

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, November 2, 2011
2:00 – 4:00
300 Morrill Hall

- Present: Thomas Brothen (chair), Kirsten Barta, Lee-Ann Breuch, Emily Combs, John Cwodzinski, Norman Chervany, Jude Higdon, Alon McCormick, Robert McMaster, Peh Ng, Jane Phillips, Leslie Schiff, Paul Siliciano, Elaine Tarone, Cathrine Wambach
- Absent: Barbara Brandt, Peggy Root, Henning Schroeder
- Guests: Professor Susan Wick (Classroom Advisory Subcommittee), Jeremy Todd, Sarah Kussow (Office of Classroom Management); Professor Nita Krevans (chair, graduate education policy review committee); Professor Peter Hudleston (chair, Council on Liberal Education)
- Other: Suzanne Bardouche (Office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education)

[In these minutes: (1) recommendations from the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee on final examinations; (2) graduate-education policies: Post-baccalaureate Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents; (3) graduate-education policies: Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees; (4) change in liberal education requirements (Twin Cities Campus)]

1. Recommendations from the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee on Final Examinations

Professor Brothen convened the meeting at 2:00 and welcomed Professor Susan Wick to present recommendations from the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS).

Professor Wick said that CAS had two recommendations and provided a handout describing the issues and recommendations:

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) recommends that the Senate Committee on Education Policy (SCEP) review the Administrative Policy on Scheduling Examinations, Final Examinations, and Study Days: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester (<http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/EXAM.html>).

CAS requests SCEP to consider two issues:

1. A change in the system for scheduling rooms for final examinations in order to improve the efficiency and accuracy of scheduling and to decrease the costs.

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

2. A review of the policy on scheduling examinations to insure it is fair to students and instructors, clearly defines final examination, takes into account capstone projects, and encourages appropriate forms of examination.

Scheduling Rooms for Final Examinations

Jeremy Todd, Director of the Office of Classroom Management (OCM) and Sarah Kussow, Scheduling Coordinator for OCM advised CAS of the inefficiencies in the current process for scheduling final exams. Currently, OCM schedules approximately 3000 exams per semester. The scheduling is done manually and takes two staff people four to five weeks. Exams are scheduled for all undergraduate courses that meet in general classroom space unless the department notifies the scheduling unit ahead of time that an exam will not be taking place. OCM believes that only about 2000 exams are taking place and about 1000 rooms are scheduled unnecessarily. OCM is seeking a method to more efficiently schedule exams and eliminate scheduling classroom space for exams that do not take place.

After considering the issue and discussing it with OCM, CAS recommends that a process should be established for departments to notify OCM if final exams are not taking place. The second week of any academic term, departments should poll instructors to determine if they would need a room for final exams. There would be an assumption that a final exam would be given and a room should be scheduled, unless the instructor notifies the department. The departments would then notify OCM's scheduling unit of their final exam room needs.

Review of Examination Policy

Mr. Todd pointed out to CAS that the policy should be updated to reflect changes in pedagogy around issues such as take home examinations and capstone projects. CAS agreed with Mr. Todd and upon reviewing the policy, identified additional areas in need of clarification. CAS recommends to SCEP that it review the policy to:

- More clearly define final examinations, and clarify where capstone projects fit into the existing policy.
- Address newer methods of assessment such as major collaborative projects, experiential learning, and service learning.
- Define the type of assignment that is an exception to a final exam and unrestricted by the final exam due date.

Professor Wick explained, apropos of (1), that it takes a lot of time to schedule rooms for final examinations. There are about 3,000 scheduled, but OCM believes that perhaps only 2,000 are actually used for final exams. She said she was uncertain if this is a policy question.

Committee members discussed several elements of the problem. Professor Chervany inquired about the extent to which students think about the date of the final exam when they register for classes. If, as CAS recommends, departments poll instructors about final exam plans during the second week of the term, students would not know about the final-exam schedule when they register. He said he understood the cost of unnecessarily scheduling 1,000 extra rooms.

Professor Brothen inquired if this is a question of time or rooms. Both, Ms. Kussow responded. It is a manual process. If they know after two weeks, it would not change, and the time slot would still be listed in the class schedule. So students would know the date and time, just not the room, Professor Chervany observed.

Professor Wambach recalled that the last time the Committee discussed this issue, it realized it did not know how many traditional final exams were scheduled. The information presented today suggests that many faculty members are not scheduling them and are using alternatives, such as papers. No one really knows the number of final examinations offered, and if there are many fewer than assumed, perhaps the final-examination period could be shortened.

Professor McCormick said he did not see this as a policy change. Students would still know the time of their exams. He suggested the Committee urge OCM to do whatever would work best. Professor Schiff suggested that implementation not include an email to faculty members; Professor Wick said CAS envisioned the implementation would occur through departments. Professor Brothen interpreted Professor McCormick's suggestion as a motion and asked for a vote. The Committee voted unanimously in favor.

Their second suggestion is a review of the policy on final exams, Professor Wick said. CAS thinks about how classrooms are used for pedagogy and observes that some courses do not offer a traditional final exam but instead use other forms of summative evaluation such as papers, service learning, presentations, etc. CAS found it confusing about what constitutes a final exam; the policy refers to final exams but the term needs clarification. It is also an issue of fairness to students; instructors should not be permitted to put all the work in the final weeks of the semester. Some summative evaluations could take more time to grade (e.g., long papers) and it could be difficult to finish grading during final exam week plus the three extra days allowed. So CAS is presenting a request to this Committee to define the final requirement. It might, for example, be a performance during the time scheduled for the final exam—or it could take place before the scheduled final exam time. What is presented and how long it takes to grade must be taken into account when the final evaluation is defined.

Professor Wambach commented that the Committee had a long discussion and debate when this policy was re-written a few years ago. A primary concern was about a conflict between an exhibit and another examination, for example. The only solution the Committee could identify was to require that any final requirement outside the scheduled exam time had to be put in the class schedule so that students were alerted in advance. She said she did not know any other way to get around the problem. If the class requires a long exhibition, it could interfere with another final exam or (if it occurs before the end of the semester) with another class. With information in the class schedule, students are on notice that they may have a conflict and can try to resolve it. That does put the burden on the student but it isn't clear there is another way to handle the matter.

Ms. Combs asked if there had been discussion about giving instructors additional time to grade final work if the final exam is late in the finals period. That depends on what one calls a final exam, Professor Wambach commented. Professor Brothen said that he and Professor Wick believe there could be many forms of final assessment but the term final exam refers to something that happens between the last day of classes and the end of the final exam period. Perhaps there could be a "performance assessment" day when no other final exams are scheduled, Professor Wambach said, but

Ms. VanVoorhis has always insisted that they need the full five days for final exams, so if that remains true, there would have to be an extra day added for performance assessment.

Professor Chervany asked about the extent of student learning but pointed out the fewer than one-third of classes have a final exam of more than two hours, so only 10-15% provide a conflict. This is a problem but it is not huge. Because he offers a different final exam, it should be noted in the class schedule. Anyone who offers an extended exam should be required to note it in the schedule. There should be a memo to check with faculty if they will have something odd or different for their final exam and it should be in the schedule. Professor Schiff said she received a prompt about the course guide; it could be at that time. And if students are to be prompted to look at the exam schedule, Professor Chervany added, it should be at the time of registration. Ms. Phillips pointed out that current policy requires a notation in the class schedule about any activities required of students; it may be a matter of enforcing the existing policy.

Professor Brothen observed that CAS was asking for a better definition of the final exam, which the Committee can't really do until it finds out what instructors are doing. Is that necessary if the space problem is solved, Professor Wambach asked? Professor Wick said that one question from CAS is whether a class requirement for a major paper summarizing the class, due before the scheduled date of the final exam, is a final exam. In her view, a final exam requires a student to show up and write, perform, speak, etc., and a paper due in advance is not a final.

Professor Breuch reported that for writing classes, it is always a paper, and they typically do not have final exams. The due date for the paper varies. Dr. Higdon asked if it is at the discretion of the instructor. If it is a paper, it can be made due whenever the instructor wishes, Professor Tarone said. That can be brutal for students, Ms. Barta commented.

Professor Brothen suggested the Committee lay over this item until it can learn what is happening with respect to final exams. Professor Chervany said that the policy requires (or should require) instructors to say whether or not they will have a final exam. It cannot say that instructors should or should not but it should ask if they will and if it will be different from the time scheduled. Students can look at the schedule to see if they have a final or not or if it will be outside the norm. Even if not outside the normal schedule, students should know if something else is due, Professor Wick said. Professor Schiff suggested there could be a yes/no box in the course guide indicating whether the class has a final. This would only apply to finals week, Professor McCormick asked? That is his understanding, Professor Chervany said—anything required during finals week would have to be noted.

Professor Brothen concluded that the sense of the Committee is that students need more information about final exam requirements and the Committee needs more information about how faculty are using the final exam period. He thanked Professor Wick for bringing the CAS report to the Committee.

2. Graduate Education Policies: Post-baccalaureate Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents

Professor Brothen now welcomed Professor Krevans to the meeting to bring two additional policies on graduate education.

Professor Krevans said that she had two plans to present today, one dealing with post-baccalaureate certificate plans that have been approved by the Regents. They had not planned on crafting such a policy but were "firmly requested" to do so. The second policy is on admission for Masters and Doctoral degrees. [The two proposed policies are appended to these minutes.]

The post-baccalaureate certificates are not degrees, they are granted by programs that offer certificate programs for professionals or others wishing credentials beyond the bachelor's, Professor Krevans related. On average they are 12-15 credits, so short of a Masters degree. There are two kinds: those that have gone through the program-proposal review and approved by the Board of Regents, and those that have not. It is only the former that are governed by this policy; if it is not a certificate program approved by the Board, her committee had no control over it. There are a number of ad hoc certificate programs in departments, and students are happy to have those certificates, but they are not awarded by the University.

What is the difference? If the certificate program has not been approved by the Board of Regents, receipt of the certificate will not appear on a student's transcript, Professor Krevans said. The coursework for the certificate would, but the certificate would be from the program and could not say that it came from the University of Minnesota.

There is wide variation in certificates that have been approved by the Board of Regents, Professor Krevans said. Some require many credits; most of them can be completed in two semesters. There is no post-baccalaureate certificate program that is not in compliance with the requirements established in the proposed policy.

Ms. Combs asked compliance included time to degree. Professor Krevans repeated that most are 12-15 credits and often are time-sensitive in relation to the person's profession. The program or University would not issue a certificate if a number of years had passed, but the policy provides that colleges can petition for an exception.

Professor Wambach asked where the requirement of the 2.8 GPA to maintain satisfactory progress came from. It is the current University standard for graduate coursework, Professor Krevans said.

Professor Krevans said she had a question on which she wished the guidance of the Committee. Section II(b) of the policy provides that "all courses must be at the 4000 level or above. At least 50% of the certificate course credits must be at the 5000 level or above." There used to be a review process to decide who was eligible to teach 4xxx and 5xxx courses: One had to be on the graduate faculty (and one could be approved for graduate-faculty status to teach one course). The graduate faculty is gone, however, so there is no mechanism to review who is teaching 4xxx and 5xxx courses. These are gateways for Masters Plans A and B and Ph.D. committees (but not for Masters Plan C or certificates). She said she did not need an answer today but has had many reactions, from "it is in the program's best interest to have the best faculty teaching" to "there has to be a rule because programs could hire anyone to teach the courses."

Does the question affect this policy, Professor Brothen asked? It was originally an item in the policy, Professor Krevans said; all 5xxx courses were to be taught only by individuals qualified to

teach at the graduate level. But what does that mean? One problem they were concerned about is graduate students teaching other graduate students in the same program. They originally proposed to say that one could not teach a graduate course unless one has a higher degree than the students in the course, but some people who do not meet that standard are clearly qualified to teach in some instances (e.g., Joe Dowling teaching theater students). The graduate-faculty system is gone, however, so now there is no review process for instructors for graduate courses.

So the authority has devolved to the colleges, Professor McCormick said. Can they require that the colleges articulate what they will do? Some argue that programs will not hire "bad" faculty so there isn't a need for a rule, Professor Krevans responded.

This discussion demonstrates why Dean Schroeder must complete the study started with the Size, Scope, and Mission report, Professor Chervany said, because this is beyond Ph.D. education. The University needs quality metrics for certificate programs as well as Ph.D. and other post-baccalaureate programs.

Professor Krevans asked whether SCEP would like a statement that collegiate deans must establish and maintain policies on teaching graduate courses; that requirement could be in this policy as well as for Masters and Ph.D. programs. Professor Wambach suggested not embedding the requirement in longer policies; they found it more effective, when redoing the undergraduate policies, to make them short and to the point.

Professor Wambach commented that one should not teach undergraduates without a baccalaureate degree. So also here, there can be qualifications that are accepted and a way to obtain an exception. There is no policy on undergraduate teaching, Professor Krevans said; colleges can hire anyone.

Professor Tarone said she wished to reinforce Professor Chervany's point: With the financial pressure on colleges to merge programs, there are programs that are hiring people with Masters degrees to teach Masters students, and while it is a stopgap measure, it is appalling. Professor Krevans said her committee was told that in some programs, advanced graduate students teach new graduate students—and they are grading those students. This is distinct from organized mentoring and other efforts where senior students help more junior students.

The Committee supported the idea that Professor Krevans take a policy proposal to her committee about who should be eligible to teach 4xxx and 5xxx courses.

Dr. Higdon inquired about the requirement that colleges provide the policy upon matriculation rather than upon admission. Professor Krevans said it would be a massive job for a college to provide policies to all who are offered admission, and the students won't read the policy before matriculation anyway. It is also online, Ms. Combs observed.

Professor Brothen observed that it is this Committee's job to review and endorse the policies and forward them to the Faculty Consultative Committee. Professor Krevans said that before the Committee acted on this one, there were some tweaks that were needed. It was agreed that unless there were significant changes, the Committee would vote by email on the proposed policy.

3. Graduate Education Policies: Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees

Professor Krevans turned next to the admissions policy, which she said does not contain much change. They are working with Dean Schroeder to be sure they are not proposing a policy that cannot be implemented through technology—the goal is that all admissions will be online. Everything in the policy is the same as current language, although it is broken up in different ways, and is pretty standard language across research universities in the U.S.

The tricky items, all from Section I(a), include the requirement that applicants must have a baccalaureate degree. What is tricky is (1) the joint programs in which students complete both a baccalaureate and a graduate program, and (2) instances where the student is clearly qualified to do graduate work but who for some reason has not gotten a baccalaureate degree (e.g., a refugee who cannot get the degree from the home institution, a wunderkind that the program is eager to get into graduate education). So they propose to include an exceptions process.

Another tricky question is what "accredited" is, Professor Krevans said. If a student starts at a non-accredited institution but completes a degree at an accredited institution, University graduate programs may accept the student.

And another question is what a comparable degree from an institution in another country is, Professor Krevans said. One problem has been that some programs have not counted the three-year European degree as equivalent to the U.S. undergraduate baccalaureate degree. She said they will discuss this with graduate-admissions staff; it may be, for example, that some three-year degrees have been identified as insufficient. The Graduate School admissions office has been used by small programs to evaluate credentials (larger programs come to know about degrees in their field from foreign institutions).

Professor McCormick asked if there are any changes in course from what the Graduate School was doing in admissions. Notification comes from the programs, not the Graduate School, Professor Krevans said, and they want to put in bold language: "Graduate programs make all admissions decisions. Colleges issue the official notification of admission to applicants. The Graduate School does the paperwork." It has always been true that the programs make the decisions and the Graduate School office was a service unit.

Deans are giving programs quotas for enrollment, Professor Krevans reported, but negotiations between a program and a college do not affect individual students; it affects the enrollment targets for the program.

Professor Ng asked if there is any reason for VI: "University employees holding academic appointments above the rank of instructor or research fellow must obtain permission from their college and supervisor to apply for admission to pursue a master's or doctoral degree." It is a reality on the ground, Professor Krevans said: If one is a University employee, one must have approval. They could add the modifier "full-time," she added. But if one is an instructor, one does not need permission, Professor Ng asked? Even if full-time? That is correct, Professor Krevans said, but one would still need supervisor signature on the Regents Scholarship application. The assumption is that full-time employment is a demanding, responsible job, and one must confer with a supervisor to take classes.

Ms. Phillips suggested that the policy should also then prohibit having a child, which surely takes as much time as going to school. She said she did not like that provision—if one has an appointment higher than instructor and wants to go to school, and spend the required time, that is his or her business, not the University's. If an activity is related to one's job, it must be reported on the REPA, Professor Krevans pointed out, and schooling could be a potential conflict in schedule. Ms. Phillips disagreed and said the policy is reaching into the personal lives of employees where it does not belong.

Professor Chervany agreed with Ms. Phillips. He said he finds it disturbing that the University would have the right to tell someone they could not attend an evening MBA program. If one says that one must report on the REPA because of "rules from the sky," he would be upset but accept it. But if it is only because of University rules, he would find it unacceptable.

Professor Krevans said she believed this is a Human Resources issue and that she could see a reason for it. There is nothing in the policy that says whether the additional education would be at the University. It means a faculty member who wanted to get a law degree and teach in law, permission would be required (and such a case has occurred at the University). She said she thinks it is common sense to obtain permission.

Ms. Phillips maintained it is an intrusion into employees' personal lives. Professor Chervany said that if, as he got closer to retirement, he wanted to study "geezer law," he would take the idea to his chair. If the chair said no, "I would raise hell."

What is the provision protecting against, Professor Schiff inquired? Many clinical faculty want to take a new Masters program, and are encouraged to do so, Professor Krevans said. She said, however, that she would find out if it is necessary that the provision remain in the policy.

Vice Provost McMaster said he was inclined to agree with Ms. Phillips and Professor Chervany but he pointed out that the University does have a policy providing that faculty members may not have a second job. He can see the logic of the language, because if one has a full-time faculty position and is pursuing another graduate degree, the latter could be a distraction. But he could spend 12 hours per week working in a church or tending bar and there would be no question, Professor Chervany responded. The question is about doing one's job, Professor Tarone said—church, a child, fishing can all interfere with it.

Professor Krevans said she was not convinced but said she would find out if they are obligated to retain the language in the policy. It seems similar to the REPA, she said; if one is tending bar on weekends, one need not put it on the REPA, but if one is teaching a course and takes fees for it in a field that is part of one's University/professional identity, it must be reported. If one wants to take courses in another field that changes one's professional identity, that changes the term of employment.

Professor Brothen said it would be useful to know if the language has been in the policy before.

Once one receives permission, some cannot later say "no," Professor Wambach observed. So permission could protect an employee from an arbitrary decision. That opens the door to arbitrary refusals, Professor Tarone responded; some would approve and some would not. Professor Krevans

said that the reality is that a faculty member would be "insane" not to talk to his or her department chair about enrolling in a graduate degree program.

Professor Brothen thanked Professor Krevans for bringing the policies to the Committee for review.

4. Change in Liberal Education Requirements (Twin Cities Campus)

Professor Brothen welcomed Professor Hudleston from the Council on Liberal Education to present the proposed change in the undergraduate liberal-education requirements for the Twin Cities campus.

Professor Hudleston recalled that the new requirements went into effect in the fall of 2010, after two years of review and, ultimately, approval by the Faculty Senate. The new requirements are similar to the old ones in terms of having core and theme requirements; the difference between the old and the new is one less core and one more theme. The new requirements also differ in that the liberal-education components of a course, and how they fulfill the requirement, must be much more obvious to students. The theme requirements must be integrated fully into the course, not just one-third of it. The expectation was that the demand on students would be neutral.

As the Council has reviewed courses, however, it has become apparent the change was not neutral. In making the theme requirements more rigorous and more difficult to satisfy, the number of courses that could satisfy both a core and a theme requirement dropped. In particular, the faculty for some large-enrollment courses, such as Chemistry 1021, decided they could not meet the theme requirements, so there was a loss of about 1,000 seats per semester of a theme course. As a consequence, double-dipping options also declined, leading to a loss of flexibility for students in planning their programs.

The Council had a long discussion about this and concluded that one way to counteract the loss of flexibility was to reduce the number of required themes from five to four. Part of a handout from Professor Hudleston read as follows:

Reducing the designated theme requirement could counterbalance the negative effects of this loss of choice and flexibility, and the Council believes this can be done without seriously impacting the quality and substance of the liberal education experience. The factors the Council took into account when considering such a change were these:

-- Loss of double-dipping opportunities. The reduction in flexibility of student choice in selecting LE courses is especially of concern to students in highly structured majors, who must take maximum advantage of double-dipping in order to complete their degree requirements in a timely manner without the need to take additional coursework. It is not a desirable situation when students choose LE courses not on the basis of course content and its fit with academic program planning but rather simply to fit into a schedule that must also meet major coursework requirements.

-- Increased thematic content of the theme courses. Those courses that have been approved to meet the new theme requirements are more fully infused with the spirit of the theme and

address the thematic elements throughout the course, since it is no longer sufficient for a course to be "approximately a third of the course" as under the old requirements.

-- Overlap among the themes. All theme courses emphasize significant contemporary issues and must approach these from multiple perspectives. They encourage students to think ethically about the issues raised in the course and to reflect on the significance of those issues on society and on their own lives. Because of this and because of the nature of the five thematic areas, there is significant overlap among theme courses of different categories. In taking theme courses under the new requirements students are in fact exposed to more thematic content and ways of thinking than in taking theme courses under the old requirements, in which the thematic elements in courses often constituted only a fraction of the course.

In summary, the Council believes that reducing the required number of theme courses from five to four has several benefits. It gives students more flexibility in meeting their liberal education requirements, it facilitates program planning, and it decreases the likelihood of delaying graduation. It does these things while still paying significantly more attention to thematic issues and ways of thinking than was the case under the old LE requirements. If a change is to be made in the requirements, it should be done before the first students who fall under these requirements advance far into their undergraduate careers.

On March 28, 2011, and following carefully considered discussion, the Council voted unanimously in favor of reducing the number of required theme courses from five to four.

It would be up to the student to decide which four of the five themes he or she would wish to take, Professor Hudleston affirmed in response to a question from Professor Siliciano. Have they run a simulation to see if any of the themes would be "wounded? Would Technology and Society be harmed? Professor Hudleston said he did not know of any way to run such a simulation and that he believes there will be more proposals for courses to meet the Technology and Society theme. He said he did not foresee so many students migrating from one particular theme so that it became an insignificant part of any program. Dr. McMaster said he also doubted such migration would occur and suggested that students in some colleges might migrate to one theme while students in another college might migrate to another. Professor Hudleston later commented that there are wonderful courses in the Technology and Society theme and predicted that the number would grow, and also observed that it is not only Science and Engineering students who are enrolling in them.

Even if students in one college migrated away from one of the themes, Professor Hudleston said, there is sufficient overlap among them that students will encounter much of the material from all of them. If that is so, why not just have only four themes, Professor Siliciano asked? Professor Schiff, who chaired the task force that recommended the new liberal-education requirements, said that they worked hard to separate the themes so there would not be a great deal of overlap. They also debated at length about letting students make choices, but decided not to do so—but there was not overwhelming agreement on the point. She said she now believes, given the amazing theme courses that have been developed, that a student could take four of the five themes but would still not avoid encountering all the major issues they believed should be addressed in the theme courses. Professor Hudleston clarified that he believed students would receive elements of all five themes even if they only take four of the five, but they will not see all themes covered equally if they take only four.

Dr. McMaster said that some on the task force argued for choice because these are socially-constructed themes and cores. One could slice and dice the themes and cores in a number of different ways, and he did not believe that a student would be less educated or less exposed to ideas as a result of subtracting one theme from the requirements. There could be many other themes proposed and required that are not on the table. Reducing the requirement will also help the graduation rate, he surmised. Professor Schiff concurred.

Professor Wambach said she thought this was a positive step. If it works, the Council should consider requiring only three of the five and emphasize that major courses should look at the themes as well. The themes could be embedded in the majors rather than lie outside them. She said she would like to see the curriculum get to the point where the themes were no longer required because they would be addressed within all majors, not just stuck off on the side. The theme requirement lets majors off the hook.

Professor McCormick said he would go farther than Professor Wambach; the themes are a snapshot that could be divided a number of ways. The core requirements are intended to ensure a liberal education so one could see the themes as more dynamic and new ones could be allowed to emerge. As more and more fields become interdisciplinary, Ms. Combs added, it would be a good idea to force students to interact with a broad variety of majors.

Professor Schiff said that the liberal-education requirements seem to be reviewed about every 15 years, and new themes could be identified at the next iteration. Keeping a number of requirements is a way to say that engineers may not take only engineering courses and biologists may not take only biology courses. All units want to keep more money in their college, which is a problem because there have to be opportunities to mix students from several colleges.

Professor McCormick asked if, with the increased number of themes, students are required to take more credits. It is too early to say, Professor Hudleston said; this is only the third semester that the new requirements have been in place. Dr. McMaster reported that Academic Support Resources did model the impact of the new liberal-education requirements on majors, and in certain majors they will create difficulties in getting through in four years. This would ameliorate that problem, Professor Brothen asked? It would, Dr. McMaster said.

The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the change.

Professor Brothen thanked Professor Hudleston and adjourned the meeting at 3:55.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

Post-baccalaureate Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents

POLICY STATEMENT

Post-baccalaureate certificates may be offered by collegiate units to individuals who wish to enhance their knowledge, skills, and professional credibility.

I. Admission

Minimum admission requirements for post-baccalaureate certificates are the same as for master's and doctoral degrees. Admission is governed by the University-wide policy, Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees: Twin Cities, Duluth, and Rochester.

II. Program Requirements

Programs offering post-baccalaureate certificate plans must assure students receive graduate-level training. The minimal criteria are:

- a) Plans must consist of at least 12 semester course credits.
- b) All courses must be at the 4000 level or above. At least 50% of the certificate course credits must be at the 5000 level or above.
- c) Students must maintain at least a 2.800 GPA (on a 4.000 scale) for satisfactory progress. Programs may establish a higher minimum GPA.

Colleges and programs may specify additional or more stringent requirements. Colleges and graduate programs must publish these requirements and provide them to students upon matriculation.

III. Transfer of Credits

- a) Graduate course credits earned at other institutions may be transferred to University post-baccalaureate certificate plans subject to approval by the University graduate program. Such credits must have been earned at an accredited institution in the United States or at a non-U.S. institution judged by the graduate program to be comparable to a regionally accredited graduate program in the United States.
- b) At least 60% of the graduate course credits required for the certificate must be taken at the University.

IV. Credits in Common

A maximum of three graduate course credits may be counted in common between two University post-baccalaureate certificate plans.

V. Certificate Completion Timeline

All requirements for the certificate must be completed and the certificate awarded within five calendar years after initial enrollment. Colleges and programs may set more stringent time requirements and

may allow students to petition for exceptions to the time limit.

* * *

Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees: Twin Cities, Duluth, and Rochester

POLICY STATEMENT

The University establishes minimum admission requirements for master's and doctoral degrees. Colleges and graduate programs may set additional or more stringent requirements (e.g., an undergraduate GPA standard). Colleges and graduate programs must publish and maintain their admission requirements.

Graduate programs make all admission decisions. Colleges issue the official notification of admission to applicants.

I. General Admission Requirements for Degree Seeking Students

- a) Applicants must hold a bachelor's degree from an accredited U.S. college or university or a comparable degree from a recognized college or university in another country.
- i) Students from any University undergraduate program may be admitted and may matriculate in a graduate program while simultaneously completing their baccalaureate work, if they have no more than seven semester credits or two courses remaining to complete their bachelor's degree (including liberal education and distribution requirements).

If the student does not complete the work for the baccalaureate degree before the second term of enrollment in the graduate program, his/her admission is revoked until the student completes the required coursework for the baccalaureate.

- ii) Current University students in officially approved integrated bachelor's/master's degree programs may be admitted to the master's program prior to the award of the bachelor's degree if allowed under the admission requirements of the integrated program.
- b) International applicants: Must meet English language proficiency requirements specified by each college. Colleges and programs must publish and maintain their requirements.

International applicants who have completed 24 quarter credits/16 semester credits within the past 24 months in residence as a full-time student at an accredited U.S. college or university or designated equivalent are exempt from demonstrating language proficiency or meeting proficiency standards.

- c) Applicants must provide official transcripts from all post-secondary institutions attended.

II. Conditional Admission

Applicants may be admitted contingent upon satisfying specific requirements (conditional admission). Graduate programs that choose to admit applicants conditionally must ensure that these requirements

are communicated in the notification of admission. A timeframe for satisfying the requirements must be specified.

III. Concurrent or Sequential Graduate Degrees

Applicants who wish to pursue degrees concurrently in different graduate programs and/or different colleges must apply and be admitted to each college and program in which they plan to pursue a degree.

Applicants who have already been awarded a University graduate degree or a post-baccalaureate certificate and are seeking to obtain an additional degree must apply and meet the admissions criteria for their new graduate program and/or degree objective.

IV. Deferred Admission

Admitted applicants may request, from the graduate program, a deferral of their admission to graduate study for up to one year without re-applying. If the deferral is approved and matriculation does not occur within the one-year period, the applicant must re-apply.

V. Acceptance of Financial Support

In the event that a college or graduate program offers an applicant financial support, the student may not be compelled by the college or graduate program to accept the financial support offer prior to April 15 of the year of admission. [LINK to Council of Graduate Schools' Resolution Regarding Graduate Scholars, Fellows, Trainees, and Assistants]

VI. University Employees

University employees holding academic appointments above the rank of instructor or research fellow must obtain permission from their college and supervisor to apply for admission to pursue a master's or doctoral degree.

VII. Exceptions

Graduate programs may request exceptions to I.a. from the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education.