

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
September 26, 1991**

Present: Stanford Lehmberg (chair), Victor Bloomfield, Stephanie Carr, Thomas Clayton, James Cotter, Michael Handberg, Karen Karni, Robert Kvavik, James Maertens, Clark Starr, Susan Wick

Guests: Associate Vice President Carol Carrier, Vice Provost Anne Hopkins

1. Evaluation of Teaching; Council on Liberal Education

Professor Lehmberg welcomed Committee members to the meeting and turned to Dr. Hopkins for discussion of issues she wished to raise.

TRANSFER RULES: Dr. Hopkins reported on two reports recently completed for the legislature. One dealt with improvement in student transfer rules; a number of University administrators have worked with individuals from the other systems and reached a series of tentative agreements. Simultaneously, the undergraduate deans at the University worked to improve internal transfer rules. There will be considerable discussion of the issues in the colleges and among the deans. A report must be made to the legislature by January 1, at which point the University will have to deliver on promises it has made.

Dr. Hopkins was asked whether or not the University is the one being asked to make compromises on the transfer rules. She responded that both the institutions and the students create problems but that she does not want to compromise quality. She expressed concern about "top down" actions being taken by the State and said she hopes to be able to link faculty, by disciplines, across institutions to establish understandings about content. Her experience with such "articulation councils" in other states have led to substantial agreements about expectations in disciplines.

Professor Lehmberg informed the Committee that he had been consulted on the transfer issues over the summer and had asked Professors Clayton and Starr, as SCEP members, to participate in the discussions. Professor Starr reported on the discussions with representatives of the other systems. The problems appeared to be more organizational than quality. Professor Clayton reported that he had been very impressed with the group of administrators and faculty with whom they had worked; the community colleges are prepared to teach whatever the University requires and are awaiting the actions of the Council on Liberal Education. Hope was expressed that the University would accept the A.A degree as completing liberal education requirements; one problem, he observed, is that the Task Force proposes that part of liberal education requirements be met at the upper division level. Dr. Hopkins thanked the two faculty members for participating and asked that they continue their involvement, as there are a number of problems which remain to be dealt with.

RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES: The second report dealt with quality issues in

*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.

undergraduate education; the University was asked to provide measurements of retention and graduation rates and explain what it would do to improve those rates. These are issues the legislature is very concerned about. A statewide data base for tracking students, she said, would be extremely helpful in learning what happens to students and for developing policy. Concern was expressed about the possible imposition of an expectation of a four-year residence period for graduation; it will be important to learn the needs and goals of the diverse kinds of students who attend the University and whether or not they are being met--rather than a "cookie cutter" evaluation of graduation rates. Dr. Hopkins agreed, although noted that even taking into account the diversity of University students there is still a problem with the graduation rates. Moreover, the legislature is increasingly taking the position that it is not providing state funding for students who may want to take a course or two or fulfill educational needs other than undergraduate education and degrees. Such course work should pay for itself; there may soon be a rule which holds that the two-thirds state subsidy is for degree candidates. For those seeking degrees, she said, no one is trying to fit them into a single mold; concern is about the 18-24-year-old who is going to school, perhaps also working, but who is not taking sufficient course work to graduate in a timely fashion. Some of them have financial difficulties and need time. But there are students who work a reasonable amount, who are decent students, and who should be taking more than 12 hours per quarter. The State has changed its financial aid rules to define a full-time load as 15 hours because one cannot graduate in four years taking only 12 credits per quarter--even if no mistakes are made in curricular choices, which is rare. The University is trying to push people firmly but gently to move as quickly as feasible--but it remains committed to people who return to school, who might be working full time or have families, who don't fit the 15-hour model.

The objective of the enrollment policy discussions is to lay out sound policies for getting students where the interest is and ensuring that resources are available--and taking into account what other systems are doing (where is where 90% of the students are). Enrollment management is also intended to address the mission and role of the institutions and which students should be attracted or recruited to them. The University needs first to get its own house in order, but conversations are being held with the other systems at the same time. The University has been guilty of ad hoc, unconnected decisions on admissions and enrollment without resort to broader principles. A concern with probability of success is the larger context of the University's approach; it must be more careful about matching students to the institution.

Also being discussed is enrollment policy--from an institutional perspective rather than the collected views of the deans.

The Office of Admissions is being reviewed, by both internal and external groups. The goal is to change dramatically the way the University handles admissions and to become much more effective in recruiting students.

LIBERAL EDUCATION: Dr. Hopkins told the Committee she had been asked by former Provost Kuhi to be responsible for implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force on Liberal Education. It has been agreed that she and Professor Tom Scott, Chair of the Consultative Committee, would appoint the Council on Liberal Education [once established by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly]; all the deans have been solicited for nominees and Professor Scott is also identifying candidates. The deans are also being asked to assess what they can do to implement the new curriculum through a redirection of effort; there is, at present, no large sum of money that can be provided for it. It appears that the most feasible and sensible thing to do first is to establish the core curriculum. She and the Council

will work to plan the staged implementation of the plans. It is unlikely the core will be in place by next Fall; one of her concerns is that nothing be required which cannot be staffed.

Professor Lehmborg drew to Dr. Hopkins's attention the proposed revised bylaw amendment to be submitted to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly to create the Council on Liberal Education. She and the Committee members discussed the membership provisions contained in the revised bylaw. **It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to endorse the proposed bylaw.** Dr. Hopkins assured the Committee that the Council would be appointed as soon as possible.

DEPARTMENT REVIEWS: Dr. Hopkins recalled for the Committee the set of questions on undergraduate education it developed, last year, for incorporation in department reviews. She reported that she and Dean Holt had reached agreement on the inclusion of the questions in the department review procedures.

TEACHING EVALUATION: Dr. Hopkins reported that she has written to the other Big Ten schools requesting copies of whatever policies they may have dealing with teaching evaluation. She encouraged the Committee to continue its activities in this area.

Professor Lehmborg thanked Dr. Hopkins for meeting with the Committee.

2. Criteria for Morse-Alumni Teaching Awards

Professor Lehmborg reported that he and Associate Vice President Carrier met during the summer to discuss unresolved issues about eligibility for the Morse-Alumni awards.

Dr. Carrier reviewed for the Committee the history and evolution of the program. At present, the award to the faculty member is \$2500 for three years; an equivalent amount is provided to the individual's department. Up to ten awards are made each year. SCEP deliberated eligibility last year and voted to extend eligibility to faculty on "T" (temporary) appointments.

The question of "T" appointments is a complex one, she told the Committee, and may require additional deliberations by the Committee. She distributed information concerning the 873 "T" appointees (as of April, 1991) and explained the differences among various "T" appointments. It is difficult to talk about "T" appointees as a single category and there are problems with making them eligible, as a class, for the award.

One Committee member noted that in his college these nominations are taken very seriously and that the chances of nomination of an individual only peripherally involved in its activities was effectively zero. Further, a large fraction of Medical School faculty are "T" appointees; to the extent those faculty are eligible (which they are), a large group of people would be ineligible for the award if "T" appointees are excluded--even though they may do much of the teaching and commit their entire careers to the University. Professor Karni also recalled for the Committee the work that she and other Committee members had done last year in dealing with these issues and urged that "T" appointees remain eligible.

Dr. Carrier solicited the views of the Committee about the instance where a "T" appointee receives the (3-year) award but who might not be reappointed because of budget cuts--what happens to the award?

Professor Lehmberg said he was of the view that the award was an expression of appreciation for excellence in past teaching and that a lump sum award should be made to the individual and the department continue to receive its portion of the funds; he noted that the same problem arises when a faculty member retires prior to the expiration of the award.

It would simpler to make a one-time award, Professor Lehmberg noted; why was it decided to phase the award over three years, he inquired. Dr. Kvavik explained that the principal reason was to encourage a distinguished teacher to get involved with his or her department and engage departmental interest in teaching excellence. The administration was interested in seeing the award be more than recognition of past accomplishment and wanted to encourage additional activity by recipients. The implementation questions now need to be considered, and there are complications when an individual leaves the University. The 3-year award, Dr. Kvavik also recalled, was a compromise between the lump-sum award and a permanent augmentation to salary.

Committee members discussed various aspects of the questions which had been raised. Dr. Kvavik suggested that while this may be a small administrative mess, one can rely on the nominating committees, and the SCEP awarding committee, to make the appropriate judgments about those "T" appointees who have a long-term commitment to the University as against those who do not or those whose activities are primarily devoted to graduate education or research. The Committee concurred and was of the view that individuals on "T" appointments should remain eligible for the award.

A question about restricting the award to 100%-time appointees was also raised; sentiment was expressed by several that the definition of "regular" faculty should control--which includes tenured and tenure-track faculty who have appointments of at least 2/3 time. The Committee endorsed this change without objection and agreed that it should also apply to "T" appointees. (Most "T" appointees, it was noted, have appointments of less than 2/3 time.)

The Committee also appeared to be of the view that the individual and the department should receive the award funds irrespective of whether or not the individual remains at the University. It is the intent that the departmental funds be used for undergraduate education, Dr. Carrier noted, although departments are not monitored in how they use them. At Morris, it was noted, the departmental funds are set up in a separate line item for use in undergraduate teaching, so they are not lost in general unit needs.

Associate Vice President Carrier thanked the Committee for its deliberations and clarification of the eligibility rules. Another issue that may be raised in the future, she added, will be eligibility for P&A appointees whose primary responsibilities are teaching and undergraduate education.

3. ROTC Faculty Nomination

Professor Lehmberg noted that the Committee has been asked to approve a faculty nomination for the ROTC program; the Committee approved the nomination without objection.

4. Report on Summer Activities

Professor Lehmberg reported that he had represented SCEP several times during the summer in his role as ex-officio member of the Consultative Committee, which had met a number of times to consult

with the administration on the budget. At several points, he reported, he had emphasized that budget cuts do have implications for educational policy; it appears that the proposed cuts are sensible and expressed the hope that they can be made without grave damage to the University's educational mission. He also informed the Committee of the special meeting to be held with Senior Vice President Infante on October 8 to discuss the final budget document for 1991-92.

Professor Lehmborg also reported that he had represented SCEP at a meeting to deal with scheduling of athletic events during caucus night (the department was advised not to seek a waiver) and on Winter Quarter Study Day. On the latter, Professor Lehmborg said he expressed strong views that the event should not be held--despite the fact that national television and other factors would be involved. President Hasselmo, he said, had supported his view. It appeared that the department will be sterner about scheduling events and will also seek alternative dates for that specific event.

Another issue that arose, in this connection, is faculty members who will not permit student-athletes to make up work even when they participate in a properly-arranged and scheduled event. The advisors and athletic director felt that SCEP should make a statement on allowing students to make up work that is missed for legitimate reasons. It was pointed out that the policy adopted by the Senate **REQUIRES** that faculty permit students to make up work when they participate in events approved under the policy.

Advisors have also expressed concern about faculty members who continue to administer final exams on the last day of classes rather than at the time specified in the class schedule, Professor Lehmborg told the Committee. A problem for all students, it particularly affects student-athletes. Is there not a Senate policy on this issue? Dr. Kvavik said he believed there is and that Academic Affairs will send out a notice to department heads. The Committee appeared to concur.

5. Relationship Between Contact Hours and Credits

Professor Lehmborg reported that he had discussed this issue with Professor Ibele, former chair of the Consultative Committee; the concern is that class hours per week match the number of quarter credits awarded for a course. There are a number of courses which carry more credits than class hours, he noted; Elizabeth Grundner (responsible for assignment of classrooms) has informed him that there is not enough classroom space for 4-credit classes to meet four times per week.

With the exception of CLA, Dr. Kvavik reported, there are very few courses not in compliance with the policy. The faculty typically argue that they have added readings to the course work and that this should count for the additional credit.

Professor Lehmborg indicated that President Hasselmo is interested in discussing (again) the matter of semesters rather than quarters. He wondered if changes in the credit/contact-hour ratio might not be deferred until that issue is settled.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand