management Committee and take part in the weekly breakfasts of the President and Vice Presidents.

It may be useful for us to explain why we recommend a Vice Provost who will gather together a broad range of undergraduate education functions but to whom deans will not report.

We approached our charge from the point of view of improving education for undergraduate students, not from the point of view of changing the power relationships between the St. Paul campus, the health sciences, and the other parts of the University. We believe that the recommendations we have developed, if implemented as a group, will greatly improve the undergraduate education the University provides. Given the turmoil and controversy surrounding the recommendations for new vice presidents or vice provosts to whom deans report, it seems useful to have a set of recommendations that show what can be done independently of that controversy.

As a first cut, therefore, we ask the University community to view our recommendations as an attempt to separate some issues and carve out a path for much needed improvements that can be followed independently of what is done about new vice presidents.

We believe further that the creation of a new Vice President, or Vice Provost, for Arts and Sciences, to whom the deans of the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology, the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College report is probably not the best way to improve undergraduate education. We believe that improvement of undergraduate education can be done directly, and more efficiently, by the Provost, working with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education in the way we recommend.

It may be argued that a "matrix" vice provost, of the kind we propose, without line authority and substantial budgetary control over collegiate units would be powerless and ineffective. The key issue is the Provost's support for undergraduate education. If the Provost supports the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the position will be effective. On the other hand, if the Provost does not support undergraduate initiatives, whatever number of line vice presidents or vice provosts, they will not be effective. The Provost's support must be assumed. The problem of administrative design is to find the most efficient system that, with the Provost's support, can be effective.

We return to some important details of the reorganization we recommend based on the principle that functions that directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions should be brought under unified authority.

The present Offices of Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Information Systems and Services, Publications, and Orientation should report to the Vice Provost.

The funds currently dedicated to Educational Development Programs should be redirected to the curricular reforms recommended above for at least five years, after which time their use should be reassessed. The distribution of these funds should be directed by the Vice Provost.

Offices for students with special needs, including the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, the Office for Students with

Disabilities, and an Office for Honors Programs should report to the Vice Provost. Functions shared by the Martin Luther King Program (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs should be brought under unified leadership and authority in the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

Field learning, internships, and community service will become even more important than at present as the University works to bring its research and land grant missions more into the undergraduate curriculum. To coordinate the expansion of these opportunities across the Twin Cities campus, the Office of Special Learning Opportunities (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) should move to the Vice Provost's Office.

Precollege programs link the academic opportunities of the University with students in the schools. The University should establish a Director of Precollege Programs to coordinate and strengthen current programs, to identify gaps in the current set of programs, and to stimulate the creation of appropriate new programs. The director should report to the Vice Provost.

Enrollment management is of the first importance now that the Legislature has adopted enrollment limits for the University. Policy proposals in this area should be generated by the Council of Undergraduate Deans, chaired by the Vice Provost. The Vice Provost will assess the recommendations and carry the recommended policies to the Provost and President for adoption.

Active recruitment ensures cultural and ethnic diversity on campus, matches faculty with students in ability and interests, and balances distribution of students across majors. The Twin Cities campus should have a Director of Recruitment who reports to the Vice Provost.

5. What Does It Add Up To?

In response to Commitment to Focus the people of the state are asking what the University will do to improve the undergraduate education it provides on the Twin Cities campus. How shall we respond to this question?

If the recommendations of this report are accepted, the answer falls into four parts.

Entry and exploration We will create a single entry point with curricular paths and establish a Regents' College, with strong advising resources, for freshmen and sophomores who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University. This will help prospective students understand how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them. It will enhance the ability of freshman and sophomore students to explore various intellectual and career possibilities.

Curriculum We will establish an expanded Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which includes faculty from professional schools, to define and deliver liberal education. A Provost's Task Force will conduct a fundamental review and reshaping of the University's approach to liberal education. Starting in the fall of 1988 there will be a three-year period of experimentation in which faculty develop and teach mini-core curricula, integrated packages of courses that enhance skills and support academic and career exploration.

Advising Faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers will cooperate in advising students under the leadership of a new Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus. Resources will be allocated to bring adviser/advisee ratios into conformity with national standards. A computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking will be developed.

Administrative organization A new office of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will bring under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority the functions of entry into the University, curriculum, and advising just listed as well as the following functions which directly support the colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions: financial aid; admissions and records; data and reporting services; publications; educational development grants and programs; special offices for minority students, students with disabilities, and honors students; the Office of Special Learning Opportunities; precollege programs; recruitment; and enrollment management.

These concrete changes will help bring the research and land grant missions into the education of students, creating a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

6. Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues

We approached our charge with hope and concern. It is a time of challenge and possibility for undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. Commitment to Focus, with its proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollments while keeping resources constant, has put a spotlight on this part of our mission. The people of the State recognize that at present our undergraduate education has along with considerable strengths grave weaknesses, especially in the lower division. They know they deserve better and they are challenging us to provide better. This is an exciting challenge which we can meet with flair. The Twin Cities campus of the University has the people and ideas to make significant improvements in undergraduate education, to make it an education of which we are all proud.

At the same time we are worried about the future of undergraduate education on this campus. The planning process in the wake of Commitment to Focus has generated expectations on the part both of faculty and of external audiences that, in the event of actual resource allocations, may exceed our means. In this climate whatever resources are available to the University

may be perceived as woefully inadequate, and in the competition for them undergraduate education may again be shortchanged. We are concerned about the divisions that have appeared recently in the University community. We hope for return to an atmosphere that nurtures attitudes essential to improving undergraduate education--openness to new ways of teaching, patient cooperation, willingness to share energy and idealism about teaching and learning.

Finally, we have felt and would like to convey a sense of urgency. It is urgent that the University act quickly to make improvements in undergraduate education that will be felt by students, faculty, and staff. We believe that our recommendations provide a direct and efficient path to important improvements. We know that our colleagues in the University community will critically examine and amend our work. Our recommendations, or alternatives to similar ends, should be acted on beginning in this academic year. Derek Bok ended an article in a recent Harvard Magazine with an anecdote that applies to us.

We should take inspiration from the story President Kennedy used to tell about the French general Louis Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slow-growing and would not reach maturity for one hundred years. "In that case," Lyautey responded, "there is no time to lose. We must plant it this afternoon."

A P P E N D I X

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, this report makes the following recommendations:

Entry and Exploration

1. Establish a uniform admissions policy for the Twin Cities campus. (Page 2.)
2. Change the new high school student application procedure by having students apply to the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities instead of seven colleges. (Page 2.)
3. Create an enrollment and advising designator, titled "Regents' College," for students who wish to explore the full variety of majors and degree programs on the Twin Cities campus. (Page 3.)
4. Identify curricular paths that require admission and/or course sequences during the first or second years of study. (Page 2.)

Curriculum

5. Establish a "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" from the colleges on the Twin Cities campus which would have among its responsibilities oversight of liberal education standards and admissions policies. (Page 4.)
6. Appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review of undergraduate curricula, recommend minimum liberal education standards for all colleges on the Twin Cities campus, and possibly develop new curricular and instructional models. (Page 4.)
7. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to recommend campus standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree. (Page 5.)
8. Establish a three-year period of curricular experimentation in which substantial funds are directed for design and implementation of innovative undergraduate curricula such as mini-core curricula and honors curricula. (Page 5.)
9. Establish a procedure of annual review of undergraduate curricula by the Vice Provost and Provost with the deans of undergraduate colleges. (Page 6.)

Advising

10. Create a University Advising Office administered by a Director of

Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which would be charged with providing leadership for advising on the campus. (Page 8.)

11. Implement a computerized system for academic advising, tracking, and for degree clearance, including conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base. (Page 8.)
12. Develop a model for improved advising, utilizing the concept of advising clusters that cut across college lines. (Page 8.)
13. Create an advising staff for Regents' College students. (Page 3.)

Administrative Organization

14. Hold to the principle of reassignment of current personnel as often as possible in filling any proposed positions. (Page 9.)
15. Establish the position, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. (Page 9.)
16. Establish the position, Director of Precollege Programs. (Page 10.)
17. Establish the position, Director of Recruitment. (Page 11.)
18. Shift the reporting line of the following units to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education: Office of Admissions and Records, Office of Financial Aid, Information Systems and Services, Orientation, Office for Minority and Special Student Affairs, Office of Educational Development Programs, Office for Honors, Office of Special Learning Opportunities, and selected units, including the Office for Students with Disabilities, from the University Counseling Services. (Page 10.)
19. Develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan that guides, minimally, recruitment and precollege program planning. (Page 11.)

January 6, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Committee Members	
Introduction	1
Section 1: Entry and Exploration	2
Section 2: Curriculum	3
Section 3: Advising	6
Section 4: Administrative Organization	8
Section 5: What Does It Add Up To?	10
Section 6: Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues	11
Appendix: Summary of Recommendations	

LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

THE ACADEMY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Julieann Carson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Marjorie K. Cowmeadow, Assistant Dean, General College

Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs

Russell K. Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology

Jeanne T. Lupton, Special Assistant to the Vice Presidents for
Academic Affairs and Student Affairs

Earl Nolting, Director, Continuing Education and Extension
Counseling

Kathleen F. Peterson, Associate Advisor, Biological Sciences
Student Services

Wesley K. Wharton, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture

John Wallace, Chair, and Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs

flo wiger, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Academic
Affairs

The Organization of Undergraduate Education
Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota

We are moving into a complex, technology and value based, interdependent world. To generate and sustain in this environment a decent society--just in distribution of wealth and position, efficient and abundant in provision of goods and services, judicious in the use of natural resources, vital in cultural and artistic life, fair in dealings with other nations--requires people who can deliberate together to envision ambitious projects and then work together to carry them out.

Our committee has assumed that undergraduate education has an essential role in educating people to do this job. We believe that the University of Minnesota, both research and land grant, committed to the creation of new knowledge and the application of knowledge to solve problems, can provide a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

Our distinctive kind of undergraduate education will bring the research and land grant missions into the undergraduate curriculum, showing students that knowledge is not fixed, but an ongoing process of revision and growth. It will give them a first hand sense of how old knowledge is criticized and new knowledge is made, a sense of the complexity of social problems, of how institutional change can be brought about through application of new knowledge, and how change in one institution reverberates through the social fabric. The education will be liberal, freeing the students from the dominance of authorities and orthodoxies, giving them the resources to criticize, to probe for hidden assumptions, to construct new solutions. The instructional methods in the curriculum will balance lecture with discussion, reading and listening with writing and speaking, mastery of theory with application in the field and laboratory.

Students of color will find in our classrooms, laboratories, student clubs, and informal student and faculty groups a genuine welcome, respect for their cultural integrity, and appreciation of the contributions they bring from their racial and cultural experience. The full participation of students of color in the University, in numbers at least equal to their representation in the wider population, is a fundamental goal for reasons not only of social justice but also of educational quality: the richness of diversity students of color bring to the University community enhances learning for everyone, students and faculty. Furthermore, there is no better preparation for helping to build a decent society than participating in a decent university community when one is a student.

We propose in the following four sections a structure to make this vision a reality.

1. Entry and Exploration

The University's policies for entry have two goals: to show prospective students how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them and to give new students a sense of the opportunities and limits of intellectual exploration. We wanted to devise policies that provide the entering student a simple admission procedure and freedom to explore various curricular and career possibilities.

Under our current system, seven colleges admit freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. We propose that all students apply for entry not to a college but to the University. Students will normally be admitted if they have a PAR of 150 or above and have taken the prerequisite courses. They will be considered for admission if they have a PAR of 120 or above and have taken the prerequisites. Beginning in 1991 the prerequisite courses will be:

Four years of English with emphasis on writing, including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appreciation;

Two years of social studies, including American history;

Three years of mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra;

Three years of science, including one biological and one physical science;

Two years of a single second language.

The applications of students who do not meet the requirements will automatically receive special review. The applications of underprepared and disadvantaged students will continue to be reviewed individually, with admission decisions based on an assessment of applicants' potential for successfully completing college work at the baccalaureate level.

At the time of application, students who qualify may also apply to be admitted to designated curricular paths within one of the colleges with a lower division. If admitted to the path, a student would then be enrolled as a student in that college.

Curricular paths serve two purposes. They help provide students a sense of community, and they recognize the diversity of curricular interests while still assuring a broad liberal education. Examples of curricular paths are fine arts, foreign languages, physical sciences and engineering, and life sciences. Special paths will also be provided for students who have not completed the preparation requirements.

Curricular paths may in some cases serve a third purpose: enrollment control. For example, the engineering and physical sciences path can be

used for enrollment management in the Institute of Technology. Students who complete this path would be given preferential admission to majors in the Institute of Technology. We believe that this preferential policy would encourage students to explore offerings elsewhere in the University, since they would be less concerned about admission to the Institute of Technology. Students in other paths might have to demonstrate higher performance for junior year admission to majors in the Institute of Technology.

Students need not, however, apply for a curricular path. Students who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University would enroll in Regents' College. No faculty would reside in Regents' College and no courses would carry that designation. Rather, students would take courses offered by the other colleges on the Twin Cities campus and taught by the comprehensive Faculty of Arts and Sciences (described in the curriculum section below). It is essential that new funds for advising be allocated to this college so that it will be extraordinarily attractive to students as an advising resource.

2. Curriculum

The vitality of a research university derives from the dynamism of creating new knowledge, of challenging it, and of sharing it with our students. In recent years, knowledge has expanded rapidly, overlapping disciplines while establishing others. Incorporating this vitality into basic arts and science education for undergraduates is the particular challenge of baccalaureate education at our University and one to which we need to turn our attention.

Although a single entry point, a uniform admissions policy, and curricular paths will go some distance in addressing significant problems for current and prospective students, those changes can be interpreted at worst as cosmetic and at best as minor. We believe that far more fundamental change is needed in undergraduate education at the University and we call for a campus-wide reexamination of baccalaureate programs and requirements.

In thinking about the curriculum we have had in mind responding to fundamental changes in knowledge, increasing the participation of professional school faculty in teaching undergraduate courses, and increasing the coherence of students' programs.

Policies that define baccalaureate degrees, including liberal education requirements, create the framework for curricula. In considering a reorganization to improve undergraduate education, there are several basic policy questions: where does liberal education fit in the University and who sets the liberal education requirements? who sets the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree? for the Bachelor of Science degree? There are also questions of implementation. Assuming that we want to undertake a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education, who does it? In this

section we make proposals and identify alternatives for addressing these questions.

Liberal Education At present there are as many liberal education policies as there are colleges, for though every college uses the same group distribution categories, they require different numbers of credits in the categories and, most importantly, recognize different courses as meeting requirements. There should be one Twin Cities policy for liberal education which sets a minimum standard for the liberal education component for all bachelors degrees. In principle, this policy should be the responsibility of all faculty who participate in undergraduate education, a group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This group will include faculty from the professional schools; it will be the functional arts and sciences faculty, broader than the group traditionally called by that name. This group should also be responsible for admission policies for freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. In reaching this recommendation, we considered the alternative that the policy group should be the faculties of a subset of colleges: the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology (or its successor colleges), the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College. We rejected this alternative, because a main goal of reorganization is to involve faculty of all colleges in providing liberal education. The best and fairest way to achieve this goal is to include all participating faculty in the policy group.

A committee appointed by the Provost for upto a two year term should undertake a review and reshaping of liberal education. The committee should recommend to the Provost and to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy the reshaping of the curriculum and the proper organization and operation of the curriculum policy group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In this review, the group distribution categories in the present policy should not be regarded as sacred, but up for change, possibly radical change that reflects the changing structure of knowledge. We rejected the alternative that the Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education should be asked to undertake this task because that committee is too small to include the needed range of representation and because Assembly committees do not have the continuity over two years that is needed in this case.

Bachelors Degrees Standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree presently are set in two places: the College of Liberal Arts (which for purposes of this policy includes some departments in the Institute of Technology and the College of Biological Sciences) and University College. Unless the College of Liberal Arts divides into two or more colleges, this arrangement should continue. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, an appropriate sub-faculty of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should take responsibility for the successor of the present College of Liberal Arts Bachelor of Arts degree. Standards for Bachelor of Science degrees presently are set by the faculties of the various colleges which offer the degrees; this arrangement should continue.

As a first stage in reforming the curriculum, we propose a three-year period (1988-91) of experimentation in which faculty prepare, develop, and

teach courses that constitute major changes in course content or delivery. We recommended above that the Provost appoint a committee to review and reshape liberal education. We think this committee is important. But we do not want to wait to begin experimentation until a committee with a two-year charge reports and has its recommendations debated by the faculty. We believe that the faculty are ready now to strengthen undergraduate education, and require only support to do so. One area in which we encourage immediate experimentation is "mini-core" curricula.

Mini-core curricula Students will benefit from packages of courses that (i) involve students actively in the shaping of knowledge, (ii) are integrated by a theme that challenges the student to make connections, (iii) develop skills, and (iv) support academic and career exploration. We call such packages of courses mini-core curricula. Mini-cores will address the widely recognized problems that many students lack a sense of intellectual community and that under our present curriculum, many students' programs lack coherence, especially in the first two years. Mini-core curricula will foster communities ancillary to those in the admissions tracks. For example, there might be a mini-core liberal education curriculum which treated the impact of science and technology on nutrition and health, explored the history of institutions and professions related to health and agriculture, and dealt with ethical issues in these areas.

The University should aggressively pursue the development of mini-core curricula.

We also recommend the expansion of honors curricula in the lower division and in all colleges. Our picture of honors curricula is not of more content poured into quicker students, but deeper exploration of the making of knowledge and the application of knowledge to problems by students whose preparation and motivation ready them for greater challenge. Such education provides the ideal fit between the University's undergraduate, research, and land grant missions. Development of honors curricula leads to ideas and approaches that can be applied more widely in regular curricula.

There is wide agreement that reform of liberal education, development of mini-core curricula, and expansion of honors programs are urgently needed, but there has been little discussion of how to bring about real curricular change. We make the following recommendations:

Faculty will need summer and academic year released time to design new curricula. All funds in the current Educational Development Grants Program and Small Grants Program should be redirected to this purpose. Dedicating the Bush Sabbatical Program to this purpose for a several years should also be considered. Outside support should be sought as part of the Minnesota Campaign.

For mini-core curricula and improvements in liberal education to happen on a significant scale, departments will have to redirect teaching resources to new courses that become part of the departments' regular programs. Working singly and in consort, departments should create

packages and sequences of courses which achieve multiple educational goals. A fundamental policy issue is the allocation of teaching resources between the lower and upper divisions. The University must be sensitive to the educational argument that personalized instruction and active learning strategies invested in beginning students can equip them to learn effectively on their own and in large groups later on. Every department should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its distribution of effort among 1000, 3000, 5000, and 8000 level courses. Attention should be given also to the reward system. The University should recognize that faculty in different stages of their careers may want to devote more or less of their effort to undergraduate education. Departments should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its evaluation of faculty contributions to undergraduate education and its balance of rewards for these contributions and research.

The Provost should institute a comprehensive and ongoing system of planning to improve curricula. The Provost should work with deans, and deans with department chairs and heads, in an annual planning cycle beginning with agreement on goals and on resources to be committed to reaching the goals and ending with an evaluation of progress. High performance departments should be rewarded with resources. This planning should probably be on a three year rolling cycle.

We considered the recommending that a significant budget be placed in the control of an officer in the Provost's office with responsibility for lower division curriculum. This officer would negotiate with departments for contributions to the curriculum; high performing departments would be rewarded with increased resources. We believe that this approach could improve curricula, at least in the short run, but at the cost of creating uncertainty for departments that might damage their quality in the longer run. The approach might also create a group of faculty who teach only in the lower division. We conclude that continuous planning and review should be given a chance to work before the University tries fiscal strong-arm methods to improve curricula in the lower division.

3. Advising

Preceding sections have provided a vision of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus, a model of student flow into and through the lower division, and exciting recommendations for curricular innovation. Academic advising is the means by which these improvements to undergraduate education are delivered to University students. If fundamental problems in the advising system are not addressed, all of the above improvements will be at risk.

The committee has identified three major themes that need to be addressed: (1) reducing the advisee/adviser ratio; (2) changing administrative organization to improve coordination and leadership; and (3) moving to proactive advising for lower division students.

High-quality academic advising is essential for a diverse student population to make informed decisions about their education, especially in the rich context of the Twin Cities campus. To improve advising, the University must address policy resource, leadership, and organizational issues. Advising is an area that cries out for campus-wide leadership and coordination.

A key policy issue is who is responsible for advising lower division students. Advising systems need to be articulated that respond to student and collegiate needs and incorporate all of our resources--i.e., faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers.

Present resources for advising create an advisee/adviser ratio of about 460 to 1 in the College of Liberal Arts. This ratio should be seen in comparison with the following national standards recommended by the National Association of Academic Advisers:

- fragile, high-risk, special populations--1 adviser to 100 students.
- exploring options, uncommitted, undecided--1 adviser to 200 entering students.
- committed, declared majors--1 adviser to 300 students.

This shortfall in advising resources is so severe as to rise to the level of policy. Funds should be provided to make good advising possible, with advisee/adviser ratio goals being the starting point.

We recommend the creation of a University Advising Office, administered by a Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which will be charged to provide leadership for advising on the campus for such issues as the following: roles and responsibilities of advisers, advising loads, advisee/adviser ratio, annual goals, a Twin Cities campus advising philosophy and mission statement, evaluation scheme for advising officers and advisers, coordinating existing advising resources, providing training and professional development for advisers, being responsible for disseminating information critical to the advising process.

We recommend, as a model for improved advising, the concept of "advising clusters" that cut across collegiate lines. In this model each freshman will be assigned to a professional adviser who coordinates teams, or clusters, which include professional advisers, faculty advisers, graduate teaching assistants, and peer advisers. The student will benefit from the special skills and perspectives of the various members of the cluster; the members of the cluster will benefit from being able to concentrate on contributing their particular strengths to a cooperative advising effort. Advising clusters are also a way of creating a community for students who are getting started at the University, for the office of a student's professional adviser will be a home base for both the student and the advising cluster.

We further recommend the immediate development of a computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking. This is the first step toward providing students with the accurate and personalized information needed to take advantage of the rich resources this University has available for undergraduate education. It will free student and adviser time for more meaningful dialogue. The implementation of a common entry port and the academy structure supportive of academic exploration make the computer-assisted advising program critical to the necessary educational planning. To be most effective, this system should include courses taken through Continuing Education and Extension. Therefore, the conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base should proceed.

As a rule, where possible, the new advising structure should use the expertise of current advising staff and the current advising strategies and schemes that have proven effective.

4. Administrative Organization

Given our path to this point, we necessarily view administrative organization in the context of the needs for strengthened curricula and improved advising discussed in earlier sections. We want strongly to insist on a principle of economy: administrators should not be multiplied beyond necessity. We have held the number of new positions we recommend to a minimum compatible with new functions we believe must be served. We urge that serious consideration be given either to eliminating existing positions or to recasting them to provide for the new administrative needs.

Our basic observation is that there is a set of functions that need to be brought under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority in the Office of the Provost; for convenience of reference, we assume that they will be the responsibility of a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This position is distinct from any issues of reporting of deans to the Provost's Office. The functions for which this officer will be responsible include entry into the University, curriculum, and lower division advising matters discussed above. They also include functions which have to do with bringing students into the University and supporting them while they are here. These additional functions all have the feature that they directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions. It is essential that this position be regarded as part of the President's cabinet and that the holder of the position attend meetings of the Management Committee and take part in the weekly breakfasts of the President and Vice Presidents.

It may be useful for us to explain why we recommend a Vice Provost who will gather together a broad range of undergraduate education functions but to whom deans will not report.

We approached our charge from the point of view of improving education for undergraduate students, not from the point of view of changing the power relationships between the St. Paul campus, the health sciences, and the other parts of the University. We believe that the recommendations we have developed, if implemented as a group, will greatly improve the undergraduate education the University provides. Given the turmoil and controversy surrounding the recommendations for new vice presidents or vice provosts to whom deans report, it seems useful to have a set of recommendations that show what can be done independently of that controversy.

As a first cut, therefore, we ask the University community to view our recommendations as an attempt to separate some issues and carve out a path for much needed improvements that can be followed independently of what is done about new vice presidents.

We believe further that the creation of a new Vice President, or Vice Provost, for Arts and Sciences, to whom the deans of the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology, the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College report is probably not the best way to improve undergraduate education. We believe that improvement of undergraduate education can be done directly, and more efficiently, by the Provost, working with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education in the way we recommend.

It may be argued that a "matrix" vice provost, of the kind we propose, without line authority and substantial budgetary control over collegiate units would be powerless and ineffective. The key issue is the Provost's support for undergraduate education. If the Provost supports the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the position will be effective. On the other hand, if the Provost does not support undergraduate initiatives, whatever number of line vice presidents or vice provosts, they will not be effective. The Provost's support must be assumed. The problem of administrative design is to find the most efficient system that, with the Provost's support, can be effective.

We return to some important details of the reorganization we recommend based on the principle that functions that directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions should be brought under unified authority.

The present Offices of Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Information Systems and Services, Publications, and Orientation should report to the Vice Provost.

The funds currently dedicated to Educational Development Programs should be redirected to the curricular reforms recommended above for at least five years, after which time their use should be reassessed. The distribution of these funds should be directed by the Vice Provost.

Offices for students with special needs, including the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, the Office for Students with

Disabilities, and an Office for Honors Programs should report to the Vice Provost. Functions shared by the Martin Luther King Program (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs should be brought under unified leadership and authority in the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

Field learning, internships, and community service will become even more important than at present as the University works to bring its research and land grant missions more into the undergraduate curriculum. To coordinate the expansion of these opportunities across the Twin Cities campus, the Office of Special Learning Opportunities (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) should move to the Vice Provost's Office.

Precollege programs link the academic opportunities of the University with students in the schools. The University should establish a Director of Precollege Programs to coordinate and strengthen current programs, to identify gaps in the current set of programs, and to stimulate the creation of appropriate new programs. The director should report to the Vice Provost.

Enrollment management is of the first importance now that the Legislature has adopted enrollment limits for the University. Policy proposals in this area should be generated by the Council of Undergraduate Deans, chaired by the Vice Provost. The Vice Provost will assess the recommendations and carry the recommended policies to the Provost and President for adoption.

Active recruitment ensures cultural and ethnic diversity on campus, matches faculty with students in ability and interests, and balances distribution of students across majors. The Twin Cities campus should have a Director of Recruitment who reports to the Vice Provost.

5. What Does It Add Up To?

In response to Commitment to Focus the people of the state are asking what the University will do to improve the undergraduate education it provides on the Twin Cities campus. How shall we respond to this question?

If the recommendations of this report are accepted, the answer falls into four parts.

Entry and exploration We will create a single entry point with curricular paths and establish a Regents' College, with strong advising resources, for freshmen and sophomores who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University. This will help prospective students understand how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them. It will enhance the ability of freshman and sophomore students to explore various intellectual and career possibilities.

Curriculum We will establish an expanded Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which includes faculty from professional schools, to define and deliver liberal education. A Provost's Task Force will conduct a fundamental review and reshaping of the University's approach to liberal education. Starting in the fall of 1988 there will be a three-year period of experimentation in which faculty develop and teach mini-core curricula, integrated packages of courses that enhance skills and support academic and career exploration.

Advising Faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers will cooperate in advising students under the leadership of a new Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus. Resources will be allocated to bring adviser/advisee ratios into conformity with national standards. A computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking will be developed.

Administrative organization A new office of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will bring under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority the functions of entry into the University, curriculum, and advising just listed as well as the following functions which directly support the colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions: financial aid; admissions and records; data and reporting services; publications; educational development grants and programs; special offices for minority students, students with disabilities, and honors students; the Office of Special Learning Opportunities; precollege programs; recruitment; and enrollment management.

These concrete changes will help bring the research and land grant missions into the education of students, creating a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

7. Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues

We approached our charge with hope and concern. It is a time of challenge and possibility for undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. Commitment to Focus, with its proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollments while keeping resources constant, has put a spotlight on this part of our mission. The people of the State recognize that at present our undergraduate education has along with considerable strengths grave weaknesses, especially in the lower division. They know they deserve better and they are challenging us to provide better. This is an exciting challenge which we can meet with flair. The Twin Cities campus of the University has the people and ideas to make significant improvements in undergraduate education, to make it an education of which we are all proud.

At the same time we are worried about the future of undergraduate education on this campus. The planning process in the wake of Commitment to Focus has generated expectations on the part both of faculty and of external audiences that, in the event of actual resource allocations, may exceed our means. In this climate whatever resources are available to the University

may be perceived as woefully inadequate, and in the competition for them undergraduate education may again be shortchanged. We are concerned about the divisions that have appeared recently in the University community. We hope for return to an atmosphere that nurtures attitudes essential to improving undergraduate education--openness to new ways of teaching, patient cooperation, willingness to share energy and idealism about teaching and learning.

Finally, we have felt and would like to convey a sense of urgency. It is urgent that the University act quickly to make improvements in undergraduate education that will be felt by students, faculty, and staff. We believe that our recommendations provide a direct and efficient path to important improvements. We know that our colleagues in the University community will critically examine and amend our work. Our recommendations, or alternatives to similar ends, should be acted on beginning in this academic year. Derek Bok ended an article in a recent Harvard Magazine with an anecdote that applies to us.

We should take inspiration from the story President Kennedy used to tell about the French general Louis Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slow-growing and would not reach maturity for one hundred years. "In that case," Lyautey responded, "there is no time to lose. We must plant it this afternoon."

A P P E N D I X

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, this report makes the following recommendations:

Entry and Exploration

1. Establish a uniform admissions policy for the Twin Cities campus. (Page 2.)
2. Change the New High School student application procedure by having students apply to the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities instead of seven colleges. (Page 2.)
3. Create an enrollment and advising designator, titled "Regents College," for students who wish to explore the full variety of majors and degree programs on the Twin Cities campus. (Page 3.)
4. Identify curricular paths that require admission and/or course sequences during the first or second years of study. (Page 2.)

Curriculum

5. Establish a "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" from the colleges on the Twin Cities campus which would have among its responsibilities oversight of liberal education standards and admissions policies. (Page 4.)
6. Appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review of undergraduate curricula, recommend minimum liberal education standards for all colleges on the Twin Cities campus, and possibly develop new curricular and instructional models. (Page 4.)
7. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to recommend campus standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree. (Page 5.)
8. Establish a three-year period of curricular experimentation in which substantial funds are directed for design and implementation of innovative undergraduate curricula such as mini-core curricula and honors curricula. (Page 5.)
9. Establish a procedure of annual review of undergraduate curricula by the Vice Provost and Provost with the deans of undergraduate colleges. (Page 6.)

Advising

10. Create a University Advising Office administered by a Director of

Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which would be charged with providing leadership for advising on the campus. (Page 8.)

11. Implement a computerized system for academic advising, tracking, and for degree clearance, including conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base. (Page 8.)
12. Develop a model for improved advising utilizing the concept of advising clusters that cut across college lines. (Page 8.)
13. Create an advising staff for Regents College students. (Page 3.)

Administrative Organization

14. Hold to the principle of reassignment of current personnel as often as possible in filling any proposed positions. (Page 9.)
15. Establish the position, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. (Page 9.)
16. Establish the position, Director of Precollege Programs. (Page 10.)
17. Establish the position, Director of Recruitment. (Page 11.)
18. Shift the reporting line of the following units to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education: Office of Admissions and Records, Office of Financial Aid, Information Systems and Services, Orientation, Office for Minority and Special Student Affairs, Office of Educational Development Programs, Office for Honors, Office of Special Learning Opportunities, and selected units, including the Office for Students with Disabilities, from the University Counseling Services. (Page 10.)
19. Develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan that guides, minimally, recruitment and precollege program planning. (Page 11.)

December 7, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Committee Members	
Introduction	1
Section 1: Entry and Exploration	2
Section 2: Curriculum	3
Section 3: Advising	6
Section 4: Administrative Organization	8
Section 5: What Does It Add Up To?	10
Section 6: Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues	11
Appendix: Summary of Recommendations	

LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

THE ACADEMY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Julieann Carson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Marjorie K. Cowmeadow, Assistant Dean, General College

Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs

Russell K. Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology

Jeanne T. Lupton, Special Assistant to the Vice Presidents for
Academic Affairs and Student Affairs

Earl Nolting, Director, Continuing Education and Extension
Counseling

Kathleen F. Peterson, Associate Advisor, Biological Sciences
Student Services

Wesley K. Wharton, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture

John Wallace, Chair, and Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs

flo wiger, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Academic
Affairs

The Organization of Undergraduate Education
Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota

We are moving into a complex, technology and value based, interdependent world. To generate and sustain in this environment a decent society—just in distribution of wealth and position, efficient and abundant in provision of goods and services, judicious in the use of natural resources, vital in cultural and artistic life, fair in dealings with other nations—requires people who can deliberate together to envision ambitious projects and then work together to carry them out.

Our committee has assumed that undergraduate education has an essential role in educating people to do this job. We believe that the University of Minnesota, both research and land grant, committed to the creation of new knowledge and the application of knowledge to solve problems, can provide a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

Our distinctive kind of undergraduate education will bring the research and land grant missions into the undergraduate curriculum, showing students that knowledge is not fixed, but an ongoing process of revision and growth. It will give them a first hand sense of how old knowledge is criticized and new knowledge is made, a sense of the complexity of social problems, of how institutional change can be brought about through application of new knowledge, and how change in one institution reverberates through the social fabric. The education will be liberal, freeing the students from the dominance of authorities and orthodoxies, giving them the resources to criticize, to probe for hidden assumptions, to construct new solutions. The instructional methods in the curriculum will balance lecture with discussion, reading and listening with writing and speaking, mastery of theory with application in the field and laboratory.

Students of color will find in our classrooms, laboratories, student clubs, and informal student and faculty groups a genuine welcome, respect for their cultural integrity, and appreciation of the contributions they bring from their racial and cultural experience. The full participation of students of color in the University, in numbers at least equal to their representation in the wider population, is a fundamental goal for reasons not only of social justice but also of educational quality: the richness of diversity students of color bring to the University community enhances learning for everyone, students and faculty. Furthermore, there is no better preparation for helping to build a decent society than participating in a decent university community when one is a student.

We propose in the following four sections a structure to make this vision a reality.

1. Entry and Exploration

The University's policies for entry have two goals: to show prospective students how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them and to give new students a sense of the opportunities and limits of intellectual exploration. We wanted to devise policies that provide the entering student a simple admission procedure and freedom to explore various curricular and career possibilities.

Under our current system, seven colleges admit freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. We propose that all students apply for entry not to a college but to the University. Students will normally be admitted if they have a PAR of 150 or above and have taken the prerequisite courses. They will be considered for admission if they have a PAR of 120 or above and have taken the prerequisites. Beginning in 1991 the prerequisite courses will be:

Four years of English with emphasis on writing, including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appreciation;

Two years of social studies, including American history;

Three years of mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra;

Three years of science, including one biological and one physical science;

Two years of a single second language.

The applications of students who do not meet the requirements will automatically receive special review. The applications of underprepared and disadvantaged students will continue to be reviewed individually, with admission decisions based on an assessment of applicants' potential for successfully completing college work at the baccalaureate level.

At the time of application, students who qualify may also apply to be admitted to designated curricular paths within one of the colleges with a lower division. If admitted to the path, a student would then be enrolled as a student in that college.

Curricular paths serve two purposes. They help provide students a sense of community, and they recognize the diversity of curricular interests while still assuring a broad liberal education. Examples of curricular paths are fine arts, foreign languages, physical sciences and engineering, and life sciences. Special paths will also be provided for students who have not completed the preparation requirements.

Curricular paths may in some cases serve a third purpose: enrollment control. For example, the engineering and physical sciences path can be

used for enrollment management in the Institute of Technology. Students who complete this path would be given preferential admission to majors in the Institute of Technology. We believe that this preferential policy would encourage students to explore offerings elsewhere in the University, since they would be less concerned about admission to the Institute of Technology. Students in other paths might have to demonstrate higher performance for junior year admission to majors in the Institute of Technology.

Students need not, however, apply for a curricular path. Students who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University would enroll in Regents' College. No faculty would reside in Regents' College and no courses would carry that designation. Rather, students would take courses offered by the other colleges on the Twin Cities campus and taught by the comprehensive Faculty of Arts and Sciences (described in the curriculum section below). It is essential that new funds for advising be allocated to this college so that it will be extraordinarily attractive to students as an advising resource.

2. Curriculum

The vitality of a research university derives from the dynamism of creating new knowledge, of challenging it, and of sharing it with our students. In recent years, knowledge has expanded rapidly, overlapping disciplines while establishing others. Incorporating this vitality into basic arts and science education for undergraduates is the particular challenge of baccalaureate education at our University and one to which we need to turn our attention.

Although a single entry point, a uniform admissions policy, and curricular paths will go some distance in addressing significant problems for current and prospective students, those changes can be interpreted at worst as cosmetic and at best as minor. We believe that far more fundamental change is needed in undergraduate education at the University and we call for a campus-wide reexamination of baccalaureate programs and requirements.

In thinking about the curriculum we have had in mind responding to fundamental changes in knowledge, increasing the participation of professional school faculty in teaching undergraduate courses, and increasing the coherence of students' programs.

Policies that define baccalaureate degrees, including liberal education requirements, create the framework for curricula. In considering a reorganization to improve undergraduate education, there are several basic policy questions: where does liberal education fit in the University and who sets the liberal education requirements? who sets the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree? for the Bachelor of Science degree? There are also questions of implementation. Assuming that we want to undertake a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education, who does it? In this

section we make proposals and identify alternatives for addressing these questions.

Liberal Education At present there are as many liberal education policies as there are colleges, for though every college uses the same group distribution categories, they require different numbers of credits in the categories and, most importantly, recognize different courses as meeting requirements. There should be one Twin Cities policy for liberal education which sets a minimum standard for the liberal education component for all bachelors degrees. In principle, this policy should be the responsibility of all faculty who participate in undergraduate education, a group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This group will include faculty from the professional schools; it will be the functional arts and sciences faculty, broader than the group traditionally called by that name. This group should also be responsible for admission policies for freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. In reaching this recommendation, we considered the alternative that the policy group should be the faculties of a subset of colleges: the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology (or its successor colleges), the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College. We rejected this alternative, because a main goal of reorganization is to involve faculty of all colleges in providing liberal education. The best and fairest way to achieve this goal is to include all participating faculty in the policy group.

A committee appointed by the Provost for upto a two year term should undertake a review and reshaping of liberal education. The committee should recommend to the Provost and to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy the reshaping of the curriculum and the proper organization and operation of the curriculum policy group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In this review, the group distribution categories in the present policy should not be regarded as sacred, but up for change, possibly radical change that reflects the changing structure of knowledge. We rejected the alternative that the Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education should be asked to undertake this task because that committee is too small to include the needed range of representation and because Assembly committees do not have the continuity over two years that is needed in this case.

Bachelors Degrees Standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree presently are set in two places: the College of Liberal Arts (which for purposes of this policy includes some departments in the Institute of Technology and the College of Biological Sciences) and University College. Unless the College of Liberal Arts divides into two or more colleges, this arrangement should continue. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, an appropriate sub-faculty of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should take responsibility for the successor of the present College of Liberal Arts Bachelor of Arts degree. Standards for Bachelor of Science degrees presently are set by the faculties of the various colleges which offer the degrees; this arrangement should continue.

As a first stage in reforming the curriculum, we propose a three-year period (1988-91) of experimentation in which faculty prepare, develop, and

teach courses that constitute major changes in course content or delivery. We recommended above that the Provost appoint a committee to review and reshape liberal education. We think this committee is important. But we do not want to wait to begin experimentation until a committee with a two-year charge reports and has its recommendations debated by the faculty. We believe that the faculty are ready now to strengthen undergraduate education, and require only support to do so. One area in which we encourage immediate experimentation is "mini-core" curricula.

Mini-core curricula Students will benefit from packages of courses that (i) involve students actively in the shaping of knowledge, (ii) are integrated by a theme that challenges the student to make connections, (iii) develop skills, and (iv) support academic and career exploration. We call such packages of courses mini-core curricula. Mini-cores will address the widely recognized problems that many students lack a sense of intellectual community and that under our present curriculum, many students' programs lack coherence, especially in the first two years. Mini-core curricula will foster communities ancillary to those in the admissions tracks. For example, there might be a mini-core liberal education curriculum which treated the impact of science and technology on nutrition and health, explored the history of institutions and professions related to health and agriculture, and dealt with ethical issues in these areas.

The University should aggressively pursue the development of mini-core curricula.

We also recommend the expansion of honors curricula in the lower division and in all colleges. Our picture of honors curricula is not of more content poured into quicker students, but deeper exploration of the making of knowledge and the application of knowledge to problems by students whose preparation and motivation ready them for greater challenge. Such education provides the ideal fit between the University's undergraduate, research, and land grant missions. Development of honors curricula leads to ideas and approaches that can be applied more widely in regular curricula.

There is wide agreement that reform of liberal education, development of mini-core curricula, and expansion of honors programs are urgently needed, but there has been little discussion of how to bring about real curricular change. We make the following recommendations:

Faculty will need summer and academic year released time to design new curricula. All funds in the current Educational Development Grants Program and Small Grants Program should be redirected to this purpose. Dedicating the Bush Sabbatical Program to this purpose for a several years should also be considered. Outside support should be sought as part of the Minnesota Campaign.

For mini-core curricula and improvements in liberal education to happen on a significant scale, departments will have to redirect teaching resources to new courses that become part of the departments' regular programs. Working singly and in consort, departments should create

packages and sequences of courses which achieve multiple educational goals. A fundamental policy issue is the allocation of teaching resources between the lower and upper divisions. The University must be sensitive to the educational argument that personalized instruction and active learning strategies invested in beginning students can equip them to learn effectively on their own and in large groups later on. Every department should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its distribution of effort among 1000, 3000, 5000, and 8000 level courses. Attention should be given also to the reward system. The University should recognize that faculty in different stages of their careers may want to devote more or less of their effort to undergraduate education. Departments should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its evaluation of faculty contributions to undergraduate education and its balance of rewards for these contributions and research.

The Provost should institute a comprehensive and ongoing system of planning to improve curricula. The Provost should work with deans, and deans with department chairs and heads, in an annual planning cycle beginning with agreement on goals and on resources to be committed to reaching the goals and ending with an evaluation of progress. High performance departments should be rewarded with resources. This planning should probably be on a three year rolling cycle.

We considered the recommending that a significant budget be placed in the control of an officer in the Provost's office with responsibility for lower division curriculum. This officer would negotiate with departments for contributions to the curriculum; high performing departments would be rewarded with increased resources. We believe that this approach could improve curricula, at least in the short run, but at the cost of creating uncertainty for departments that might damage their quality in the longer run. The approach might also create a group of faculty who teach only in the lower division. We conclude that continuous planning and review should be given a chance to work before the University tries fiscal strong-arm methods to improve curricula in the lower division.

3. Advising

Preceding sections have provided a vision of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus, a model of student flow into and through the lower division, and exciting recommendations for curricular innovation. Academic advising is the means by which these improvements to undergraduate education are delivered to University students. If fundamental problems in the advising system are not addressed, all of the above improvements will be at risk.

The committee has identified three major themes that need to be addressed: (1) reducing the advisee/adviser ratio; (2) changing administrative organization to improve coordination and leadership; and (3) moving to proactive advising for lower division students.

High-quality academic advising is essential for a diverse student population to make informed decisions about their education, especially in the rich context of the Twin Cities campus. To improve advising, the University must address policy resource, leadership, and organizational issues. Advising is an area that cries out for campus-wide leadership and coordination.

A key policy issue is who is responsible for advising lower division students. Advising systems need to be articulated that respond to student and collegiate needs and incorporate all of our resources--i.e., faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers.

Present resources for advising create an advisee/adviser ratio of about 460 to 1 in the College of Liberal Arts. This ratio should be seen in comparison with the following national standards recommended by the National Association of Academic Advisers:

- fragile, high-risk, special populations--1 adviser to 100 students.
- exploring options, uncommitted, undecided--1 adviser to 200 entering students.
- committed, declared majors--1 adviser to 300 students.

This shortfall in advising resources is so severe as to rise to the level of policy. Funds should be provided to make good advising possible, with advisee/adviser ratio goals being the starting point.

We recommend the creation of a University Advising Office, administered by a Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which will be charged to provide leadership for advising on the campus for such issues as the following: roles and responsibilities of advisers, advising loads, advisee/adviser ratio, annual goals, a Twin Cities campus advising philosophy and mission statement, evaluation scheme for advising officers and advisers, coordinating existing advising resources, providing training and professional development for advisers, being responsible for disseminating information critical to the advising process.

We recommend, as a model for improved advising, the concept of "advising clusters" that cut across collegiate lines. In this model each freshman will be assigned to a professional adviser who coordinates teams, or clusters, which include professional advisers, faculty advisers, graduate teaching assistants, and peer advisers. The student will benefit from the special skills and perspectives of the various members of the cluster; the members of the cluster will benefit from being able to concentrate on contributing their particular strengths to a cooperative advising effort. Advising clusters are also a way of creating a community for students who are getting started at the University, for the office of a student's professional adviser will be a home base for both the student and the advising cluster.

We further recommend the immediate development of a computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking. This is the first step toward providing students with the accurate and personalized information needed to take advantage of the rich resources this University has available for undergraduate education. It will free student and adviser time for more meaningful dialogue. The implementation of a common entry point and the academy structure supportive of academic exploration make the computer-assisted advising program critical to the necessary educational planning. To be most effective, this system should include courses taken through Continuing Education and Extension. Therefore, the conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base should proceed.

As a rule, where possible, the new advising structure should use the expertise of current advising staff and the current advising strategies and schemes that have proven effective.

4. Administrative Organization

Given our path to this point, we necessarily view administrative organization in the context of the needs for strengthened curricula and improved advising discussed in earlier sections. We want strongly to insist on a principle of economy: administrators should not be multiplied beyond necessity. We have held the number of new positions we recommend to a minimum compatible with new functions we believe must be served. We urge that serious consideration be given either to eliminating existing positions or to recasting them to provide for the new administrative needs.

Our basic observation is that there is a set of functions that need to be brought under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority in the Office of the Provost; for convenience of reference, we assume that they will be the responsibility of a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This position is distinct from any issues of reporting of deans to the Provost's Office. The functions for which this officer will be responsible include entry into the University, curriculum, and lower division advising matters discussed above. They also include functions which have to do with bringing students into the University and supporting them while they are here. These additional functions all have the feature that they directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions. It is essential that this position be regarded as part of the President's cabinet and that the holder of the position attend meetings of the Management Committee and take part in the weekly breakfasts of the President and Vice Presidents.

It may be useful for us to explain why we recommend a Vice Provost who will gather together a broad range of undergraduate education functions but to whom deans will not report.

We approached our charge from the point of view of improving education for undergraduate students, not from the point of view of changing the power relationships between the St. Paul campus, the health sciences, and the other parts of the University. We believe that the recommendations we have developed, if implemented as a group, will greatly improve the undergraduate education the University provides. Given the turmoil and controversy surrounding the recommendations for new vice presidents or vice provosts to whom deans report, it seems useful to have a set of recommendations that show what can be done independently of that controversy.

As a first cut, therefore, we ask the University community to view our recommendations as an attempt to separate some issues and carve out a path for much needed improvements that can be followed independently of what is done about new vice presidents.

We believe further that the creation of a new Vice President, or Vice Provost, for Arts and Sciences, to whom the deans of the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology, the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College report is probably not the best way to improve undergraduate education. We believe that improvement of undergraduate education can be done directly, and more efficiently, by the Provost, working with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education in the way we recommend.

It may be argued that a "matrix" vice provost, of the kind we propose, without line authority and substantial budgetary control over collegiate units would be powerless and ineffective. The key issue is the Provost's support for undergraduate education. If the Provost supports the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the position will be effective. On the other hand, if the Provost does not support undergraduate initiatives, whatever number of line vice presidents or vice provosts, they will not be effective. The Provost's support must be assumed. The problem of administrative design is to find the most efficient system that, with the Provost's support, can be effective.

We return to some important details of the reorganization we recommend based on the principle that functions that directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions should be brought under unified authority.

The present Offices of Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Information Systems and Services, Publications, and Orientation should report to the Vice Provost.

The funds currently dedicated to Educational Development Programs should be redirected to the curricular reforms recommended above for at least five years, after which time their use should be reassessed. The distribution of these funds should be directed by the Vice Provost.

Offices for students with special needs, including the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, the Office for Students with

Disabilities, and an Office for Honors Programs should report to the Vice Provost. Functions shared by the Martin Luther King Program (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs should be brought under unified leadership and authority in the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

Field learning, internships, and community service will become even more important than at present as the University works to bring its research and land grant missions more into the undergraduate curriculum. To coordinate the expansion of these opportunities across the Twin Cities campus, the Office of Special Learning Opportunities (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) should move to the Vice Provost's Office.

Precollege programs link the academic opportunities of the University with students in the schools. The University should establish a Director of Precollege Programs to coordinate and strengthen current programs, to identify gaps in the current set of programs, and to stimulate the creation of appropriate new programs. The director should report to the Vice Provost.

Enrollment management is of the first importance now that the Legislature has adopted enrollment limits for the University. Policy proposals in this area should be generated by the Council of Undergraduate Deans, chaired by the Vice Provost. The Vice Provost will assess the recommendations and carry the recommended policies to the Provost and President for adoption.

Active recruitment ensures cultural and ethnic diversity on campus, matches faculty with students in ability and interests, and balances distribution of students across majors. The Twin Cities campus should have a Director of Recruitment who reports to the Vice Provost.

5. What Does It Add Up To?

In response to Commitment to Focus the people of the state are asking what the University will do to improve the undergraduate education it provides on the Twin Cities campus. How shall we respond to this question?

If the recommendations of this report are accepted, the answer falls into four parts.

Entry and exploration We will create a single entry point with curricular paths and establish a Regents' College, with strong advising resources, for freshmen and sophomores who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University. This will help prospective students understand how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them. It will enhance the ability of freshman and sophomore students to explore various intellectual and career possibilities.

Curriculum We will establish an expanded Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which includes faculty from professional schools, to define and deliver liberal education. A Provost's Task Force will conduct a fundamental review and reshaping of the University's approach to liberal education. Starting in the fall of 1988 there will be a three-year period of experimentation in which faculty develop and teach mini-core curricula, integrated packages of courses that enhance skills and support academic and career exploration.

Advising Faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers will cooperate in advising students under the leadership of a new Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus. Resources will be allocated to bring adviser/advisee ratios into conformity with national standards. A computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking will be developed.

Administrative organization A new office of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will bring under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority the functions of entry into the University, curriculum, and advising just listed as well as the following functions which directly support the colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions: financial aid; admissions and records; data and reporting services; publications; educational development grants and programs; special offices for minority students, students with disabilities, and honors students; the Office of Special Learning Opportunities; precollege programs; recruitment; and enrollment management.

These concrete changes will help bring the research and land grant missions into the education of students, creating a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

7. Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues

We approached our charge with hope and concern. It is a time of challenge and possibility for undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. Commitment to Focus, with its proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollments while keeping resources constant, has put a spotlight on this part of our mission. The people of the State recognize that at present our undergraduate education has along with considerable strengths grave weaknesses, especially in the lower division. They know they deserve better and they are challenging us to provide better. This is an exciting challenge which we can meet with flair. The Twin Cities campus of the University has the people and ideas to make significant improvements in undergraduate education, to make it an education of which we are all proud.

At the same time we are worried about the future of undergraduate education on this campus. The planning process in the wake of Commitment to Focus has generated expectations on the part both of faculty and of external audiences that, in the event of actual resource allocations, may exceed our means. In this climate whatever resources are available to the University

may be perceived as woefully inadequate, and in the competition for them undergraduate education may again be shortchanged. We are concerned about the divisions that have appeared recently in the University community. We hope for return to an atmosphere that nurtures attitudes essential to improving undergraduate education--openness to new ways of teaching, patient cooperation, willingness to share energy and idealism about teaching and learning.

Finally, we have felt and would like to convey a sense of urgency. It is urgent that the University act quickly to make improvements in undergraduate education that will be felt by students, faculty, and staff. We believe that our recommendations provide a direct and efficient path to important improvements. We know that our colleagues in the University community will critically examine and amend our work. Our recommendations, or alternatives to similar ends, should be acted on beginning in this academic year. Derek Bok ended an article in a recent Harvard Magazine with an anecdote that applies to us.

We should take inspiration from the story President Kennedy used to tell about the French general Louis Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slow-growing and would not reach maturity for one hundred years. "In that case," Lyautey responded, "there is no time to lose. We must plant it this afternoon."

A P P E N D I X

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, this report makes the following recommendations:

Entry and Exploration

1. Establish a uniform admissions policy for the Twin Cities campus. (Page 2.)
2. Change the New High School student application procedure by having students apply to the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities instead of seven colleges. (Page 2.)
3. Create an enrollment and advising designator, titled "Regents College," for students who wish to explore the full variety of majors and degree programs on the Twin Cities campus. (Page 3.)
4. Identify curricular paths that require admission and/or course sequences during the first or second years of study. (Page 2.)

Curriculum

5. Establish a "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" from the colleges on the Twin Cities campus which would have among its responsibilities oversight of liberal education standards and admissions policies. (Page 4.)
6. Appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review of undergraduate curricula, recommend minimum liberal education standards for all colleges on the Twin Cities campus, and possibly develop new curricular and instructional models. (Page 4.)
7. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to recommend campus standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree. (Page 5.)
8. Establish a three-year period of curricular experimentation in which substantial funds are directed for design and implementation of innovative undergraduate curricula such as mini-core curricula and honors curricula. (Page 5.)
9. Establish a procedure of annual review of undergraduate curricula by the Vice Provost and Provost with the deans of undergraduate colleges. (Page 6.)

Advising

10. Create a University Advising Office administered by a Director of

Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which would be charged with providing leadership for advising on the campus. (Page 8.)

11. Implement a computerized system for academic advising, tracking, and for degree clearance, including conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base. (Page 8.)
12. Develop a model for improved advising utilizing the concept of advising clusters that cut across college lines. (Page 8.)
13. Create an advising staff for Regents College students. (Page 3.)

Administrative Organization

14. Hold to the principle of reassignment of current personnel as often as possible in filling any proposed positions. (Page 9.)
15. Establish the position, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. (Page 9.)
16. Establish the position, Director of Precollege Programs. (Page 10.)
17. Establish the position, Director of Recruitment. (Page 11.)
18. Shift the reporting line of the following units to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education: Office of Admissions and Records, Office of Financial Aid, Information Systems and Services, Orientation, Office for Minority and Special Student Affairs, Office of Educational Development Programs, Office for Honors, Office of Special Learning Opportunities, and selected units, including the Office for Students with Disabilities, from the University Counseling Services. (Page 10.)
19. Develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan that guides, minimally, recruitment and precollege program planning. (Page 11.)

December 7, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Committee Members	
Introduction	1
Section 1: Entry and Exploration	2
Section 2: Curriculum	3
Section 3: Advising	6
Section 4: Administrative Organization	8
Section 5: What Does It Add Up To?	10
Section 6: Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues	11
Appendix: Summary of Recommendations	

LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

THE ACADEMY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Julieann Carson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Marjorie K. Cowmeadow, Assistant Dean, General College
Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs
Russell K. Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology
Jeanne T. Lupton, Special Assistant to the Vice Presidents for
Academic Affairs and Student Affairs
Earl Nolting, Director, Continuing Education and Extension
Counseling
Kathleen F. Peterson, Associate Advisor, Biological Sciences
Student Services
Wesley K. Wharton, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture
John Wallace, Chair, and Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs
Flo Wiger, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Academic
Affairs

The Organization of Undergraduate Education
Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota

We are moving into a complex, technology and value based, interdependent world. To generate and sustain in this environment a decent society--just in distribution of wealth and position, efficient and abundant in provision of goods and services, judicious in the use of natural resources, vital in cultural and artistic life, fair in dealings with other nations--requires people who can deliberate together to envision ambitious projects and then work together to carry them out.

Our committee has assumed that undergraduate education has an essential role in educating people to do this job. We believe that the University of Minnesota, both research and land grant, committed to the creation of new knowledge and the application of knowledge to solve problems, can provide a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

Our distinctive kind of undergraduate education will bring the research and land grant missions into the undergraduate curriculum, showing students that knowledge is not fixed, but an ongoing process of revision and growth. It will give them a first hand sense of how old knowledge is criticized and new knowledge is made, a sense of the complexity of social problems, of how institutional change can be brought about through application of new knowledge, and how change in one institution reverberates through the social fabric. The education will be liberal, freeing the students from the dominance of authorities and orthodoxies, giving them the resources to criticize, to probe for hidden assumptions, to construct new solutions. The instructional methods in the curriculum will balance lecture with discussion, reading and listening with writing and speaking, mastery of theory with application in the field and laboratory.

Students of color will find in our classrooms, laboratories, student clubs, and informal student and faculty groups a genuine welcome, respect for their cultural integrity, and appreciation of the contributions they bring from their racial and cultural experience. The full participation of students of color in the University, in numbers at least equal to their representation in the wider population, is a fundamental goal for reasons not only of social justice but also of educational quality: the richness of diversity students of color bring to the University community enhances learning for everyone, students and faculty. Furthermore, there is no better preparation for helping to build a decent society than participating in a decent university community when one is a student.

We propose in the following four sections a structure to make this vision a reality.

1. Entry and Exploration

The University's policies for entry have two goals: to show prospective students how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them and to give new students a sense of the opportunities and limits of intellectual exploration. We wanted to devise policies that provide the entering student a simple admission procedure and freedom to explore various curricular and career possibilities.

Under our current system, seven colleges admit freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. We propose that all students apply for entry not to a college but to the University. Students will normally be admitted if they have a PAR of 150 or above and have taken the prerequisite courses. They will be considered for admission if they have a PAR of 120 or above and have taken the prerequisites. Beginning in 1991 the prerequisite courses will be:

Four years of English with emphasis on writing, including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appreciation;

Two years of social studies, including American history;

Three years of mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra;

Three years of science, including one biological and one physical science;

Two years of a single second language.

The applications of students who do not meet the requirements will automatically receive special review. The applications of underprepared and disadvantaged students will continue to be reviewed individually, with admission decisions based on an assessment of applicants' potential for successfully completing college work at the baccalaureate level.

At the time of application, students who qualify may also apply to be admitted to designated curricular paths within one of the colleges with a lower division. If admitted to the path, a student would then be enrolled as a student in that college.

Curricular paths serve two purposes. They help provide students a sense of community, and they recognize the diversity of curricular interests while still assuring a broad liberal education. Examples of curricular paths are fine arts, foreign languages, physical sciences and engineering, and life sciences. Special paths will also be provided for students who have not completed the preparation requirements.

Curricular paths may in some cases serve a third purpose: enrollment control. For example, the engineering and physical sciences path can be

used for enrollment management in the Institute of Technology. Students who complete this path would be given preferential admission to majors in the Institute of Technology. We believe that this preferential policy would encourage students to explore offerings elsewhere in the University, since they would be less concerned about admission to the Institute of Technology. Students in other paths might have to demonstrate higher performance for junior year admission to majors in the Institute of Technology.

Students need not, however, apply for a curricular path. Students who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University would enroll in Regents' College. No faculty would reside in Regents' College and no courses would carry that designation. Rather, students would take courses offered by the other colleges on the Twin Cities campus and taught by the comprehensive Faculty of Arts and Sciences (described in the curriculum section below). It is essential that new funds for advising be allocated to this college so that it will be extraordinarily attractive to students as an advising resource.

2. Curriculum

The vitality of a research university derives from the dynamism of creating new knowledge, of challenging it, and of sharing it with our students. In recent years, knowledge has expanded rapidly, overlapping disciplines while establishing others. Incorporating this vitality into basic arts and science education for undergraduates is the particular challenge of baccalaureate education at our University and one to which we need to turn our attention.

Although a single entry point, a uniform admissions policy, and curricular paths will go some distance in addressing significant problems for current and prospective students, those changes can be interpreted at worst as cosmetic and at best as minor. We believe that far more fundamental change is needed in undergraduate education at the University and we call for a campus-wide reexamination of baccalaureate programs and requirements.

In thinking about the curriculum we have had in mind responding to fundamental changes in knowledge, increasing the participation of professional school faculty in teaching undergraduate courses, and increasing the coherence of students' programs.

Policies that define baccalaureate degrees, including liberal education requirements, create the framework for curricula. In considering a reorganization to improve undergraduate education, there are several basic policy questions: where does liberal education fit in the University and who sets the liberal education requirements? who sets the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree? for the Bachelor of Science degree? There are also questions of implementation. Assuming that we want to undertake a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education, who does it? In this

section we make proposals and identify alternatives for addressing these questions.

Liberal Education At present there are as many liberal education policies as there are colleges, for though every college uses the same group distribution categories, they require different numbers of credits in the categories and, most importantly, recognize different courses as meeting requirements. There should be one Twin Cities policy for liberal education which sets a minimum standard for the liberal education component for all bachelors degrees. In principle, this policy should be the responsibility of all faculty who participate in undergraduate education, a group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This group will include faculty from the professional schools; it will be the functional arts and sciences faculty, broader than the group traditionally called by that name. This group should also be responsible for admission policies for freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. In reaching this recommendation, we considered the alternative that the policy group should be the faculties of a subset of colleges: the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology (or its successor colleges), the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College. We rejected this alternative, because a main goal of reorganization is to involve faculty of all colleges in providing liberal education. The best and fairest way to achieve this goal is to include all participating faculty in the policy group.

A committee appointed by the Provost for upto a two year term should undertake a review and reshaping of liberal education. The committee should recommend to the Provost and to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy the reshaping of the curriculum and the proper organization and operation of the curriculum policy group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In this review, the group distribution categories in the present policy should not be regarded as sacred, but up for change, possibly radical change that reflects the changing structure of knowledge. We rejected the alternative that the Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education should be asked to undertake this task because that committee is too small to include the needed range of representation and because Assembly committees do not have the continuity over two years that is needed in this case.

Bachelors Degrees Standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree presently are set in two places: the College of Liberal Arts (which for purposes of this policy includes some departments in the Institute of Technology and the College of Biological Sciences) and University College. Unless the College of Liberal Arts divides into two or more colleges, this arrangement should continue. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, an appropriate sub-faculty of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should take responsibility for the successor of the present College of Liberal Arts Bachelor of Arts degree. Standards for Bachelor of Science degrees presently are set by the faculties of the various colleges which offer the degrees; this arrangement should continue.

As a first stage in reforming the curriculum, we propose a three-year period (1988-91) of experimentation in which faculty prepare, develop, and

teach courses that constitute major changes in course content or delivery. We recommended above that the Provost appoint a committee to review and reshape liberal education. We think this committee is important. But we do not want to wait to begin experimentation until a committee with a two-year charge reports and has its recommendations debated by the faculty. We believe that the faculty are ready now to strengthen undergraduate education, and require only support to do so. One area in which we encourage immediate experimentation is "mini-core" curricula.

Mini-core curricula Students will benefit from packages of courses that (i) involve students actively in the shaping of knowledge, (ii) are integrated by a theme that challenges the student to make connections, (iii) develop skills, and (iv) support academic and career exploration. We call such packages of courses mini-core curricula. Mini-cores will address the widely recognized problems that many students lack a sense of intellectual community and that under our present curriculum, many students' programs lack coherence, especially in the first two years. Mini-core curricula will foster communities ancillary to those in the admissions tracks. For example, there might be a mini-core liberal education curriculum which treated the impact of science and technology on nutrition and health, explored the history of institutions and professions related to health and agriculture, and dealt with ethical issues in these areas.

The University should aggressively pursue the development of mini-core curricula.

We also recommend the expansion of honors curricula in the lower division and in all colleges. Our picture of honors curricula is not of more content poured into quicker students, but deeper exploration of the making of knowledge and the application of knowledge to problems by students whose preparation and motivation ready them for greater challenge. Such education provides the ideal fit between the University's undergraduate, research, and land grant missions. Development of honors curricula leads to ideas and approaches that can be applied more widely in regular curricula.

There is wide agreement that reform of liberal education, development of mini-core curricula, and expansion of honors programs are urgently needed, but there has been little discussion of how to bring about real curricular change. We make the following recommendations:

Faculty will need summer and academic year released time to design new curricula. All funds in the current Educational Development Grants Program and Small Grants Program should be redirected to this purpose. Dedicating the Bush Sabbatical Program to this purpose for a several years should also be considered. Outside support should be sought as part of the Minnesota Campaign.

For mini-core curricula and improvements in liberal education to happen on a significant scale, departments will have to redirect teaching resources to new courses that become part of the departments' regular programs. Working singly and in consort, departments should create

packages and sequences of courses which achieve multiple educational goals. A fundamental policy issue is the allocation of teaching resources between the lower and upper divisions. The University must be sensitive to the educational argument that personalized instruction and active learning strategies invested in beginning students can equip them to learn effectively on their own and in large groups later on. Every department should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its distribution of effort among 1000, 3000, 5000, and 8000 level courses. Attention should be given also to the reward system. The University should recognize that faculty in different stages of their careers may want to devote more or less of their effort to undergraduate education. Departments should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its evaluation of faculty contributions to undergraduate education and its balance of rewards for these contributions and research.

The Provost should institute a comprehensive and ongoing system of planning to improve curricula. The Provost should work with deans, and deans with department chairs and heads, in an annual planning cycle beginning with agreement on goals and on resources to be committed to reaching the goals and ending with an evaluation of progress. High performance departments should be rewarded with resources. This planning should probably be on a three year rolling cycle.

We considered the recommending that a significant budget be placed in the control of an officer in the Provost's office with responsibility for lower division curriculum. This officer would negotiate with departments for contributions to the curriculum; high performing departments would be rewarded with increased resources. We believe that this approach could improve curricula, at least in the short run, but at the cost of creating uncertainty for departments that might damage their quality in the longer run. The approach might also create a group of faculty who teach only in the lower division. We conclude that continuous planning and review should be given a chance to work before the University tries fiscal strong-arm methods to improve curricula in the lower division.

3. Advising

Preceding sections have provided a vision of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus, a model of student flow into and through the lower division, and exciting recommendations for curricular innovation. Academic advising is the means by which these improvements to undergraduate education are delivered to University students. If fundamental problems in the advising system are not addressed, all of the above improvements will be at risk.

The committee has identified three major themes that need to be addressed: (1) reducing the advisee/adviser ratio; (2) changing administrative organization to improve coordination and leadership; and (3) moving to proactive advising for lower division students.

High-quality academic advising is essential for a diverse student population to make informed decisions about their education, especially in the rich context of the Twin Cities campus. To improve advising, the University must address policy resource, leadership, and organizational issues. Advising is an area that cries out for campus-wide leadership and coordination.

A key policy issue is who is responsible for advising lower division students. Advising systems need to be articulated that respond to student and collegiate needs and incorporate all of our resources--i.e., faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers.

Present resources for advising create an advisee/adviser ratio of about 460 to 1 in the College of Liberal Arts. This ratio should be seen in comparison with the following national standards recommended by the National Association of Academic Advisers:

- fragile, high-risk, special populations--1 adviser to 100 students.
- exploring options, uncommitted, undecided--1 adviser to 200 entering students.
- committed, declared majors--1 adviser to 300 students.

This shortfall in advising resources is so severe as to rise to the level of policy. Funds should be provided to make good advising possible, with advisee/adviser ratio goals being the starting point.

We recommend the creation of a University Advising Office, administered by a Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which will be charged to provide leadership for advising on the campus for such issues as the following: roles and responsibilities of advisers, advising loads, advisee/adviser ratio, annual goals, a Twin Cities campus advising philosophy and mission statement, evaluation scheme for advising officers and advisers, coordinating existing advising resources, providing training and professional development for advisers, being responsible for disseminating information critical to the advising process.

We recommend, as a model for improved advising, the concept of "advising clusters" that cut across collegiate lines. In this model each freshman will be assigned to a professional adviser who coordinates teams, or clusters, which include professional advisers, faculty advisers, graduate teaching assistants, and peer advisers. The student will benefit from the special skills and perspectives of the various members of the cluster; the members of the cluster will benefit from being able to concentrate on contributing their particular strengths to a cooperative advising effort. Advising clusters are also a way of creating a community for students who are getting started at the University, for the office of a student's professional adviser will be a home base for both the student and the advising cluster.

We further recommend the immediate development of a computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking. This is the first step toward providing students with the accurate and personalized information needed to take advantage of the rich resources this University has available for undergraduate education. It will free student and adviser time for more meaningful dialogue. The implementation of a common entry port and the academy structure supportive of academic exploration make the computer-assisted advising program critical to the necessary educational planning. To be most effective, this system should include courses taken through Continuing Education and Extension. Therefore, the conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base should proceed.

As a rule, where possible, the new advising structure should use the expertise of current advising staff and the current advising strategies and schemes that have proven effective.

4. Administrative Organization

Given our path to this point, we necessarily view administrative organization in the context of the needs for strengthened curricula and improved advising discussed in earlier sections. We want strongly to insist on a principle of economy: administrators should not be multiplied beyond necessity. We have held the number of new positions we recommend to a minimum compatible with new functions we believe must be served. We urge that serious consideration be given either to eliminating existing positions or to recasting them to provide for the new administrative needs.

Our basic observation is that there is a set of functions that need to be brought under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority in the Office of the Provost; for convenience of reference, we assume that they will be the responsibility of a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This position is distinct from any issues of reporting of deans to the Provost's Office. The functions for which this officer will be responsible include entry into the University, curriculum, and lower division advising matters discussed above. They also include functions which have to do with bringing students into the University and supporting them while they are here. These additional functions all have the feature that they directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions. It is essential that this position be regarded as part of the President's cabinet and that the holder of the position attend meetings of the Management Committee and take part in the weekly breakfasts of the President and Vice Presidents.

It may be useful for us to explain why we recommend a Vice Provost who will gather together a broad range of undergraduate education functions but to whom deans will not report.

We approached our charge from the point of view of improving education for undergraduate students, not from the point of view of changing the power relationships between the St. Paul campus, the health sciences, and the other parts of the University. We believe that the recommendations we have developed, if implemented as a group, will greatly improve the undergraduate education the University provides. Given the turmoil and controversy surrounding the recommendations for new vice presidents or vice provosts to whom deans report, it seems useful to have a set of recommendations that show what can be done independently of that controversy.

As a first cut, therefore, we ask the University community to view our recommendations as an attempt to separate some issues and carve out a path for much needed improvements that can be followed independently of what is done about new vice presidents.

We believe further that the creation of a new Vice President, or Vice Provost, for Arts and Sciences, to whom the deans of the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology, the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College report is probably not the best way to improve undergraduate education. We believe that improvement of undergraduate education can be done directly, and more efficiently, by the Provost, working with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education in the way we recommend.

It may be argued that a "matrix" vice provost, of the kind we propose, without line authority and substantial budgetary control over collegiate units would be powerless and ineffective. The key issue is the Provost's support for undergraduate education. If the Provost supports the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the position will be effective. On the other hand, if the Provost does not support undergraduate initiatives, whatever number of line vice presidents or vice provosts, they will not be effective. The Provost's support must be assumed. The problem of administrative design is to find the most efficient system that, with the Provost's support, can be effective.

We return to some important details of the reorganization we recommend based on the principle that functions that directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions should be brought under unified authority.

The present Offices of Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Information Systems and Services, Publications, and Orientation should report to the Vice Provost.

The funds currently dedicated to Educational Development Programs should be redirected to the curricular reforms recommended above for at least five years, after which time their use should be reassessed. The distribution of these funds should be directed by the Vice Provost.

Offices for students with special needs, including the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, the Office for Students with

Disabilities, and an Office for Honors Programs should report to the Vice Provost. Functions shared by the Martin Luther King Program (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs should be brought under unified leadership and authority in the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

Field learning, internships, and community service will become even more important than at present as the University works to bring its research and land grant missions more into the undergraduate curriculum. To coordinate the expansion of these opportunities across the Twin Cities campus, the Office of Special Learning Opportunities (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) should move to the Vice Provost's Office.

Precollege programs link the academic opportunities of the University with students in the schools. The University should establish a Director of Precollege Programs to coordinate and strengthen current programs, to identify gaps in the current set of programs, and to stimulate the creation of appropriate new programs. The director should report to the Vice Provost.

Enrollment management is of the first importance now that the Legislature has adopted enrollment limits for the University. Policy proposals in this area should be generated by the Council of Undergraduate Deans, chaired by the Vice Provost. The Vice Provost will assess the recommendations and carry the recommended policies to the Provost and President for adoption.

Active recruitment ensures cultural and ethnic diversity on campus, matches faculty with students in ability and interests, and balances distribution of students across majors. The Twin Cities campus should have a Director of Recruitment who reports to the Vice Provost.

5. What Does It Add Up To?

In response to Commitment to Focus the people of the state are asking what the University will do to improve the undergraduate education it provides on the Twin Cities campus. How shall we respond to this question?

If the recommendations of this report are accepted, the answer falls into four parts.

Entry and exploration We will create a single entry point with curricular paths and establish a Regents' College, with strong advising resources, for freshmen and sophomores who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University. This will help prospective students understand how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them. It will enhance the ability of freshman and sophomore students to explore various intellectual and career possibilities.

Curriculum We will establish an expanded Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which includes faculty from professional schools, to define and deliver liberal education. A Provost's Task Force will conduct a fundamental review and reshaping of the University's approach to liberal education. Starting in the fall of 1988 there will be a three-year period of experimentation in which faculty develop and teach mini-core curricula, integrated packages of courses that enhance skills and support academic and career exploration.

Advising Faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers will cooperate in advising students under the leadership of a new Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus. Resources will be allocated to bring adviser/advisee ratios into conformity with national standards. A computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking will be developed.

Administrative organization A new office of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will bring under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority the functions of entry into the University, curriculum, and advising just listed as well as the following functions which directly support the colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions: financial aid; admissions and records; data and reporting services; publications; educational development grants and programs; special offices for minority students, students with disabilities, and honors students; the Office of Special Learning Opportunities; precollege programs; recruitment; and enrollment management.

These concrete changes will help bring the research and land grant missions into the education of students, creating a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

7. Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues

We approached our charge with hope and concern. It is a time of challenge and possibility for undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. Commitment to Focus, with its proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollments while keeping resources constant, has put a spotlight on this part of our mission. The people of the State recognize that at present our undergraduate education has along with considerable strengths grave weaknesses, especially in the lower division. They know they deserve better and they are challenging us to provide better. This is an exciting challenge which we can meet with flair. The Twin Cities campus of the University has the people and ideas to make significant improvements in undergraduate education, to make it an education of which we are all proud.

At the same time we are worried about the future of undergraduate education on this campus. The planning process in the wake of Commitment to Focus has generated expectations on the part both of faculty and of external audiences that, in the event of actual resource allocations, may exceed our means. In this climate whatever resources are available to the University

may be perceived as woefully inadequate, and in the competition for them undergraduate education may again be shortchanged. We are concerned about the divisions that have appeared recently in the University community. We hope for return to an atmosphere that nurtures attitudes essential to improving undergraduate education--openness to new ways of teaching, patient cooperation, willingness to share energy and idealism about teaching and learning.

Finally, we have felt and would like to convey a sense of urgency. It is urgent that the University act quickly to make improvements in undergraduate education that will be felt by students, faculty, and staff. We believe that our recommendations provide a direct and efficient path to important improvements. We know that our colleagues in the University community will critically examine and amend our work. Our recommendations, or alternatives to similar ends, should be acted on beginning in this academic year. Derek Bok ended an article in a recent Harvard Magazine with an anecdote that applies to us.

We should take inspiration from the story President Kennedy used to tell about the French general Louis Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slow-growing and would not reach maturity for one hundred years. "In that case," Lyautey responded, "there is no time to lose. We must plant it this afternoon."

A P P E N D I X

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, this report makes the following recommendations:

Entry and Exploration

1. Establish a uniform admissions policy for the Twin Cities campus. (Page 2.)
2. Change the New High School student application procedure by having students apply to the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities instead of seven colleges. (Page 2.)
3. Create an enrollment and advising designator, titled "Regents College," for students who wish to explore the full variety of majors and degree programs on the Twin Cities campus. (Page 3.)
4. Identify curricular paths that require admission and/or course sequences during the first or second years of study. (Page 2.)

Curriculum

5. Establish a "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" from the colleges on the Twin Cities campus which would have among its responsibilities oversight of liberal education standards and admissions policies. (Page 4.)
6. Appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review of undergraduate curricula, recommend minimum liberal education standards for all colleges on the Twin Cities campus, and possibly develop new curricular and instructional models. (Page 4.)
7. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to recommend campus standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree. (Page 5.)
8. Establish a three-year period of curricular experimentation in which substantial funds are directed for design and implementation of innovative undergraduate curricula such as mini-core curricula and honors curricula. (Page 5.)
9. Establish a procedure of annual review of undergraduate curricula by the Vice Provost and Provost with the deans of undergraduate colleges. (Page 6.)

Advising

10. Create a University Advising Office administered by a Director of

Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which would be charged with providing leadership for advising on the campus. (Page 8.)

11. Implement a computerized system for academic advising, tracking, and for degree clearance, including conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base. (Page 8.)
12. Develop a model for improved advising utilizing the concept of advising clusters that cut across college lines. (Page 8.)
13. Create an advising staff for Regents College students. (Page 3.)

Administrative Organization

14. Hold to the principle of reassignment of current personnel as often as possible in filling any proposed positions. (Page 9.)
15. Establish the position, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. (Page 9.)
16. Establish the position, Director of Precollege Programs. (Page 10.)
17. Establish the position, Director of Recruitment. (Page 11.)
18. Shift the reporting line of the following units to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education: Office of Admissions and Records, Office of Financial Aid, Information Systems and Services, Orientation, Office for Minority and Special Student Affairs, Office of Educational Development Programs, Office for Honors, Office of Special Learning Opportunities, and selected units, including the Office for Students with Disabilities, from the University Counseling Services. (Page 10.)
19. Develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan that guides, minimally, recruitment and precollege program planning. (Page 11.)

December 7, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Committee Members	
Introduction	1
Section 1: Entry and Exploration	2
Section 2: Curriculum	3
Section 3: Advising	6
Section 4: Administrative Organization	8
Section 5: What Does It Add Up To?	10
Section 6: Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues	11
Appendix: Summary of Recommendations	

LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

THE ACADEMY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Julieann Carson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Marjorie K. Cowmeadow, Assistant Dean, General College

Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs

Russell K. Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology

Jeanne T. Lupton, Special Assistant to the Vice Presidents for
Academic Affairs and Student Affairs

Earl Nolting, Director, Continuing Education and Extension
Counseling

Kathleen F. Peterson, Associate Advisor, Biological Sciences
Student Services

Wesley K. Wharton, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture

John Wallace, Chair, and Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs

flo wiger, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Academic
Affairs

The Organization of Undergraduate Education
Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota

We are moving into a complex, technology and value based, interdependent world. To generate and sustain in this environment a decent society—just in distribution of wealth and position, efficient and abundant in provision of goods and services, judicious in the use of natural resources, vital in cultural and artistic life, fair in dealings with other nations—requires people who can deliberate together to envision ambitious projects and then work together to carry them out.

Our committee has assumed that undergraduate education has an essential role in educating people to do this job. We believe that the University of Minnesota, both research and land grant, committed to the creation of new knowledge and the application of knowledge to solve problems, can provide a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

Our distinctive kind of undergraduate education will bring the research and land grant missions into the undergraduate curriculum, showing students that knowledge is not fixed, but an ongoing process of revision and growth. It will give them a first hand sense of how old knowledge is criticized and new knowledge is made, a sense of the complexity of social problems, of how institutional change can be brought about through application of new knowledge, and how change in one institution reverberates through the social fabric. The education will be liberal, freeing the students from the dominance of authorities and orthodoxies, giving them the resources to criticize, to probe for hidden assumptions, to construct new solutions. The instructional methods in the curriculum will balance lecture with discussion, reading and listening with writing and speaking, mastery of theory with application in the field and laboratory.

Students of color will find in our classrooms, laboratories, student clubs, and informal student and faculty groups a genuine welcome, respect for their cultural integrity, and appreciation of the contributions they bring from their racial and cultural experience. The full participation of students of color in the University, in numbers at least equal to their representation in the wider population, is a fundamental goal for reasons not only of social justice but also of educational quality: the richness of diversity students of color bring to the University community enhances learning for everyone, students and faculty. Furthermore, there is no better preparation for helping to build a decent society than participating in a decent university community when one is a student.

We propose in the following four sections a structure to make this vision a reality.

1. Entry and Exploration

The University's policies for entry have two goals: to show prospective students how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them and to give new students a sense of the opportunities and limits of intellectual exploration. We wanted to devise policies that provide the entering student a simple admission procedure and freedom to explore various curricular and career possibilities.

Under our current system, seven colleges admit freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. We propose that all students apply for entry not to a college but to the University. Students will normally be admitted if they have a PAR of 150 or above and have taken the prerequisite courses. They will be considered for admission if they have a PAR of 120 or above and have taken the prerequisites. Beginning in 1991 the prerequisite courses will be:

Four years of English with emphasis on writing, including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appreciation;

Two years of social studies, including American history;

Three years of mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra;

Three years of science, including one biological and one physical science;

Two years of a single second language.

The applications of students who do not meet the requirements will automatically receive special review. The applications of underprepared and disadvantaged students will continue to be reviewed individually, with admission decisions based on an assessment of applicants' potential for successfully completing college work at the baccalaureate level.

At the time of application, students who qualify may also apply to be admitted to designated curricular paths within one of the colleges with a lower division. If admitted to the path, a student would then be enrolled as a student in that college.

Curricular paths serve two purposes. They help provide students a sense of community, and they recognize the diversity of curricular interests while still assuring a broad liberal education. Examples of curricular paths are fine arts, foreign languages, physical sciences and engineering, and life sciences. Special paths will also be provided for students who have not completed the preparation requirements.

Curricular paths may in some cases serve a third purpose: enrollment control. For example, the engineering and physical sciences path can be

used for enrollment management in the Institute of Technology. Students who complete this path would be given preferential admission to majors in the Institute of Technology. We believe that this preferential policy would encourage students to explore offerings elsewhere in the University, since they would be less concerned about admission to the Institute of Technology. Students in other paths might have to demonstrate higher performance for junior year admission to majors in the Institute of Technology.

Students need not, however, apply for a curricular path. Students who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University would enroll in Regents' College. No faculty would reside in Regents' College and no courses would carry that designation. Rather, students would take courses offered by the other colleges on the Twin Cities campus and taught by the comprehensive Faculty of Arts and Sciences (described in the curriculum section below). It is essential that new funds for advising be allocated to this college so that it will be extraordinarily attractive to students as an advising resource.

2. Curriculum

The vitality of a research university derives from the dynamism of creating new knowledge, of challenging it, and of sharing it with our students. In recent years, knowledge has expanded rapidly, overlapping disciplines while establishing others. Incorporating this vitality into basic arts and science education for undergraduates is the particular challenge of baccalaureate education at our University and one to which we need to turn our attention.

Although a single entry point, a uniform admissions policy, and curricular paths will go some distance in addressing significant problems for current and prospective students, those changes can be interpreted at worst as cosmetic and at best as minor. We believe that far more fundamental change is needed in undergraduate education at the University and we call for a campus-wide reexamination of baccalaureate programs and requirements.

In thinking about the curriculum we have had in mind responding to fundamental changes in knowledge, increasing the participation of professional school faculty in teaching undergraduate courses, and increasing the coherence of students' programs.

Policies that define baccalaureate degrees, including liberal education requirements, create the framework for curricula. In considering a reorganization to improve undergraduate education, there are several basic policy questions: where does liberal education fit in the University and who sets the liberal education requirements? who sets the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree? for the Bachelor of Science degree? There are also questions of implementation. Assuming that we want to undertake a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education, who does it? In this

section we make proposals and identify alternatives for addressing these questions.

Liberal Education At present there are as many liberal education policies as there are colleges, for though every college uses the same group distribution categories, they require different numbers of credits in the categories and, most importantly, recognize different courses as meeting requirements. There should be one Twin Cities policy for liberal education which sets a minimum standard for the liberal education component for all bachelors degrees. In principle, this policy should be the responsibility of all faculty who participate in undergraduate education, a group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This group will include faculty from the professional schools; it will be the functional arts and sciences faculty, broader than the group traditionally called by that name. This group should also be responsible for admission policies for freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. In reaching this recommendation, we considered the alternative that the policy group should be the faculties of a subset of colleges: the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology (or its successor colleges), the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College. We rejected this alternative, because a main goal of reorganization is to involve faculty of all colleges in providing liberal education. The best and fairest way to achieve this goal is to include all participating faculty in the policy group.

A committee appointed by the Provost for upto a two year term should undertake a review and reshaping of liberal education. The committee should recommend to the Provost and to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy the reshaping of the curriculum and the proper organization and operation of the curriculum policy group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In this review, the group distribution categories in the present policy should not be regarded as sacred, but up for change, possibly radical change that reflects the changing structure of knowledge. We rejected the alternative that the Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education should be asked to undertake this task because that committee is too small to include the needed range of representation and because Assembly committees do not have the continuity over two years that is needed in this case.

Bachelors Degrees Standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree presently are set in two places: the College of Liberal Arts (which for purposes of this policy includes some departments in the Institute of Technology and the College of Biological Sciences) and University College. Unless the College of Liberal Arts divides into two or more colleges, this arrangement should continue. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, an appropriate sub-faculty of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should take responsibility for the successor of the present College of Liberal Arts Bachelor of Arts degree. Standards for Bachelor of Science degrees presently are set by the faculties of the various colleges which offer the degrees; this arrangement should continue.

As a first stage in reforming the curriculum, we propose a three-year period (1988-91) of experimentation in which faculty prepare, develop, and

teach courses that constitute major changes in course content or delivery. We recommended above that the Provost appoint a committee to review and reshape liberal education. We think this committee is important. But we do not want to wait to begin experimentation until a committee with a two-year charge reports and has its recommendations debated by the faculty. We believe that the faculty are ready now to strengthen undergraduate education, and require only support to do so. One area in which we encourage immediate experimentation is "mini-core" curricula.

Mini-core curricula Students will benefit from packages of courses that (i) involve students actively in the shaping of knowledge, (ii) are integrated by a theme that challenges the student to make connections, (iii) develop skills, and (iv) support academic and career exploration. We call such packages of courses mini-core curricula. Mini-cores will address the widely recognized problems that many students lack a sense of intellectual community and that under our present curriculum, many students' programs lack coherence, especially in the first two years. Mini-core curricula will foster communities ancillary to those in the admissions tracks. For example, there might be a mini-core liberal education curriculum which treated the impact of science and technology on nutrition and health, explored the history of institutions and professions related to health and agriculture, and dealt with ethical issues in these areas.

The University should aggressively pursue the development of mini-core curricula.

We also recommend the expansion of honors curricula in the lower division and in all colleges. Our picture of honors curricula is not of more content poured into quicker students, but deeper exploration of the making of knowledge and the application of knowledge to problems by students whose preparation and motivation ready them for greater challenge. Such education provides the ideal fit between the University's undergraduate, research, and land grant missions. Development of honors curricula leads to ideas and approaches that can be applied more widely in regular curricula.

There is wide agreement that reform of liberal education, development of mini-core curricula, and expansion of honors programs are urgently needed, but there has been little discussion of how to bring about real curricular change. We make the following recommendations:

Faculty will need summer and academic year released time to design new curricula. All funds in the current Educational Development Grants Program and Small Grants Program should be redirected to this purpose. Dedicating the Bush Sabbatical Program to this purpose for a several years should also be considered. Outside support should be sought as part of the Minnesota Campaign.

For mini-core curricula and improvements in liberal education to happen on a significant scale, departments will have to redirect teaching resources to new courses that become part of the departments' regular programs. Working singly and in consort, departments should create

packages and sequences of courses which achieve multiple educational goals. A fundamental policy issue is the allocation of teaching resources between the lower and upper divisions. The University must be sensitive to the educational argument that personalized instruction and active learning strategies invested in beginning students can equip them to learn effectively on their own and in large groups later on. Every department should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its distribution of effort among 1000, 3000, 5000, and 8000 level courses. Attention should be given also to the reward system. The University should recognize that faculty in different stages of their careers may want to devote more or less of their effort to undergraduate education. Departments should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its evaluation of faculty contributions to undergraduate education and its balance of rewards for these contributions and research.

The Provost should institute a comprehensive and ongoing system of planning to improve curricula. The Provost should work with deans, and deans with department chairs and heads, in an annual planning cycle beginning with agreement on goals and on resources to be committed to reaching the goals and ending with an evaluation of progress. High performance departments should be rewarded with resources. This planning should probably be on a three year rolling cycle.

We considered the recommending that a significant budget be placed in the control of an officer in the Provost's office with responsibility for lower division curriculum. This officer would negotiate with departments for contributions to the curriculum; high performing departments would be rewarded with increased resources. We believe that this approach could improve curricula, at least in the short run, but at the cost of creating uncertainty for departments that might damage their quality in the longer run. The approach might also create a group of faculty who teach only in the lower division. We conclude that continuous planning and review should be given a chance to work before the University tries fiscal strong-arm methods to improve curricula in the lower division.

3. Advising

Preceding sections have provided a vision of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus, a model of student flow into and through the lower division, and exciting recommendations for curricular innovation. Academic advising is the means by which these improvements to undergraduate education are delivered to University students. If fundamental problems in the advising system are not addressed, all of the above improvements will be at risk.

The committee has identified three major themes that need to be addressed: (1) reducing the advisee/adviser ratio; (2) changing administrative organization to improve coordination and leadership; and (3) moving to proactive advising for lower division students.

High-quality academic advising is essential for a diverse student population to make informed decisions about their education, especially in the rich context of the Twin Cities campus. To improve advising, the University must address policy resource, leadership, and organizational issues. Advising is an area that cries out for campus-wide leadership and coordination.

A key policy issue is who is responsible for advising lower division students. Advising systems need to be articulated that respond to student and collegiate needs and incorporate all of our resources--i.e., faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers.

Present resources for advising create an advisee/adviser ratio of about 460 to 1 in the College of Liberal Arts. This ratio should be seen in comparison with the following national standards recommended by the National Association of Academic Advisers:

- fragile, high-risk, special populations--1 adviser to 100 students.
- exploring options, uncommitted, undecided--1 adviser to 200 entering students.
- committed, declared majors--1 adviser to 300 students.

This shortfall in advising resources is so severe as to rise to the level of policy. Funds should be provided to make good advising possible, with advisee/adviser ratio goals being the starting point.

We recommend the creation of a University Advising Office, administered by a Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which will be charged to provide leadership for advising on the campus for such issues as the following: roles and responsibilities of advisers, advising loads, advisee/adviser ratio, annual goals, a Twin Cities campus advising philosophy and mission statement, evaluation scheme for advising officers and advisers, coordinating existing advising resources, providing training and professional development for advisers, being responsible for disseminating information critical to the advising process.

We recommend, as a model for improved advising, the concept of "advising clusters" that cut across collegiate lines. In this model each freshman will be assigned to a professional adviser who coordinates teams, or clusters, which include professional advisers, faculty advisers, graduate teaching assistants, and peer advisers. The student will benefit from the special skills and perspectives of the various members of the cluster; the members of the cluster will benefit from being able to concentrate on contributing their particular strengths to a cooperative advising effort. Advising clusters are also a way of creating a community for students who are getting started at the University, for the office of a student's professional adviser will be a home base for both the student and the advising cluster.

We further recommend the immediate development of a computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking. This is the first step toward providing students with the accurate and personalized information needed to take advantage of the rich resources this University has available for undergraduate education. It will free student and adviser time for more meaningful dialogue. The implementation of a common entry port and the academy structure supportive of academic exploration make the computer-assisted advising program critical to the necessary educational planning. To be most effective, this system should include courses taken through Continuing Education and Extension. Therefore, the conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base should proceed.

As a rule, where possible, the new advising structure should use the expertise of current advising staff and the current advising strategies and schemes that have proven effective.

4. Administrative Organization

Given our path to this point, we necessarily view administrative organization in the context of the needs for strengthened curricula and improved advising discussed in earlier sections. We want strongly to insist on a principle of economy: administrators should not be multiplied beyond necessity. We have held the number of new positions we recommend to a minimum compatible with new functions we believe must be served. We urge that serious consideration be given either to eliminating existing positions or to recasting them to provide for the new administrative needs.

Our basic observation is that there is a set of functions that need to be brought under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority in the Office of the Provost; for convenience of reference, we assume that they will be the responsibility of a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This position is distinct from any issues of reporting of deans to the Provost's Office. The functions for which this officer will be responsible include entry into the University, curriculum, and lower division advising matters discussed above. They also include functions which have to do with bringing students into the University and supporting them while they are here. These additional functions all have the feature that they directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions. It is essential that this position be regarded as part of the President's cabinet and that the holder of the position attend meetings of the Management Committee and take part in the weekly breakfasts of the President and Vice Presidents.

It may be useful for us to explain why we recommend a Vice Provost who will gather together a broad range of undergraduate education functions but to whom deans will not report.

We approached our charge from the point of view of improving education for undergraduate students, not from the point of view of changing the power relationships between the St. Paul campus, the health sciences, and the other parts of the University. We believe that the recommendations we have developed, if implemented as a group, will greatly improve the undergraduate education the University provides. Given the turmoil and controversy surrounding the recommendations for new vice presidents or vice provosts to whom deans report, it seems useful to have a set of recommendations that show what can be done independently of that controversy.

As a first cut, therefore, we ask the University community to view our recommendations as an attempt to separate some issues and carve out a path for much needed improvements that can be followed independently of what is done about new vice presidents.

We believe further that the creation of a new Vice President, or Vice Provost, for Arts and Sciences, to whom the deans of the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology, the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College report is probably not the best way to improve undergraduate education. We believe that improvement of undergraduate education can be done directly, and more efficiently, by the Provost, working with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education in the way we recommend.

It may be argued that a "matrix" vice provost, of the kind we propose, without line authority and substantial budgetary control over collegiate units would be powerless and ineffective. The key issue is the Provost's support for undergraduate education. If the Provost supports the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the position will be effective. On the other hand, if the Provost does not support undergraduate initiatives, whatever number of line vice presidents or vice provosts, they will not be effective. The Provost's support must be assumed. The problem of administrative design is to find the most efficient system that, with the Provost's support, can be effective.

We return to some important details of the reorganization we recommend based on the principle that functions that directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions should be brought under unified authority.

The present Offices of Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Information Systems and Services, Publications, and Orientation should report to the Vice Provost.

The funds currently dedicated to Educational Development Programs should be redirected to the curricular reforms recommended above for at least five years, after which time their use should be reassessed. The distribution of these funds should be directed by the Vice Provost.

Offices for students with special needs, including the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, the Office for Students with

Disabilities, and an Office for Honors Programs should report to the Vice Provost. Functions shared by the Martin Luther King Program (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs should be brought under unified leadership and authority in the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

Field learning, internships, and community service will become even more important than at present as the University works to bring its research and land grant missions more into the undergraduate curriculum. To coordinate the expansion of these opportunities across the Twin Cities campus, the Office of Special Learning Opportunities (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) should move to the Vice Provost's Office.

Precollege programs link the academic opportunities of the University with students in the schools. The University should establish a Director of Precollege Programs to coordinate and strengthen current programs, to identify gaps in the current set of programs, and to stimulate the creation of appropriate new programs. The director should report to the Vice Provost.

Enrollment management is of the first importance now that the Legislature has adopted enrollment limits for the University. Policy proposals in this area should be generated by the Council of Undergraduate Deans, chaired by the Vice Provost. The Vice Provost will assess the recommendations and carry the recommended policies to the Provost and President for adoption.

Active recruitment ensures cultural and ethnic diversity on campus, matches faculty with students in ability and interests, and balances distribution of students across majors. The Twin Cities campus should have a Director of Recruitment who reports to the Vice Provost.

5. What Does It Add Up To?

In response to Commitment to Focus the people of the state are asking what the University will do to improve the undergraduate education it provides on the Twin Cities campus. How shall we respond to this question?

If the recommendations of this report are accepted, the answer falls into four parts.

Entry and exploration We will create a single entry point with curricular paths and establish a Regents' College, with strong advising resources, for freshmen and sophomores who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University. This will help prospective students understand how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them. It will enhance the ability of freshman and sophomore students to explore various intellectual and career possibilities.

Curriculum We will establish an expanded Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which includes faculty from professional schools, to define and deliver liberal education. A Provost's Task Force will conduct a fundamental review and reshaping of the University's approach to liberal education. Starting in the fall of 1988 there will be a three-year period of experimentation in which faculty develop and teach mini-core curricula, integrated packages of courses that enhance skills and support academic and career exploration.

Advising Faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers will cooperate in advising students under the leadership of a new Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus. Resources will be allocated to bring adviser/advisee ratios into conformity with national standards. A computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking will be developed.

Administrative organization A new office of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will bring under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority the functions of entry into the University, curriculum, and advising just listed as well as the following functions which directly support the colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions: financial aid; admissions and records; data and reporting services; publications; educational development grants and programs; special offices for minority students, students with disabilities, and honors students; the Office of Special Learning Opportunities; precollege programs; recruitment; and enrollment management.

These concrete changes will help bring the research and land grant missions into the education of students, creating a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

7. Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues

We approached our charge with hope and concern. It is a time of challenge and possibility for undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. Commitment to Focus, with its proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollments while keeping resources constant, has put a spotlight on this part of our mission. The people of the State recognize that at present our undergraduate education has along with considerable strengths grave weaknesses, especially in the lower division. They know they deserve better and they are challenging us to provide better. This is an exciting challenge which we can meet with flair. The Twin Cities campus of the University has the people and ideas to make significant improvements in undergraduate education, to make it an education of which we are all proud.

At the same time we are worried about the future of undergraduate education on this campus. The planning process in the wake of Commitment to Focus has generated expectations on the part both of faculty and of external audiences that, in the event of actual resource allocations, may exceed our means. In this climate whatever resources are available to the University

may be perceived as woefully inadequate, and in the competition for them undergraduate education may again be shortchanged. We are concerned about the divisions that have appeared recently in the University community. We hope for return to an atmosphere that nurtures attitudes essential to improving undergraduate education—openness to new ways of teaching, patient cooperation, willingness to share energy and idealism about teaching and learning.

Finally, we have felt and would like to convey a sense of urgency. It is urgent that the University act quickly to make improvements in undergraduate education that will be felt by students, faculty, and staff. We believe that our recommendations provide a direct and efficient path to important improvements. We know that our colleagues in the University community will critically examine and amend our work. Our recommendations, or alternatives to similar ends, should be acted on beginning in this academic year. Derek Bok ended an article in a recent Harvard Magazine with an anecdote that applies to us.

We should take inspiration from the story President Kennedy used to tell about the French general Louis Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slow-growing and would not reach maturity for one hundred years. "In that case," Lyautey responded, "there is no time to lose. We must plant it this afternoon."

A P P E N D I X

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, this report makes the following recommendations:

Entry and Exploration

1. Establish a uniform admissions policy for the Twin Cities campus. (Page 2.)
2. Change the New High School student application procedure by having students apply to the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities instead of seven colleges. (Page 2.)
3. Create an enrollment and advising designator, titled "Regents College," for students who wish to explore the full variety of majors and degree programs on the Twin Cities campus. (Page 3.)
4. Identify curricular paths that require admission and/or course sequences during the first or second years of study. (Page 2.)

Curriculum

5. Establish a "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" from the colleges on the Twin Cities campus which would have among its responsibilities oversight of liberal education standards and admissions policies. (Page 4.)
6. Appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review of undergraduate curricula, recommend minimum liberal education standards for all colleges on the Twin Cities campus, and possibly develop new curricular and instructional models. (Page 4.)
7. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to recommend campus standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree. (Page 5.)
8. Establish a three-year period of curricular experimentation in which substantial funds are directed for design and implementation of innovative undergraduate curricula such as mini-core curricula and honors curricula. (Page 5.)
9. Establish a procedure of annual review of undergraduate curricula by the Vice Provost and Provost with the deans of undergraduate colleges. (Page 6.)

Advising

10. Create a University Advising Office administered by a Director of

Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which would be charged with providing leadership for advising on the campus. (Page 8.)

11. Implement a computerized system for academic advising, tracking, and for degree clearance, including conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base. (Page 8.)
12. Develop a model for improved advising utilizing the concept of advising clusters that cut across college lines. (Page 8.)
13. Create an advising staff for Regents College students. (Page 3.)

Administrative Organization

14. Hold to the principle of reassignment of current personnel as often as possible in filling any proposed positions. (Page 9.)
15. Establish the position, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. (Page 9.)
16. Establish the position, Director of Precollege Programs. (Page 10.)
17. Establish the position, Director of Recruitment. (Page 11.)
18. Shift the reporting line of the following units to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education: Office of Admissions and Records, Office of Financial Aid, Information Systems and Services, Orientation, Office for Minority and Special Student Affairs, Office of Educational Development Programs, Office for Honors, Office of Special Learning Opportunities, and selected units, including the Office for Students with Disabilities, from the University Counseling Services. (Page 10.)
19. Develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan that guides, minimally, recruitment and precollege program planning. (Page 11.)

December 7, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Committee Members	
Introduction	1
Section 1: Entry and Exploration	2
Section 2: Curriculum	3
Section 3: Advising	6
Section 4: Administrative Organization	8
Section 5: What Does It Add Up To?	10
Section 6: Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues	11
Appendix: Summary of Recommendations	

LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

THE ACADEMY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Julieann Carson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Marjorie K. Cowmeadow, Assistant Dean, General College

Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs

Russell K. Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology

Jeanne T. Lupton, Special Assistant to the Vice Presidents for
Academic Affairs and Student Affairs

Earl Nolting, Director, Continuing Education and Extension
Counseling

Kathleen F. Peterson, Associate Advisor, Biological Sciences
Student Services

Wesley K. Wharton, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture

John Wallace, Chair, and Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs

flo wiger, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Academic
Affairs

The Organization of Undergraduate Education
Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota

We are moving into a complex, technology and value based, interdependent world. To generate and sustain in this environment a decent society--just in distribution of wealth and position, efficient and abundant in provision of goods and services, judicious in the use of natural resources, vital in cultural and artistic life, fair in dealings with other nations--requires people who can deliberate together to envision ambitious projects and then work together to carry them out.

Our committee has assumed that undergraduate education has an essential role in educating people to do this job. We believe that the University of Minnesota, both research and land grant, committed to the creation of new knowledge and the application of knowledge to solve problems, can provide a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

Our distinctive kind of undergraduate education will bring the research and land grant missions into the undergraduate curriculum, showing students that knowledge is not fixed, but an ongoing process of revision and growth. It will give them a first hand sense of how old knowledge is criticized and new knowledge is made, a sense of the complexity of social problems, of how institutional change can be brought about through application of new knowledge, and how change in one institution reverberates through the social fabric. The education will be liberal, freeing the students from the dominance of authorities and orthodoxies, giving them the resources to criticize, to probe for hidden assumptions, to construct new solutions. The instructional methods in the curriculum will balance lecture with discussion, reading and listening with writing and speaking, mastery of theory with application in the field and laboratory.

Students of color will find in our classrooms, laboratories, student clubs, and informal student and faculty groups a genuine welcome, respect for their cultural integrity, and appreciation of the contributions they bring from their racial and cultural experience. The full participation of students of color in the University, in numbers at least equal to their representation in the wider population, is a fundamental goal for reasons not only of social justice but also of educational quality: the richness of diversity students of color bring to the University community enhances learning for everyone, students and faculty. Furthermore, there is no better preparation for helping to build a decent society than participating in a decent university community when one is a student.

We propose in the following four sections a structure to make this vision a reality.

1. Entry and Exploration

The University's policies for entry have two goals: to show prospective students how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them and to give new students a sense of the opportunities and limits of intellectual exploration. We wanted to devise policies that provide the entering student a simple admission procedure and freedom to explore various curricular and career possibilities.

Under our current system, seven colleges admit freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. We propose that all students apply for entry not to a college but to the University. Students will normally be admitted if they have a PAR of 150 or above and have taken the prerequisite courses. They will be considered for admission if they have a PAR of 120 or above and have taken the prerequisites. Beginning in 1991 the prerequisite courses will be:

Four years of English with emphasis on writing, including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appreciation;

Two years of social studies, including American history;

Three years of mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra;

Three years of science, including one biological and one physical science;

Two years of a single second language.

The applications of students who do not meet the requirements will automatically receive special review. The applications of underprepared and disadvantaged students will continue to be reviewed individually, with admission decisions based on an assessment of applicants' potential for successfully completing college work at the baccalaureate level.

At the time of application, students who qualify may also apply to be admitted to designated curricular paths within one of the colleges with a lower division. If admitted to the path, a student would then be enrolled as a student in that college.

Curricular paths serve two purposes. They help provide students a sense of community, and they recognize the diversity of curricular interests while still assuring a broad liberal education. Examples of curricular paths are fine arts, foreign languages, physical sciences and engineering, and life sciences. Special paths will also be provided for students who have not completed the preparation requirements.

Curricular paths may in some cases serve a third purpose: enrollment control. For example, the engineering and physical sciences path can be

used for enrollment management in the Institute of Technology. Students who complete this path would be given preferential admission to majors in the Institute of Technology. We believe that this preferential policy would encourage students to explore offerings elsewhere in the University, since they would be less concerned about admission to the Institute of Technology. Students in other paths might have to demonstrate higher performance for junior year admission to majors in the Institute of Technology.

Students need not, however, apply for a curricular path. Students who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University would enroll in Regents' College. No faculty would reside in Regents' College and no courses would carry that designation. Rather, students would take courses offered by the other colleges on the Twin Cities campus and taught by the comprehensive Faculty of Arts and Sciences (described in the curriculum section below). It is essential that new funds for advising be allocated to this college so that it will be extraordinarily attractive to students as an advising resource.

2. Curriculum

The vitality of a research university derives from the dynamism of creating new knowledge, of challenging it, and of sharing it with our students. In recent years, knowledge has expanded rapidly, overlapping disciplines while establishing others. Incorporating this vitality into basic arts and science education for undergraduates is the particular challenge of baccalaureate education at our University and one to which we need to turn our attention.

Although a single entry point, a uniform admissions policy, and curricular paths will go some distance in addressing significant problems for current and prospective students, those changes can be interpreted at worst as cosmetic and at best as minor. We believe that far more fundamental change is needed in undergraduate education at the University and we call for a campus-wide reexamination of baccalaureate programs and requirements.

In thinking about the curriculum we have had in mind responding to fundamental changes in knowledge, increasing the participation of professional school faculty in teaching undergraduate courses, and increasing the coherence of students' programs.

Policies that define baccalaureate degrees, including liberal education requirements, create the framework for curricula. In considering a reorganization to improve undergraduate education, there are several basic policy questions: where does liberal education fit in the University and who sets the liberal education requirements? who sets the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree? for the Bachelor of Science degree? There are also questions of implementation. Assuming that we want to undertake a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education, who does it? In this

section we make proposals and identify alternatives for addressing these questions.

Liberal Education At present there are as many liberal education policies as there are colleges, for though every college uses the same group distribution categories, they require different numbers of credits in the categories and, most importantly, recognize different courses as meeting requirements. There should be one Twin Cities policy for liberal education which sets a minimum standard for the liberal education component for all bachelors degrees. In principle, this policy should be the responsibility of all faculty who participate in undergraduate education, a group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This group will include faculty from the professional schools; it will be the functional arts and sciences faculty, broader than the group traditionally called by that name. This group should also be responsible for admission policies for freshmen to the Twin Cities campus. In reaching this recommendation, we considered the alternative that the policy group should be the faculties of a subset of colleges: the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology (or its successor colleges), the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College. We rejected this alternative, because a main goal of reorganization is to involve faculty of all colleges in providing liberal education. The best and fairest way to achieve this goal is to include all participating faculty in the policy group.

A committee appointed by the Provost for upto a two year term should undertake a review and reshaping of liberal education. The committee should recommend to the Provost and to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy the reshaping of the curriculum and the proper organization and operation of the curriculum policy group we call the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In this review, the group distribution categories in the present policy should not be regarded as sacred, but up for change, possibly radical change that reflects the changing structure of knowledge. We rejected the alternative that the Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education should be asked to undertake this task because that committee is too small to include the needed range of representation and because Assembly committees do not have the continuity over two years that is needed in this case.

Bachelors Degrees Standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree presently are set in two places: the College of Liberal Arts (which for purposes of this policy includes some departments in the Institute of Technology and the College of Biological Sciences) and University College. Unless the College of Liberal Arts divides into two or more colleges, this arrangement should continue. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, an appropriate sub-faculty of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should take responsibility for the successor of the present College of Liberal Arts Bachelor of Arts degree. Standards for Bachelor of Science degrees presently are set by the faculties of the various colleges which offer the degrees; this arrangement should continue.

As a first stage in reforming the curriculum, we propose a three-year period (1988-91) of experimentation in which faculty prepare, develop, and

teach courses that constitute major changes in course content or delivery. We recommended above that the Provost appoint a committee to review and reshape liberal education. We think this committee is important. But we do not want to wait to begin experimentation until a committee with a two-year charge reports and has its recommendations debated by the faculty. We believe that the faculty are ready now to strengthen undergraduate education, and require only support to do so. One area in which we encourage immediate experimentation is "mini-core" curricula.

Mini-core curricula Students will benefit from packages of courses that (i) involve students actively in the shaping of knowledge, (ii) are integrated by a theme that challenges the student to make connections, (iii) develop skills, and (iv) support academic and career exploration. We call such packages of courses mini-core curricula. Mini-cores will address the widely recognized problems that many students lack a sense of intellectual community and that under our present curriculum, many students' programs lack coherence, especially in the first two years. Mini-core curricula will foster communities ancillary to those in the admissions tracks. For example, there might be a mini-core liberal education curriculum which treated the impact of science and technology on nutrition and health, explored the history of institutions and professions related to health and agriculture, and dealt with ethical issues in these areas.

The University should aggressively pursue the development of mini-core curricula.

We also recommend the expansion of honors curricula in the lower division and in all colleges. Our picture of honors curricula is not of more content poured into quicker students, but deeper exploration of the making of knowledge and the application of knowledge to problems by students whose preparation and motivation ready them for greater challenge. Such education provides the ideal fit between the University's undergraduate, research, and land grant missions. Development of honors curricula leads to ideas and approaches that can be applied more widely in regular curricula.

There is wide agreement that reform of liberal education, development of mini-core curricula, and expansion of honors programs are urgently needed, but there has been little discussion of how to bring about real curricular change. We make the following recommendations:

Faculty will need summer and academic year released time to design new curricula. All funds in the current Educational Development Grants Program and Small Grants Program should be redirected to this purpose. Dedicating the Bush Sabbatical Program to this purpose for a several years should also be considered. Outside support should be sought as part of the Minnesota Campaign.

For mini-core curricula and improvements in liberal education to happen on a significant scale, departments will have to redirect teaching resources to new courses that become part of the departments' regular programs. Working singly and in consort, departments should create

packages and sequences of courses which achieve multiple educational goals. A fundamental policy issue is the allocation of teaching resources between the lower and upper divisions. The University must be sensitive to the educational argument that personalized instruction and active learning strategies invested in beginning students can equip them to learn effectively on their own and in large groups later on. Every department should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its distribution of effort among 1000, 3000, 5000, and 8000 level courses. Attention should be given also to the reward system. The University should recognize that faculty in different stages of their careers may want to devote more or less of their effort to undergraduate education. Departments should periodically review and provide careful rationale for its evaluation of faculty contributions to undergraduate education and its balance of rewards for these contributions and research.

The Provost should institute a comprehensive and ongoing system of planning to improve curricula. The Provost should work with deans, and deans with department chairs and heads, in an annual planning cycle beginning with agreement on goals and on resources to be committed to reaching the goals and ending with an evaluation of progress. High performance departments should be rewarded with resources. This planning should probably be on a three year rolling cycle.

We considered the recommending that a significant budget be placed in the control of an officer in the Provost's office with responsibility for lower division curriculum. This officer would negotiate with departments for contributions to the curriculum; high performing departments would be rewarded with increased resources. We believe that this approach could improve curricula, at least in the short run, but at the cost of creating uncertainty for departments that might damage their quality in the longer run. The approach might also create a group of faculty who teach only in the lower division. We conclude that continuous planning and review should be given a chance to work before the University tries fiscal strong-arm methods to improve curricula in the lower division.

3. Advising

Preceding sections have provided a vision of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus, a model of student flow into and through the lower division, and exciting recommendations for curricular innovation. Academic advising is the means by which these improvements to undergraduate education are delivered to University students. If fundamental problems in the advising system are not addressed, all of the above improvements will be at risk.

The committee has identified three major themes that need to be addressed: (1) reducing the advisee/adviser ratio; (2) changing administrative organization to improve coordination and leadership; and (3) moving to proactive advising for lower division students.

High-quality academic advising is essential for a diverse student population to make informed decisions about their education, especially in the rich context of the Twin Cities campus. To improve advising, the University must address policy resource, leadership, and organizational issues. Advising is an area that cries out for campus-wide leadership and coordination.

A key policy issue is who is responsible for advising lower division students. Advising systems need to be articulated that respond to student and collegiate needs and incorporate all of our resources--i.e., faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers.

Present resources for advising create an advisee/adviser ratio of about 460 to 1 in the College of Liberal Arts. This ratio should be seen in comparison with the following national standards recommended by the National Association of Academic Advisers:

- fragile, high-risk, special populations--1 adviser to 100 students.
- exploring options, uncommitted, undecided--1 adviser to 200 entering students.
- committed, declared majors--1 adviser to 300 students.

This shortfall in advising resources is so severe as to rise to the level of policy. Funds should be provided to make good advising possible, with advisee/adviser ratio goals being the starting point.

We recommend the creation of a University Advising Office, administered by a Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which will be charged to provide leadership for advising on the campus for such issues as the following: roles and responsibilities of advisers, advising loads, advisee/adviser ratio, annual goals, a Twin Cities campus advising philosophy and mission statement, evaluation scheme for advising officers and advisers, coordinating existing advising resources, providing training and professional development for advisers, being responsible for disseminating information critical to the advising process.

We recommend, as a model for improved advising, the concept of "advising clusters" that cut across collegiate lines. In this model each freshman will be assigned to a professional adviser who coordinates teams, or clusters, which include professional advisers, faculty advisers, graduate teaching assistants, and peer advisers. The student will benefit from the special skills and perspectives of the various members of the cluster; the members of the cluster will benefit from being able to concentrate on contributing their particular strengths to a cooperative advising effort. Advising clusters are also a way of creating a community for students who are getting started at the University, for the office of a student's professional adviser will be a home base for both the student and the advising cluster.

We further recommend the immediate development of a computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking. This is the first step toward providing students with the accurate and personalized information needed to take advantage of the rich resources this University has available for undergraduate education. It will free student and adviser time for more meaningful dialogue. The implementation of a common entry port and the academy structure supportive of academic exploration make the computer-assisted advising program critical to the necessary educational planning. To be most effective, this system should include courses taken through Continuing Education and Extension. Therefore, the conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base should proceed.

As a rule, where possible, the new advising structure should use the expertise of current advising staff and the current advising strategies and schemes that have proven effective.

4. Administrative Organization

Given our path to this point, we necessarily view administrative organization in the context of the needs for strengthened curricula and improved advising discussed in earlier sections. We want strongly to insist on a principle of economy: administrators should not be multiplied beyond necessity. We have held the number of new positions we recommend to a minimum compatible with new functions we believe must be served. We urge that serious consideration be given either to eliminating existing positions or to recasting them to provide for the new administrative needs.

Our basic observation is that there is a set of functions that need to be brought under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority in the Office of the Provost; for convenience of reference, we assume that they will be the responsibility of a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This position is distinct from any issues of reporting of deans to the Provost's Office. The functions for which this officer will be responsible include entry into the University, curriculum, and lower division advising matters discussed above. They also include functions which have to do with bringing students into the University and supporting them while they are here. These additional functions all have the feature that they directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions. It is essential that this position be regarded as part of the President's cabinet and that the holder of the position attend meetings of the Management Committee and take part in the weekly breakfasts of the President and Vice Presidents.

It may be useful for us to explain why we recommend a Vice Provost who will gather together a broad range of undergraduate education functions but to whom deans will not report.

We approached our charge from the point of view of improving education for undergraduate students, not from the point of view of changing the power relationships between the St. Paul campus, the health sciences, and the other parts of the University. We believe that the recommendations we have developed, if implemented as a group, will greatly improve the undergraduate education the University provides. Given the turmoil and controversy surrounding the recommendations for new vice presidents or vice provosts to whom deans report, it seems useful to have a set of recommendations that show what can be done independently of that controversy.

As a first cut, therefore, we ask the University community to view our recommendations as an attempt to separate some issues and carve out a path for much needed improvements that can be followed independently of what is done about new vice presidents.

We believe further that the creation of a new Vice President, or Vice Provost, for Arts and Sciences, to whom the deans of the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges), the Institute of Technology, the College of Biological Sciences, and the General College report is probably not the best way to improve undergraduate education. We believe that improvement of undergraduate education can be done directly, and more efficiently, by the Provost, working with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education in the way we recommend.

It may be argued that a "matrix" vice provost, of the kind we propose, without line authority and substantial budgetary control over collegiate units would be powerless and ineffective. The key issue is the Provost's support for undergraduate education. If the Provost supports the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the position will be effective. On the other hand, if the Provost does not support undergraduate initiatives, whatever number of line vice presidents or vice provosts, they will not be effective. The Provost's support must be assumed. The problem of administrative design is to find the most efficient system that, with the Provost's support, can be effective.

We return to some important details of the reorganization we recommend based on the principle that functions that directly support colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions should be brought under unified authority.

The present Offices of Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Information Systems and Services, Publications, and Orientation should report to the Vice Provost.

The funds currently dedicated to Educational Development Programs should be redirected to the curricular reforms recommended above for at least five years, after which time their use should be reassessed. The distribution of these funds should be directed by the Vice Provost.

Offices for students with special needs, including the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, the Office for Students with

Disabilities, and an Office for Honors Programs should report to the Vice Provost. Functions shared by the Martin Luther King Program (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs should be brought under unified leadership and authority in the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

Field learning, internships, and community service will become even more important than at present as the University works to bring its research and land grant missions more into the undergraduate curriculum. To coordinate the expansion of these opportunities across the Twin Cities campus, the Office of Special Learning Opportunities (currently administered through the College of Liberal Arts) should move to the Vice Provost's Office.

Precollege programs link the academic opportunities of the University with students in the schools. The University should establish a Director of Precollege Programs to coordinate and strengthen current programs, to identify gaps in the current set of programs, and to stimulate the creation of appropriate new programs. The director should report to the Vice Provost.

Enrollment management is of the first importance now that the Legislature has adopted enrollment limits for the University. Policy proposals in this area should be generated by the Council of Undergraduate Deans, chaired by the Vice Provost. The Vice Provost will assess the recommendations and carry the recommended policies to the Provost and President for adoption.

Active recruitment ensures cultural and ethnic diversity on campus, matches faculty with students in ability and interests, and balances distribution of students across majors. The Twin Cities campus should have a Director of Recruitment who reports to the Vice Provost.

5. What Does It Add Up To?

In response to Commitment to Focus the people of the state are asking what the University will do to improve the undergraduate education it provides on the Twin Cities campus. How shall we respond to this question?

If the recommendations of this report are accepted, the answer falls into four parts.

Entry and exploration We will create a single entry point with curricular paths and establish a Regents' College, with strong advising resources, for freshmen and sophomores who wish to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University. This will help prospective students understand how they must prepare to enter fields that interest them. It will enhance the ability of freshman and sophomore students to explore various intellectual and career possibilities.

Curriculum We will establish an expanded Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which includes faculty from professional schools, to define and deliver liberal education. A Provost's Task Force will conduct a fundamental review and reshaping of the University's approach to liberal education. Starting in the fall of 1988 there will be a three-year period of experimentation in which faculty develop and teach mini-core curricula, integrated packages of courses that enhance skills and support academic and career exploration.

Advising Faculty, professional advisers, graduate teaching assistant advisers, and peer advisers will cooperate in advising students under the leadership of a new Director of Advising for the Twin Cities campus. Resources will be allocated to bring adviser/advisee ratios into conformity with national standards. A computerized system for degree clearance, academic advising, and tracking will be developed.

Administrative organization A new office of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will bring under a unified philosophy, leadership, and authority the functions of entry into the University, curriculum, and advising just listed as well as the following functions which directly support the colleges and departments in carrying out their academic missions: financial aid; admissions and records; data and reporting services; publications; educational development grants and programs; special offices for minority students, students with disabilities, and honors students; the Office of Special Learning Opportunities; precollege programs; recruitment; and enrollment management.

These concrete changes will help bring the research and land grant missions into the education of students, creating a distinctive kind of undergraduate education that prepares people for creative participation in a decent society.

7. Committee's Personal Postscript to Colleagues

We approached our charge with hope and concern. It is a time of challenge and possibility for undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. Commitment to Focus, with its proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollments while keeping resources constant, has put a spotlight on this part of our mission. The people of the State recognize that at present our undergraduate education has along with considerable strengths grave weaknesses, especially in the lower division. They know they deserve better and they are challenging us to provide better. This is an exciting challenge which we can meet with flair. The Twin Cities campus of the University has the people and ideas to make significant improvements in undergraduate education, to make it an education of which we are all proud.

At the same time we are worried about the future of undergraduate education on this campus. The planning process in the wake of Commitment to Focus has generated expectations on the part both of faculty and of external audiences that, in the event of actual resource allocations, may exceed our means. In this climate whatever resources are available to the University

may be perceived as woefully inadequate, and in the competition for them undergraduate education may again be shortchanged. We are concerned about the divisions that have appeared recently in the University community. We hope for return to an atmosphere that nurtures attitudes essential to improving undergraduate education—openness to new ways of teaching, patient cooperation, willingness to share energy and idealism about teaching and learning.

Finally, we have felt and would like to convey a sense of urgency. It is urgent that the University act quickly to make improvements in undergraduate education that will be felt by students, faculty, and staff. We believe that our recommendations provide a direct and efficient path to important improvements. We know that our colleagues in the University community will critically examine and amend our work. Our recommendations, or alternatives to similar ends, should be acted on beginning in this academic year. Derek Bok ended an article in a recent Harvard Magazine with an anecdote that applies to us.

We should take inspiration from the story President Kennedy used to tell about the French general Louis Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slow-growing and would not reach maturity for one hundred years. "In that case," Lyautey responded, "there is no time to lose. We must plant it this afternoon."

A P P E N D I X

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, this report makes the following recommendations:

Entry and Exploration

1. Establish a uniform admissions policy for the Twin Cities campus. (Page 2.)
2. Change the New High School student application procedure by having students apply to the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities instead of seven colleges. (Page 2.)
3. Create an enrollment and advising designator, titled "Regents College," for students who wish to explore the full variety of majors and degree programs on the Twin Cities campus. (Page 3.)
4. Identify curricular paths that require admission and/or course sequences during the first or second years of study. (Page 2.)

Curriculum

5. Establish a "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" from the colleges on the Twin Cities campus which would have among its responsibilities oversight of liberal education standards and admissions policies. (Page 4.)
6. Appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review of undergraduate curricula, recommend minimum liberal education standards for all colleges on the Twin Cities campus, and possibly develop new curricular and instructional models. (Page 4.)
7. If the College of Liberal Arts divides, appoint a committee whose membership derives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to recommend campus standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree. (Page 5.)
8. Establish a three-year period of curricular experimentation in which substantial funds are directed for design and implementation of innovative undergraduate curricula such as mini-core curricula and honors curricula. (Page 5.)
9. Establish a procedure of annual review of undergraduate curricula by the Vice Provost and Provost with the deans of undergraduate colleges. (Page 6.)

Advising

10. Create a University Advising Office administered by a Director of

Advising for the Twin Cities campus, which would be charged with providing leadership for advising on the campus. (Page 8.)

11. Implement a computerized system for academic advising, tracking, and for degree clearance, including conversion of Continuing Education and Extension records onto the University of Minnesota data base. (Page 8.)
12. Develop a model for improved advising utilizing the concept of advising clusters that cut across college lines. (Page 8.)
13. Create an advising staff for Regents College students. (Page 3.)

Administrative Organization

14. Hold to the principle of reassignment of current personnel as often as possible in filling any proposed positions. (Page 9.)
15. Establish the position, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. (Page 9.)
16. Establish the position, Director of Precollege Programs. (Page 10.)
17. Establish the position, Director of Recruitment. (Page 11.)
18. Shift the reporting line of the following units to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education: Office of Admissions and Records, Office of Financial Aid, Information Systems and Services, Orientation, Office for Minority and Special Student Affairs, Office of Educational Development Programs, Office for Honors, Office of Special Learning Opportunities, and selected units, including the Office for Students with Disabilities, from the University Counseling Services. (Page 10.)
19. Develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan that guides, minimally, recruitment and precollege program planning. (Page 11.)

December 7, 1987