

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
November 10, 1988**

Present: John Clark (chair), John Clausen, Jean Congdon, Marvin Mattson, Timothy Mazzoni,
James Moller, Crystal Schlosser, Shelley Thomas

Guests: Mike Franzen (Daily), Sam Lewis, Registrar

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Clark reported on several items:

One, he had received a letter, from a St. Paul faculty member working on curriculum revision for the St. Paul colleges, inquiring if there were any University-wide liberal education requirements. He-- Professor Clark--had learned from Marilee Ward that the Senate in 1965 had adopted such requirements, which called for a minimum of 9 hours in each of 4 areas. The colleges, however, define how these requirements are to be met; it is possible that they have eroded over the intervening years.

Two, the December 8 meeting will include discussions of honors and high-ability students (Leslie Cafarelli and Jim Preus will be guests) and a report on the libraries (Interim Librarian John Howe will join the Committee). At some point early in Winter Quarter the Committee will need to begin thinking about how it will work next year, assuming that its enlarged charge is adopted by the Senate on November 17.

Three, there are educational policy questions which arise from the structure and staffing of the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. such as the future of FASE and the responsibilities of the Vice Provost for Minority Affairs. The Committee agreed that the Provost, the Vice Provost for Minority Affairs, and the new President should, at some point, each be invited to meet with the Committee.

2. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes for the October 27 meeting were accepted as written.

3. Integration of CEE and Day School Records

Professor Clark welcomed Sam Lewis to the meeting and asked him to inform the Committee on the current status and plans for the integration of CEE student records with those of students in Day school.

Mr. Lewis said he would explain to the Committee where the University has been (which is where

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

it is now) and where it might go. Day school records (about 600-700,000) are in computer files; they go back to the 1950s and all records since 1975 are on computer. These records can be used to produce transcripts on line. Records for any student enrolled in a CEE course are kept on 5" by 8" cards; the information is contained in manually-added pressure sensitive labels. There are about 17,000 students per quarter enrolled in CEE courses; 70% of those students have also been enrolled in Day school courses, so duplicate records are being created and kept for each of those students and there is no match between the two.

There are a number of problems which arise in attempting to match the records. For example, at present a student must specifically request that a CEE course record be transferred to his or her Day school record. If the names are different on the records, there could be three or four records for one individual (e.g., Joe Smith, Joseph Smith, Joseph E. Smith).

The results of this dual system can be troublesome. A student may get into trouble with financial aid authorities because the Day school record shows only 8 credits; another 5 may be in CEE. There are different lists of students, different grade slips, different grade reports. We cannot, he said, even tell the number of students at the University; it is possible to determine the number in CEE and in Day school but it is not possible to ascertain the overlap.

The reason for this situation, Mr. Lewis said, is largely historical artifact. Everyone knows it's a problem. He said he has been Registrar for six years and has worked on it continuously; attempts to address it go back 17 years. The Big Ten registrars, he commented, were astonished when they learned of the situation; Minnesota may be unique in the world in having two systems, one of them manual.

In the recent past his office worked with CEE and Administrative Information Services (AIS) on a joint proposal for the development of computer programs to integrate the two systems; after a two-year study, they obtained a cost estimate of \$3 million, which was too much money. Now CEE is thinking about its own separate system, at least for registration--which is also done manually. Student Support Services is pushing, on the other hand, for integration of the two so that there is only one system. Mr. Lewis distributed copies of memo that Jim Preus sent to Associate Vice President Ed Foster last month asking for movement on integrating the two systems.

Mr. Lewis said that there are at least three items to be considered in the integration:

- Getting people to match, which requires checking identifiers; there was a complicated protocol established to accomplish this and much of it must be performed manually.
- Work on the database so that all transcripts, class lists, etc., reflect CEE and Day school registration on the record.
- Setting up a system that meets the needs of CEE, which has more complicated information because they have semesters and quarters, special terms, and so on.

Asked if this is now a "hot topic," Mr. Lewis said they are trying to make it one, trying to get action. They would like to go ahead with an integrated system which meets everyone's needs; CEE, he added, is tired of hanging on.

Asked who needs to authorize the project to proceed, Mr. Lewis said that's part of the problem; no one knows for sure. The money has to be provided centrally, by the Management Systems Information Committee (which Associate Vice President Foster chairs). CEE would also, presumably, have to go through the MIS Advisory Committee in order to act on its own separate system.

Mr. Lewis was asked if the integration could be implemented by next fall; he said no. The original study included an estimate by the data processing people which said it would take four years--this is a very large project for Student Support Services--but that is intolerable. Two years, he said, might be acceptable. Even trying to start slowly, with current records, would be expensive because the initial systems changes are very expensive; they also cannot begin to transfer the information because the existing system cannot handle it. It was noted that Crookston currently puts CEE classes on the Day transcript; that, said Mr. Lewis, is possible because they make the courses look like Day school entries (and are able to tell the two apart because of different course designators or numbers).

Another problem, it was pointed out, was that some students might not want their CEE courses transferred if they did not receive good grades; that option of not transferring them would not be available with an integrated system. Mr. Lewis commented that CEE does not wish students to have that option--this is a University and the transcript should be a record of courses taken here. Students should not be permitted to "edit" their transcripts. Committee members appeared to concur with this reasoning. One of the student members of the Committee also suggested that students generally would support an integrated system.

Another difficulty with the dual system, Mr. Lewis pointed out, is that students, faculty, and particularly advisors do not have access to the full record; that makes degree advising and "progress to a degree" evaluation very difficult if not impossible.

One of the Committee members asked Mr. Lewis if the problem was a technical one or a political one; it appears that if the money were available, they could get it done. What, Mr. Lewis was asked, are CEE's views now and where is the joint proposal? He responded that after no money was forthcoming after the two-year study, CEE started to get frustrated and probably decided that if there were to be no central action, they would do their own system so they would at least have one for CEE students. Discussions at this point have stopped; Preus's memo to Foster is an attempt to begin them again. Mr. Lewis also said that it is not true to assert that CEE is not interested in an integrated system; rather, since they never see any action, they would like to move on their own.

Asked, Mr. Lewis said he did not know what the timetable for review of the issue was. One Committee member commented, with some irritation, that the situation is intolerable; Mr. Lewis's office cannot move, CEE cannot act, and something has to be done that can break the logjam.

After further discussion with Mr. Lewis, the Committee decided to promulgate a resolution, for review and action at its next meeting, which would express the sentiments of SCEP.

4. Quarter-to-Semester Change

Professor Clark reported that he had spoken recently with Assistant Vice President Kvakik and

learned that the Michigan State survey team has offered the following opinions about the usefulness of sending someone to Minnesota to talk about the results of their survey:

1. They know what information the University of Minnesota possesses, as a result of their visit to the campus; they have no concrete information beyond what Minnesota already has.
2. They have nothing to send which would be of help.
3. In their judgment, the only significant cost of change is in the area of faculty time, which is hard to assess; they, like we, are unclear about the validity of attributing the cost of curricular change to the conversion to the semester.
4. They do not believe sending anyone would help.

Further, Professor Clark said, they do not wish, yet, to share their own internal documents because they have not yet made a change; they appear to come down squarely in the middle on whether or not to make it.

Professor Clark was asked to inquire if information could be obtained from Iowa State, which has recently converted to semesters; he agreed to do so. Beyond that, however, SCEP will continue to keep the issue on hold, gather information, and wait to determine the views of the new president.

5. Proposed Change in the Morse-Alumni Teaching Awards

Professor Clark referred the Committee members to the letter from Associate Dean Sally Jorgenson to the Provost which had been distributed with the agenda. Her proposal is to make the teaching awards similar to the Regents Professorships in that the award is made a permanent increment in the faculty member's salary. He reported that as far as he knew the Provost had not responded to the letter.

Committee members agreed wholeheartedly with the idea behind the proposal but expressed doubts that this was the right way to accomplish the objective. One member gave voice to doubts that the increment would not otherwise be taken into account by the departments at the time salaries are set; another noted that such increases are made in the College of Education by the Dean's office and that it seemed to work but there are no data to support that conclusion.

Committee members also had reservations about the cumulative cost of the proposal; the permanent addition of \$1500 or \$2000 to the salaries of ten faculty members, over their careers, could be very high. The cost would be prohibitive if ten additional faculty recipients were named each year. In addition, there would be no guarantees that a good teacher one year would continue to be a good teacher in future years.

Other concerns were that to so change this award might be understood by departments that they no longer had to be concerned with rewarding teaching in salary decisions (unlikely), that it would downplay the need to do and money for research (again, unlikely).

Several alternatives were suggested as worth exploring, including a larger one-time sum for the

award (perhaps \$5,000) or a term certain for the grant of the award (for instance, 3 or 5 years with a possibility of renewal).

After additional deliberation, the Committee decided it would support a proposal which would:

- extend the duration and increase the amount of the award (perhaps to \$5,000 and for three or five years), and
- call for the money for first year of the award to come from the Alumni Association and for the money for the ensuing years to come from central funds, and
- require that one-half of the \$5,000 each year be awarded to the faculty member and the other half of which would be set aside for that faculty member to develop materials and instructions on excellence in teaching.

Revising the award in this way was seen as emphasizing the commitment of the central administration to recognizing and rewarding good teaching and also initiating a development effort to encourage continued excellence in instruction.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve this proposal and to forward it to the Provost for consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota