

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, April 22, 2004
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Emily Hoover (chair), Roxanne Beauclair, Victor Bloomfield, Shawn Curley, Frank Kulacki, Scott LeBlanc, Marsha Odom, Karen Seashore, Mary Ellen Shaw, Mary Sue Simmons, Craig Swan, Joel Weinsheimer
- Absent: Wilbert Ahern, Dale Branton, Vernon Cardwell, Michael Edlavitch, Gretchen Haas, Geoffrey Meisner, Martin Sampson, Douglas Wangenstein
- Guests: Professor John Adams (Chair, ROTC Subcommittee); Eugene Allen, Kathleen Sellev (Office of International Programs); Robert Kvavik (Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost); Carol Chomsky, Karen Zentner Bacig, Ron Huesman, Kirsten Jamsen, Geoff Maruyama, Shelley Smith, and Jerilyn Veldof (Council for Enhancing Student Learning, Working Group on Classroom and Course Assessment)

[In these minutes: (1) report from the ROTC subcommittee; (2) teaching evaluations by auditing students; (3) report from the Office of International Programs; (4) tuition policy options; (5) report from a working group of the Council on Enhancing Student Learning]

1. Report from the ROTC Subcommittee

Professor Hoover convened the meeting at 1:05 and welcomed Professor Adams to make his annual report for the ROTC Subcommittee.

Professor Adams noted that most of the people present at this meeting heard his report from last year; not a lot has changed. The three ROTC units continue to operate in a healthy fashion. The Subcommittee is responsible for overseeing the academic work of the three units, Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Each of the three units has 80-90 students; the staff includes officers, enlisted personnel, and civil service staff. Each service sets expectations for the number of officers who will graduate from the programs. This is regarded as a very good university to have an ROTC program and the programs here receive high marks when they are evaluated by the military. Students at other local schools may enroll in a program on this campus if there is no program on their campus; there are a handful of such students.

The principal job of the Subcommittee is to evaluate the credentials of officers who are assigned to the faculty to teach here. The Subcommittee reviews the credentials very closely using

* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

standards set by this Committee. Only one, in the last year, did not pass muster; the University sent the nomination back to the Navy, which sent another very highly-qualified person instead. It can be tough to find officers to assign to ROTC programs because there is a shortage, but the Pentagon believes these programs are cost-effective and a good source of officers. The students in the programs are doing well, Professor Adams said.

This will be his last year on the Subcommittee; Professor Jo-Ida Hansen will chair it next year. It is a very good Subcommittee, he said. It meets about twice per year, or on call if there is a special need. They meet each fall with the student leader of each program, at which time they receive comments and ask questions.

He concluded that the program is good for students, who receive a lot of scholarship dollars to support them.

How often do officers rotate through the program, Professor Hoover asked? Every three years, Professor Adams said. Each service has 4-5 officers, so there are 14-15 in total. Some must leave because they are needed elsewhere. The individuals in charge of the program must meet higher requirements, but the services have been sending good people and this has not been a problem. Many of the officers enjoy being at the University, and have never worked at a university; some are University of Minnesota graduates and petition to serve in this program.

What kind of qualifications do the officers come with, Professor Weinsheimer asked? They must have a graduate degree or be qualified to be admitted to the Graduate School and be in a program while they are here. Most are glad to do so because an advanced degree is important for moving up in the military. Do they have previous teaching experience, Professor Weinsheimer asked? Yes, significant experience, Professor Adams said. The military is in the training business; if the units are not fighting, they are training. They devote all their time to the development of young people. He said he had nothing but positive things to report, and said that if there were academic problems, the Subcommittee would have heard about them. The Subcommittee has a good relationship with the services and they would bring up any problems immediately.

Vice Provost Swan seconded Professor Adams's comments about the programs. He also extended thanks and appreciation to Professor Adams for chairing the Subcommittee; Professor Adams attended to his responsibilities honorably and diligently, he told the Committee.

Professor Hoover thanked Professor Adams for his service and for his report.

2. Auditing Students and Teaching Evaluations

The Committee took up the question of whether students who are auditing a course may or must fill out the teaching evaluation forms. The Committee concluded that if the student has registered to audit the course, and appears on the class list, he or she should fill out the form. If not on the class list, the student should not.

3. Report from the Office of International Programs

Professor Hoover next welcomed Dr. Eugene Allen and Ms. Kathleen Sellew to the meeting to provide their annual report on the Office of International Programs. Dr. Allen distributed a set of handouts.

Dr. Allen began by discussing the internal environment for international education. Like all units, they have faced budget cuts. The O&M funds in their office are leveraged 8.4:1; in a total budget of about \$20 million, \$2.4 million is O&M funds, of which 28% is for scholarships for study-abroad students and international students beyond their first year.

About four years ago, ISSS asked to start a fee system for costs associated with international student services. One request this year is to increase the fee from \$50 to \$60 per semester, \$25 to \$30 for summer, and from \$150 to \$190 for J-1 (exchange visitor/visiting scholar) visas. The fee covers 61% of the cost of the work they do. With the new federal tracking system, the costs have skyrocketed; they must integrate the system with PeopleSoft, there are visa delays, and the security issues are enormous. People have worked overtime and they have had to hire an additional person to deal with federal mandates. They estimate that the international student tracking system, SEVIS, has cost the University more than \$500,000. Security clearances to the country can really mess up student programs; while the average last year was 67 days, some now take six months or longer.

Dr. Allen next noted that of the 25 institutions that enroll the most international graduate students, 19 reported a decline in applications for fall 2004. There is a rising concern about the ability of graduate programs to obtain their normal complement of international graduate students. There are also issues with the administration of the TOEFL and the GRE. The University of Minnesota has been very passive about recruiting international graduate students; it has no organized approach. Some institutions are very organized and have done well. Are the numbers at the University down, Professor Curley asked? There was a 28% decline in international applications last year and a 17% decline this year, Dean Bloomfield reported, but the year before was an anomalous high, so it is difficult to say whether or not the decline is real. But other institutions are seeing the same kind of declines. Some programs are glad to see the decline; they had too many applicants; the question is whether those programs will still get an adequate pool of qualified applicants with the reduced number. It is possible the pool will dry up in the future.

What about enrollment, Dr. Swan asked? That is not down as far, Dean Bloomfield said, and he did not have the numbers for the current academic year. Dr. Allen reported the number of new international graduate students last year declined 16% from the previous year. Dr. Bloomfield said that Minnesota is in the same position as Illinois: because it had a dramatic increase, in previous years, in the number of international graduate students, the actual NUMBER of students continues to rise, as students move through the pipeline.

Dean Bloomfield asked Dr. Allen if he thought the number of applications at Minnesota dropped earlier than at other schools because the application fee was raised from \$55 to \$75, an increase other schools did not adopt. It may have been, Dr. Allen said. The issue of applications and admissions was the major focus, for the third year, of the summer meetings of the international program directors. He said that some AAU university presidents would be in a meeting with Tom Ridge, the Secretary of Homeland Security, to discuss these issues. There was recently an editorial by Robert Gates, former CIA director, about the situation. The State Department is still in denial, Dr. Allen said, and ESL programs have been decimated.

In her field, Professor Seashore commented, they have been more actively recruiting international graduate students than in the past. She asked Dr. Allen if he had any information about whether the number of students has declined or if they are choosing to go to the UK or the Netherlands, for example. Dr. Allen said he had only anecdotal information on the point; colleagues in Europe and Australia are telling him that students are choosing to study in their countries because they want nothing to do with United States problems. It is national policy in the UK and Australia that they will recruit international graduate students.

Mr. LeBlanc asked what amount of money the University needed to spend to get back to a situation that was preferable. Dr. Allen said he did not know; Purdue spent about \$60,000 ten years ago and ranks number one in recruitment of international graduate students. Purdue also targeted undergraduates, Ms. Sellw added; the international student population at Minnesota is about 80% graduate.

Federal funding of basic research has not grown to meet demand, Professor Kulacki said and the cost to support students has grown dramatically. Does that cost of students enter these numbers, he asked? In some cases, faculty might only hire two instead of three students because of cost. Dr. Bloomfield said the cost was a factor in the pain experienced by the faculty. For Chinese students, the University has identified the total cost of attendance, including the cost of living; that sets a base and the Chinese must guarantee that total. That same amount is matched for everyone else. That serves to inflate costs across the board.

Dr. Allen said that from a philosophic point of view, he does not agree with the current structure of non-resident tuition in these times. It is pricing the University out of the market. Dean Bloomfield said the cost is \$44,000 if a GA is on a grant, a figure that includes ICR if it is an RA. Students who are half-time RAs or TAs pay resident tuition, he noted, but agreed that students who come on their own funding pay non-resident tuition. That really hurts the University at the undergraduate level, Dr. Allen said.

Ms. Sellw said that the official reason she and Dr. Allen come to SCEP each year is to report on exchange agreements, of which there are about 275. She provided a list of all the agreements of which they are aware, by country. There may be a number of small exchanges organized by individual departments that they do not know about; if anyone knows of such agreements, she asked that they let her know. They encourage college and department exchanges and discourage University-wide exchanges (because there is no stakeholder who will administer them). The Carlson School has an Executive MBA program in China; while the University struggles to get Chinese students to the U.S., the MBA program has 71 students in China studying in a University program. Do they pay non-resident tuition, Professor Seashore asked? No, Ms. Sellw said; tuition is not based on the resident/non resident model. It is set individually for each program by the Carlson School and their partners.

Dr. Swan said that 275 seems like a large number of exchanges; do they track the activities of the programs and know which are active and which are not? They try to get updates, Ms. Sellw said, but it is sometimes difficult to get data on the number of students involved, and some of the exchanges do not involve exchanging people. There are many that are inactive, Dr. Allen said. Even the inactive ones, however, help when units want to re-establish or create a program, because there may be

connections that can be drawn on, Ms. Sellew added. Dr. Allen emphasized the importance of having the information about exchanges because the University is frequently asked to identify its connections around the world (by the Governor, by the faculty, and so on). Ms. Sellew is a great resource, he said, because she knows more about the programs and has been very helpful to faculty and the programs.

Dr. Allen reported that the final draft policy on "Suspending Academic Programs in Countries with Travel Warnings" has been prepared. These situations are not always black and white, he said, and the University will not automatically suspend a program because of a travel warning; there will be a group that deals with travel warnings and educates students about them. The University is more analytical than other CIC institutions in this regard; some automatically close down a program if a travel warning is issued.

The Department of Audits is looking at college and faculty practices with respect to evacuations, waivers, health insurance, etc. Dr. Allen said he anticipates there will be proposals for new policies that the University needs. At present these issues are dealt with by recommending that a department do something; OIP does not have any leverage. Some units may not like more policies but right now the University operates too loosely. Are these changes a matter of liability or prudence, Professor Weinsheimer asked? Both, Dr. Allen said. Mr. LeBlanc asked about the number of incidents that have occurred with respect to these issues. There are two or three serious issues per year with students; so far, they have all had the proper insurance, waivers, etc. Most of these student issues are not related to travel warnings, Ms. Sellew explained, but are individual matters.

As faculty, there is also a need to be concerned, Dr. Allen said, about knowing where faculty and staff are in the world. For the most part, beyond the home unit, the University does not know, which is a risky situation in this age. Should it be University or college policy that people must inform their department that they are going somewhere, Professor Seashore asked? It is supposed to be University policy, Dr. Allen replied, but it is not followed. Some policies are strictly enforced; this one is not. He said he knew of only one department that was strict on this issue of notification.

Dr. Allen next reported that they held a curriculum integration conference that was very successful; about 400 people from 120 institutions attended. Minnesota--all four campuses--is on the leading edge of integration of study abroad in the curriculum. Since 1997, there has been a significant increase in the number of study abroad enrollments. Do the liberal education requirements impede study abroad, Professor Weinsheimer asked? Not that he knows, Dr. Allen said. They encourage study abroad, Dr. Swan added. Professor Weinsheimer related that his daughter had difficulty in fulfilling certain liberal education requirements with her study abroad experience, so he wondered. Curriculum integration is intended to deal with such problems, Dr. Allen said. Some institutions count study abroad as credits toward graduation, and some count them as transfer credits. Has there been any talk with the Council on Liberal Education about satisfying the international perspectives requirement by study abroad, Mr. LeBlanc asked? Dr. Swan said there is good reason to raise that issue with the Council.

Dr. Swan asked if Dr. Allen had any sense whether the study abroad numbers were up or down for 2003-04. Dr. Allen said they were up at least 14% across all four campuses and that it has been a good year for study abroad.

Dr. Allen reported that there are learning abroad fellowships for M.A. and professional degree programs; students are choosing, by about a 3:1 margin, internships over research experiences. It is clear, however, that internships are not well organized, and they are working with the University of Oregon on this issue because Oregon has a nationally-recognized program. Recent OIP experience with graduate and professional students indicates that they have - greater financial need than undergraduates.

Ms. Sellev noted that there is a Faculty Grant Program that awards funds to support conferences and exchange collaborations abroad; they funded 89 of 107 applications last year.

Discussion turned next to MUCIA (Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities). Dr. Swan noted that the five participating members are all land-grant institutions, but that not all the land-grant institutions in the CIC participate. It is a matter of individual choice, Ms. Sellev reported. Iowa and Indiana backed out and Wisconsin decided to proceed alone. Penn State and Michigan were members recently but decided they did not see the benefits to membership so declined to renew when MUCIA changed its mission.

Dr. Allen reported on China Center workshops, which provide opportunities for professionals from China to enroll in non-credit workshops. People come to the University for a few weeks up to 3-4 months and take various mini-courses; the China Center hires faculty to teach them. China is preparing for the World Trade Organization and the world economy, the only country he knows that has done so in this manner. Is it appropriate to work through the China Center if one is approached about agreements with China, Professor Seashore asked? Any unit that is thinking of doing something in China that does NOT contact the China Center is foolish, Dr. Allen responded--they can tell departments a lot about what they should do. It is a great resource, he said. How do these arrangements evolve, Professor Seashore asked? College by college, Dr. Allen said; the University of Minnesota is in China more than any other country in the world, which is why the China Center should be involved in any programs.

Dr. Swan commented that OIP will not take responsibility for exchange agreements; if the unit is not committed to it, it will not be carried out. But as agreements involve the name of the University, there is a process to review and approve agreements so there is some broad oversight. The China Center has an important responsibility to participate in agreements to help make them work. It is a resource, not an oversight body, Professor Seashore said. If one knows the right things, it is easy to get connected, Dr. Allen said, and if one does not, it is very difficult.

From October 24 to November 5 the President and a small delegation are going to China to start a new alumni chapter in Hong Kong and initiate activities in Beijing and Shanghai. They would like to have more international alumni chapters and are exploring if alumni would be interested in coming back to the campus to reconnect with their college and campus. They have done some probing; it appears that this kind of effort will likely be more successful in Asia than in Europe.

Professor Hoover thanked Dr. Allen and Ms. Sellev for their report.

4. Tuition Policy Options

Professor Hoover next welcomed Dr. Kvavik to the meeting to discuss tuition policy options.

Dr. Kvavik distributed copies of a report from the Tuition Strategies Advisory Group. The task force was not charged to provide recommendations answers but rather information that can serve as the basis for discussion. Why was the report prepared? The President and Provost wanted information for the budget committee and the possible development of longer-term tuition models that make tuition more predictable to students rather than having tuition decisions be ad hoc responses to budget crises.

The University is about to reach the point where tuition revenues will exceed state dollars, so the traditional partnership (whereby the state pays more of the cost of education than do students) is about to be turned on its head. At the same time, tuition increases are not new; they have occurred every decade. Now, however, they are more in the public eye. Dr. Kvavik reviewed the current tuition guidelines that have been approved by the Board of Regents. They propose a few modifications to the guidelines, none of which are earth-shaking. There is a perception that there is a single undergraduate tuition rate on each campus, but that gets confused with reciprocity agreements

Dr. Kvavik then reviewed the several models that might be considered.

- Incremental increases (the one that has been used by the University). A pragmatic approach based on revenue needs and various social, political, and programmatic factors.
- One-time significant increases for all students, followed by more modest annual increases. The increase usually comes because of a financial shortfall and includes a promise to control increases in the future. This approach usually does not work because institutions cannot stick to the promise.
- Significant increases for incoming freshmen, followed by modest or no annual increases for continuing students. This is about to be implemented in Illinois, by state law.
- Expanded differential tuition by disciplinary program, student level, and campus location. Many Big Ten schools charge by major. Minnesota did this in the past and had difficulty getting students to graduate; the system creates incentives and disincentives for going into particular majors.
- Guaranteed tuition plan. The University has it; few students use it.

Each of the models has ramifications for financial aid, Dr. Kvavik pointed out. If there were a big increase for freshmen, there would be a negative impact on aid to these students because financial aid must be set uniformly for all classes of students.

In the end, the task force was of the view that if the University commits itself to a plan, it reduces its flexibility and ability to respond to circumstances. This is a decision that carries risk.

The task force also looked at reciprocity as well as non-resident/non-reciprocity tuition, and also at fees versus tuition and the role of financial aid. Any tuition model must be in synch with financial aid rules or it could have a very negative impact on students. The University must be very careful about tuition policy. They also looked at the Minnesota state grant program and made

recommendations for changes that the University could take to the legislature. The state could do a better job of getting aid to where it is needed. The task force reviewed scholarships, demand curves, and billing practices. The more complex one makes tuition, the more difficult it is to collect, and the harder it is to program into PeopleSoft.

Dr. Kvavik said that the Committee can discuss these issues; if it makes recommendations, it should not make them in just one area but should make a comprehensive recommendation.

What comes next, Professor Hoover asked? This is an advisory document for the Provost and the Budget Advisory Committee, Dr. Kvavik said; he said he did not know what they would do with it.

Is the University worse off or better off than its peers, Professor Kulacki asked? Dr. Kvavik said that tuition models can affect institutional goals such as retention and graduation rates and these particular goals may be more problematic at the University of Minnesota. One needs to answer Professor Kulacki's question in the context of how current tuition policies at other institutions support or do not support such institutional goals. Needs are different by institution. In the way it manages, Professor Kulacki said. There are few public institutions where the governing board has as much leeway in determining reciprocity, fees, tuition rates, etc., Dr. Kvavik said--Minnesota is less restricted than most. On internal issues the University is allowed more flexibility than other institutions, Dr. Swan added, and the colleges are much more autonomous, which makes system maintenance more difficult.

What is the best model for this university, a multi-campus, research and undergraduate institution, Professor Kulacki asked? Dr. Kvavik said the task force was not charged to answer that question. They gathered information; the policy groups will make recommendations. The advantages and disadvantages presented in the report help to understand each model, and the choice should support institutional priorities.

Professor Hoover thanked Dr. Kvavik for providing his report and said the Committee would return to the issue very shortly.

5. Council for Enhancing Student Learning

Professor Hoover now welcomed a group of colleagues from the Council for Enhancing Student Learning, Working Group on Classroom and Course Assessment, Carol Chomsky, Karen Zentner Bacig, Ron Huesman, Kirsten Jamsen, Geoff Maruyama, Shelley Smith, and Jerilyn Veldof.

The visit, Professor Chomsky said, is a request for a conversation. The working group is focused on what teachers do to assess student learning in the classroom. What is the definition of assessment, Professor Hoover asked? It is their view, for the purposes of their working group, that it involves teachers understanding what their own students are actually learning in their classes; it is teacher-controlled. (Assessment is also connected to programs, curricula, advising roles, use of technology, and the Council is concerned with these forms of assessment as well.)

The goals of the working group are

To help members of the University teaching and learning community:

- recognize the importance of assessing student learning and the variety of ways it can be done effectively,
- understand connections between assessment and student learning,
- learn effective techniques for assessing student learning and become comfortable with their use,
- incorporate assessment regularly into classroom teaching, and
- know how to access resources on assessment.

During this year they have accomplished the following:

- developing and presenting workshops on assessment techniques for faculty (in the Spring CTLS Workshop series and at Partners in Learning: A Campus-Wide Symposium on Best Practices to Enhance Student Learning),
- collecting a list of resources on assessment to be disseminated to interested teachers, and
- hosting a roundtable discussion at the April 19 Partners in Learning conference to talk with participants about strategies to induce more teachers, particularly tenure-track faculty, to engage in classroom assessment and other forms of active teaching/learning.

Third, they have questions for this Committee.

- How can we best reach out to tenure-track faculty to get them more engaged with teaching development work in general and the techniques of assessing student learning in particular?
- What are the barriers to faculty engagement? How might we address them?
- What role might SCEP play in these efforts?

They have, for example, twice held a workshop on assessment that received great evaluations, but only small groups of people attended. One ongoing question is that many who come to the workshops are not tenured/tenure-track faculty--they are teaching specialists, lecturers, instructors, etc. It is important that they be part of the effort, but the working group struggles with how to engage the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Does the Committee have any advice? They want to do whatever will best reach the most faculty.

The easiest group to reach is the early career faculty, Professor Weinsheimer said. Junior faculty need to be convinced that teaching matters. Sometimes there is opposition to too much focus on good teaching; faculty learn that if it is adequate, that is fine. For older faculty, they need to identify what is broken and what needs fixing. What is inadequate? The senior faculty must be convinced that something is broken, which will be an uphill battle. People believe the system is OK. He said he did not believe that the necessary persuasion of young tenured faculty has taken place. All in higher education pay lip service to the importance of teaching, but when push comes to shove that is not the case. There needs to be a PR campaign that teaching is important in order to change attitudes.

Professor Seashore said she fundamentally disagreed with Professor Weinsheimer. The issue for faculty across the University is that there is no encouragement to work on teaching, to be innovative, to do new things. With the Internet, there is more student contact; she said she spends

about 10 hours per week more as a result. As fast as she runs, with all that students expect in terms of active learning and so on, there is simply not time to go to seminars on teaching. But they talk about teaching all the time and work hard on it. They do the same thing in the Carlson School, which is in a very competitive environment and where students are used to better presentations. She said she did not know how to get the information from the working group into faculty settings; she said she is in a "just in time" mode when it comes to instructional innovation. The pressures on teaching are increasing rapidly. Would they be open to having a curriculum development person come to the department, Ms. Smith asked? They would, Professor Seashore said.

In terms of convincing the faculty something is broken, Professor Curley said he does not believe it is. Teaching is so much better than when he started on the faculty that students are getting wonderful teaching. The question is how to continue to improve and build on what has been done. The barrier is the time commitment. One difficulty in assessment, Professor Curley added, is the confounding of evaluation and development. He is EVALUATED on teaching for salary and promotion, which is unrelated to the DEVELOPMENT of his teaching.

When they talk about improving teaching, they do not assume the system is broken, Professor Chomsky said. Their charge is to increase use of tools to identify whether students are learning better or taught better. When one says teaching is excellent, what means does one have of showing that, she asked Professor Curley? Is it based on the standard evaluation forms or something more? Professor Curley said he did not have hard data, but there are now TA training programs and they also do peer evaluation. Teaching is not about the time put in, Mr. LeBlanc said; some teachers are very good and put in very little time. Often an effortless performance takes a lot of work, Dr. Swan said. Anyone who looks purely at the time involved does not understand the fundamentals of teaching. It is not how much time one puts in but where one puts the efforts. There is no guarantee that putting in more time will mean students will get more out of the teaching.

Dr. Simmons said she has been an academic advisor for over 25 years and that in the last decade she has spent far less time with students complaining about instruction, which means she can focus on things that support the mission of the faculty and she can assess what she should. She cautioned that "assessment" is a term the meaning of which may become blurred.

They need to think about how they present information to the faculty, Professor Hoover said. She is in a "need to know" mode; she does not want an 8-hour tutorial, she wants to find an on-line tutorial that provides her the information she needs for a specific purpose. There is a role for the face-to-face model but she has not thought about on-line information for need-to-know moments.

Some of what they want to bring to faculty the faculty may not know they need to know, it was said. In some places, things are not broken; in some places, they are. But in all places, how does one inform the faculty about new tools? What would be the attitude if someone came to a group to talk about something new? How to integrate something, not add on, would be important, Professor Seashore said, as would more time management to help people be effective teachers.

Delivering information to students does not mean they are receiving it, Dr. Shaw said. There is a need to assess what students learn across the curriculum and provide that information to the faculty. That connection is not made. There needs to be more broad-scale assessment.

Dr. Swan said he works with the Council of Undergraduate Deans and the directors of undergraduate studies on what faculty need to know. What they need to know depends on the kind of teaching they are doing--that can vary with a large class or a small seminar. Should they provide a long list of teaching tools and let faculty ask which will help their class? It would no doubt help faculty to understand which techniques apply to what setting.

Professor Chomsky said they would be pleased to hear from Committee members about things they believe the faculty would like to see.

Professor Hoover thanked Professor Chomsky and her colleagues for joining the meeting.

The Committee agreed it would vote by email on the revised statement on 5xxx courses; Professor Hoover then adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota