

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy**  
**Wednesday, September 8, 2010**  
**2:00 – 4:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Thomas Brothen (chair), Barbara Brandt, Norman Chervany, Robert McMaster, Cody Mikl, Kristen Nelson, Alon McCormick, Peh Ng, Jane Phillips, Henning Schroeder, Paul Siliciano, Donna Spannaus-Martin, Elaine Tarone, Michael Wade, Cathrine Wambach

Absent: Peggy Root

Guests: Susan VanVoorhis (Academic Support Resources); Jeremy Todd, Sarah Kussow, Anya Norton (Office of Classroom Management); Julie Tonneson (Office of Budget and Finance)

[In these minutes: (1) enrollment management committee; (2) class scheduling policy; (3) teaching and the budget model]

**1. Enrollment Management Committee**

Professor Brothen convened the meeting at 2:00, called for a round of introductions, and then turned to Vice Provosts McMaster and Schroeder to lead a discussion of the work of the enrollment-management committee (E-M committee).

Vice Provost McMaster distributed to Committee members several handouts, including the charge letter to the E-M committee. They are early on in the work of the committee, he reported; they started work this summer and find that the scope of work for the committee is expanding.

The charge to the E-M committee from the Provost, as reported last spring, includes these questions (Vice Provost McMaster's comments on a charge at this meeting in parentheses):

1. What factors (such as quality, including diversity and international enrollments) should inform our enrollment goals at the undergraduate level, the graduate level, and the professional level? Are there different factors applicable to different colleges or programs? (This gets into thorny issues.)
2. At the undergraduate level, how should we determine the correct balance between PSEO, new high school students, and transfer students? (They will look at PSEO as well as AP credits.)
3. What is the relationship between enrollment at various undergraduate levels and the curriculum? Where are the pressure points? (For example, there is intense pressure in the STEM fields; the University has received a record number of applicants and freshmen in these fields in CS&E, but there

---

\* 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.

are associated curricular issues, such as the need for additional math and chemistry courses, any adjustment in enrollment affects curriculum.)

4. How do we determine the appropriate enrollment balances among the colleges? What factors should be used to determine which colleges or programs should grow and which should be smaller? (The University must also attend to state workforce needs.)
5. How do we view the transfer relationship between MNSCU and the U of M, in particular for community colleges?
6. How do we determine the optimum balance among undergraduate, professional, and graduate enrollment, college by college?
7. How do we determine the appropriate role and numbers of part-time students?
8. How do we determine the appropriate size of an academic graduate program?
9. What the appropriate metrics for monitoring the effects and success of enrollment management strategies?
10. What is the appropriate balance between financial aid and tuition, and what level is sustainable over the long term?
11. Given the size of the faculty, the campus and its facilities, what is the optimum number of students who can be accommodated and still maintain a high quality educational experience?

As the work of the E-M committee has evolved over the summer, Dr. McMaster related, it has become focused on something larger, the scale and scope of the mission, which goes beyond the numbers to how decisions are made and the criteria to be used to enlarge or reduce the size of programs.

Vice Provost McMaster turned next to eight General Principles for Enrollment Management. He highlighted three: (1) "Admit for success," which means admitting students who will benefit from the curriculum and are likely to graduate in four years; certain students have records that suggest they will not likely graduate in a timely way (within 4 years), and admissions standards are being adjusted to look very carefully at their high school records. The University has a limited number of seats and must allocate them carefully. (2) "Emphasize signature strengths," which means giving highest priority to the strongest and distinctive programs while striking a balance between existing and emerging fields. (3) "Consider state, national, and global workforce needs," which means what it says. Dr. Brandt suggested, with respect to (3), that the word "regional" be added, because the Academic Health Center has regional as well as state and national workforce needs to consider.

Dr. McMaster then noted that there are three principles related to undergraduate education: "Maintain affordability," "Maintain opportunities for transfers," and "Partner with other state systems but retain our unique mission." The three principles related to graduate education are "Support graduate students adequately from initial enrollment through graduation," "Maintain sufficient numbers of graduate students to support teaching and research within individual colleges and

programs," and "Provide graduate students with sufficient stipends and benefits." The principles for professional education have not yet been enunciated.

Professor Chervany asked why "Maintain affordability" is not a general principle. Its absence from graduate and professional education is bothersome; the implication is that the University will not worry about affordability for those students. The affordability may be different, but the programs should be affordable for the target students. Vice Provost McMaster agreed that was a fair suggestion but noted that there is normally TA/RA/Fellowship support for graduate students. With changes in the budget model, Professor Chervany said, they have cut back support for RAs and TAs. Vice Provost Schroeder said that initially the principle was geared to undergraduates, who must pay tuition, but he agreed that Professor Chervany was right, graduate and professional programs should also be affordable.

The E-M committee has divided into subcommittees on undergraduate, graduate, and professional issues, each of which inform the larger committee of its work, Dr. McMaster said, and the larger group meets every other week and will do so through the end of the academic year. They will provide a preliminary report to the Regents (and to this Committee) in December. In terms of the evolving nature of their charge, they are interviewing every dean on questions of enrollment management.

Vice Provost McMaster then drew the attention of Committee members to two pages of data on enrollment categories (full-time men, full-time women, part-time men, part-time women, and full-time and part-time totals) for Minnesota and a number of its peers (UC Berkeley, UCLA, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, and Ohio State). This is only one of many sets of data before the E-M committee, Dr. McMaster said. It appears, however, that Minnesota, with 62.7% undergraduates, differs from its peers on that score (Berkeley is 71.3%, UCLA is at 69.2%, Illinois is 71.2%, and so on. In that group, the closest to Minnesota is Michigan at 65.3%. They are trying to figure out the effect of credit loads at the various institutions; the University of Minnesota counts six credits as full time while others use nine credits as the standard.

Vice Provost Schroeder reported that he participated in a workshop on enrollment management at the Council of Graduate Schools; the 30 people at the session were asked what their plans for graduate education numbers were for next year. Most of the institutions said they planned to increase the number of graduate students; he was the only one who reported that the institution was having a discussion about whether it had too many graduate and professional students. He asked the group how, if they intended to increase the numbers, they had a plan to finance the students. Most did not, they want to increase future enrollment because that is where the jobs will be (for those who hold Masters and Ph.D.s) and in order to open up new revenue streams (e.g., through programs for self-paying professional Masters students).

The University has about 14,000 graduate students, 8,000 of whom are Masters students and 6,000 are doctoral students (including 5,000 Ph.D. students), Dr. Schroeder said. The University is heavy on Masters students because of local demand that may not exist in other places.

If one sets out to reap funds from professional Masters degrees, how "vocational" should the University be? Should it focus more on intensive Ph.D. education or emphasize professional Masters

degrees because they provide a revenue stream? The core mission of the University is research and teaching, but it is doing a lot more than that because it is a "full-service" university.

The University has increased its population of graduate students by 35% between 2000 and 2008. Most of the University's peers did not grow as much. Part of this increase is related to the University's regional position: Many of the Masters students are getting good jobs.

The E-M committee will discuss the metrics to use to assess whether a graduate program is successful, Dr. Schroeder said, and there is agreement that academic quality of research and scholarly activities (by faculty and students) should be a favored measure.

Professor Tarone said it sounds like the report assumes that PhDs are research only, while Masters students do not carry out research and are only applied. She asked whether that was the assumption, or whether the report acknowledges that Masters students often carry out excellent research. Dr. Schroeder agreed with me and said they taking that into account. There are also a lot of Masters programs where research is important; the theses that have been submitted nationally from the University represent impressive work.

There has been growth in graduate programs but not in the number of faculty, Professor Wambach observed. How has the work gotten done? How have faculty members adapted? There must be an increased workload if there are no more faculty. What is also not understood well is that decisions at the local level to create or support programs means there are more graduate students, which fact has implications for the broader campus (e.g., in facilities and housing). Dr. Schroeder agreed. What made him first aware that there may be too many students is that there was not enough money: There was Policy and Review Council discussion about students who go to conferences to present their work who must apply to the Council of Graduate Students for funding to support travel to disciplinary meetings. He said he would not be opposed to fewer students in a program if it would make the experience better for those who are in it. He also noted that after the graduate education restructuring local programs, when recruiting students, will have more flexibility in creating packages than they have in the past, because control over first year fellowship funds will be more local.

Professor Chervany said he was not sure he accepted the tentative hypothesis that the University should concentrate on research-heavy Masters degrees. That proposition will need a lot of discussion, he said. If it is to be part of the discussion, the data on student numbers should be split into graduate and professional students and they should be kept separate on the tables. Vice Provost Schroeder said that the E-M committee is doing that by having subcommittees on undergraduate, graduate and professional education. Professor Chervany said that his college has ideas for Masters programs that will fulfill a need and capture revenue. These questions get to the budget model and they clearly need debate.

Every fall he receives messages from graduate students asking if there is a position in his lab, Professor Siliciano reported. He said he worries that programs are admitting graduate students with implied promises that there will be support. He assumes the students were told to come and apply to faculty members for an RAship. Some programs may be admitting too many students. They should not, Vice Provost Schroeder responded.

Professor Brothen inquired if anyone is saying that professional Masters programs produce a net gain or loss in revenue. Vice Provost Schroder recalled that the President has said there is the potential for \$140 million in revenue from self-supporting Masters programs. The governance process for Masters programs has been changed so they no longer need a three-level review; the proposals from the colleges go right to the Provost and will be reviewed at this level. There are examples of groups of faculty who want to get new Masters programs established; this is a good development and there will be quality safeguards in the system. Several deans, when meeting with the E-M committee chairs, have expressed concern that they need to be able to recruit faculty if new programs are established.

Vice Provost McMaster said that there are costs and benefits to setting up a new program. It may generate a lot of money but the regular faculty may have to accommodate it because there are no new faculty members. In his department, they decided such a program was important enough that they would offer it, and would accept larger classes and more advising. But these programs do not make sense if they dilute quality.

Professor Spannaus-Martin said that a big difference between Minnesota and the other schools is in the large number of part-time graduate students. If the other schools count 9 credits as full time and Minnesota only 6 credits, the difference should be in the opposite direction than the data. Any reason why Minnesota has so many part-time graduate students? One possibility might be the urban effect, Vice Provost McMaster said. Professor Wambach noted that Education and Human Development has huge Masters programs. There is also a very large MBA program.

Professor Brothen thanked Vice Provosts McMaster and Schroeder for their report.

## **2. Class Scheduling Policy**

Professor Brothen turned next to Ms. VanVoorhis to lead a discussion of proposed changes in the Class Scheduling for Undergraduate and Graduate Classes policy. The Committee received a copy of the proposed policy and a summary of the changes.

Ms. VanVoorhis explained that a group has been working the last two years on the scheduling policy because there are a number of issues to be dealt with. There are hundreds of unplaced course sections leading up to the start of fall and spring semesters; there is a decrease in the quality of classroom assignments in terms of location and room characteristic appropriateness, causing a decrease in classroom satisfaction; there has been decreased student course access because of classes meeting during heavily utilized days and times; increasing classroom inventory to accommodate demand spikes leads to an inefficient use of University resources since the additional classrooms are only necessary for a few peak-hours per week. In addition, there are faculty members who wish to teach on Monday-Wednesday or Wednesday-Friday. Given these problems, the group, with representatives from all colleges, is proposing changes in the policy. The proposals have been reviewed by the college associate deans and by Vice Provost McMaster; all have approved them. She noted that the Academic Health Center is exempt except for its graduate courses.

Mr. Todd reviewed briefly the summary of the policy changes.

-- Promote spreading of classes

- Eliminate the 60/40 guideline and peak time hours
- Departments and colleges can schedule up to 3% of departmental classes during any individual time period (e.g., period VII on Thursday or period II on Monday) on any given weekday, Monday through Friday
- Colleges can schedule a maximum of 50% of their classes using a Tuesday/Thursday meeting pattern, with the remaining classes using a combination of Monday, Wednesday, Friday meeting patterns
- Encourage departments to distribute enrollments throughout the day (i.e., across class periods) and throughout the week (i.e., day patterns)
  
- Add meeting patterns to Standard Meeting Times
  - Additional 75-minute meeting patterns for 3-credit course on Monday/Wednesday, Wednesday/Friday, and Monday/Friday
  - 150-minute classes can only meet on Fridays and are required to start at a standard "A" time
  - Recommend evening classes start at 6:20 p.m.
  
- Exempt Freshmen and Honors (HSEM) seminars from using standard time periods but they are required to start at a standard "A" time
  
- Pair classes
  - Classes that meet for only part of a week pattern should be matched with another class (with a maximum enrollment difference of +/-10%) to complete the weekly sequence
  - Half-term courses must be paired with courses meeting at the same time during the other half-term with a maximum enrollment difference of +/-10%

Mr. Todd reported that they looked at the practices of peer institutions. The 3% figure was chosen because if 3.4% were used, there would not be a sufficient number of classrooms and there would be no room for flexibility and for allowing exceptions. The 3% rule, he noted, will apply to colleges, not departments.

Committee members and Mr. Todd made a number of comments.

- Departments will be provided reports on classroom scheduling.
- Since so many students hate 8:00 classes, the schedules for Minneapolis and St. Paul could be flipped.
- Longer classes that meet only once per week can use back-to-back class periods; they are pushing departments to schedule once-per-week classes on Fridays.
- Starting evening classes at 6:20 is not always feasible because that means they would end at almost 10:00 at night; some units start their classes at 5:45.
- The standards in the policy apply at the college level, not department, so colleges can allow departments flexibility in scheduling. Colleges would need to coordinate scheduling, however.
- There is a need for better scheduling or coordination with Academic Health Center classrooms. The perceived "excess capacity" provided by AHC classrooms does not really exist for the purpose of scheduling most non-AHC classes.

- They have modeled all the college class schedules with the new policy provisions and are confident that the revised policy provides the flexibility needed.
- The 3% rule is difficult to grasp; it might be better to use general statements. Perhaps retain the 60/40 rule with caveats. But: the 60/40 rule did not ensure maximum use of classrooms during the day; Mr. Todd said the proposed revisions are consistent with the practice of peer institutions.
- The revisions may be the right thing to do but faculty will not understand it. If the institution is serious about better classroom use, there will have to be less flexibility in the details. Colleges have to communicate with each other. If the goal is better use, there must be fewer exceptions.
- Most colleges are already at the 3% standard now, although there are a few problems at 2:30, when the current 60/40 rule kicks in. So the faculty can be told they can't schedule all their classes at 2:30.
- In terms of rolling out the changes, they have tried to share best practices and information on how the current policy worked at the college and department level; some colleges have better lines of communication.
- If colleges are the unit, the policy should say so, and should tell them to work with departments.
- There are long-standing practices, such as in CS&E, so that students can get all the classes they need. Chemistry classes might be offered all at one time and Physics another so that students can take them. They should consider dropping the requirement of even distribution of enrollment courses throughout the day.
- There needs to be a way to deal with the frustration of trying to place large classes.
- Faculty will buy in to these changes if they make better use of resources and help keep down the cost for students.

The Committee voted to approve the changes in principle. It was agreed a revised policy would be circulated to the Committee for review.

Professor Brothen thanked Ms. VanVoorhis and Mr. Todd for presenting the draft.

### **3. Teaching and the Budget Model**

Professor Brothen welcomed Ms. Tonneson from the Office of Budget and Finance to provide information and a primer on the budget model so that Committee members can understand its implication for teaching.

Ms. Tonneson distributed copies of a one-page handout, a flow-chart of costs and revenues under the budget model. This chart, she explained, describes the mechanics of the process in the middle; before the actual costs and revenues flow, there are forecasts of both, and then decisions made about the budget at the end of the process. She reviewed the general operation of the budget, with all major revenue sources except the state fund flowing to the colleges and the costs of services and support units then charged to the colleges through the cost pools. The state funds go to the President, who allocates them through the compact and other processes. (100% of tuition revenue goes to a college when a student in that college takes courses in the college; when a student takes a course in another college, the student's college of enrollment receives 25% of the tuition and the college offering the course receives 75%.)

Are the cost-pool formulas dynamic, Professor Brothen asked? If a college has more students, it generates more tuition, but then also has larger cost-pool charges. That is correct, Ms. Tonneson said, but cautioned that the college's cost-pool charges are a proportion of the total. But if a college's portion of the total increases, then the charges would increase as well.

There is a Budget Model Advisory Committee that receives suggested changes to the model and makes recommendations. There have been changes made to address the question of incentives.

Professor Ng asked who decides about modifications to the cost-pool charges as they apply to the coordinate campuses. Ms. Tonneson said there are tiered charges; some are only for Twin Cities colleges while some are system costs.

Professor Nelson noted that the Committee has talked about improving teaching; how does the budget model affect that? What people are saying is that there are (or are not) incentives for teaching. If a student has two majors, in two different colleges, how is the budget model used? There has to be a primary major, Dr. McMaster said. So there is a disincentive for double majors, Professor Nelson observed. The students don't know anything of how the budget model operates when they choose to double major, Dr. McMaster said.

Ms. Tonneson said that 25% of the tuition would go to the primary major, \_\_\_\_\_ wherever enrolled, so it is part of the cost pool.

Professor Wambach said that if a college has 400 students and wants to admit 40 additional students, it receives 25% of the tuition revenue when those students take courses in other colleges. But the college needs to hire advisers, etc. What if the 25% does not cover the increased cost-pool charges? For some colleges, it is not in their interest to take more students because they lose money on them. Dr. McMaster observed that the colleges do not decide on enrollment. But they can say they do not want to take any more students, Professor Wambach pointed out.

Professor Wade asked if there are any colleges that survive on tuition alone, without state funding. There are none that do so today, Ms. Tonneson said.

Ms. Tonneson said she understood Professor Wambach's point. The Budget Model Advisory Committee is discussing the 75/25 tuition split, Ms. Tonneson said. Other schools have done the opposite (25/75), while some split the tuition 50/50. There is no rationale for these practices, but the advisory committee will look at whether the split captures the expense of enrollment for the colleges. The budget model is meant to provide incentives, Ms. Tonneson explained, but it does not provide the only incentives. Even if it costs more to offer certain classes or departments, the University may decide they should be offered anyway, and that is when the discussion about the use of state funds comes into play.

Professor Wambach said the 75/25 division worked well before the cost-pool charges increase. Why would a college offer courses to students in other colleges if it does not receive the money?

Vice Provost Henning said he has been in his job since January and the theme that recurs most in discussions with faculty/student committees is how the 75/25 tuition split inhibits interdisciplinary



instruction and provides a disincentive for colleges to loan faculty members to other colleges (because they only receive 25% of the tuition when that faculty member teaches in another college). His colleagues elsewhere do not understand this practice. At some institutions, 100% of the tuition follows the instructor. That discussion will take place in October, Ms. Tonneson said, and not only of the split but also the basis for it. The system uses course designator today because the data on instructor of record were weak in 1998; today it would be possible to consider instructor of record. The course designator is a license to offer a course and receive money, not about the person. But it is the best proxy, Ms. Tonneson said. (Ms. Phillips reported that there are significant program implications; her college would very much like to have Professor Hoover teach biology, but when the tuition from her course goes to CFANS rather than Biological Sciences, they cannot justify asking her to teach in their college.) Professor McCormick said the budget model has the same negative effect on team teaching. And some faculty members have appointments in two colleges, Ms. Phillips added, and it required an enormous of time to figure out how to allocate revenue—time not spent on pedagogy. The system represents the triumph of the bean counters.

Professor Wade said that it is not possible to do interdisciplinary work as long as there are departments. It is a business proposition as long as there are departments tabulating income. Eliminating them would be a fundamental change that would open up opportunities for interdisciplinary work.

Creating a new interdisciplinary program requires a Memorandum of Understanding, Dr. Schroeder said, and everyone wants interdisciplinary programs. There must be a way to change the flow of tuition dollars so it makes sense to create the programs; the discrepancies in the budget model need to be corrected.

One key question for faculty is whether to teach a graduate or an undergraduate course, Professor Nelson commented. That they do not see the dollars from graduate courses and do not receive credit for them is mythology—but that mythology is strong. The data do exist, Dr. McMaster said.

Ms. Phillips reported that her college has decided it cannot offer Masters students the option to be part-time because they cost (in cost-pool charges to the college) the same as full-time students. That is a disincentive. They realize that if the college were assessed part-time costs for part-time students, the amount not collected would only be added to the total cost pool costs and reallocated across-the-board. But it still feels more fair to not be assessed full-time charges for part-time community members. That is being changed, Ms. Tonneson reported; part-time students will be counted as .5 FTE and full-time students as 1.0 FTE. That will help with professional Masters degree programs, Ms. Phillips agreed.

Dr. Brandt reported that with respect to clinical faculty, they need preceptors in clinics, for which the Medical School is charged about \$2500. If someone is appointed as a clinical faculty member, the Medical School is charged even if the individual teaches one student for five months. Accreditation requires that those who teach medical students in clinics be appointed as clinical faculty; the budget model is a disincentive to appoint them. For those people, access to University email and libraries means nothing and they do not use University systems the way that on-campus faculty do. That issue is also on the agenda of the Budget Model Advisory Committee, Ms. Tonneson responded.

Ms. Tonneson observed that it would have been possible, at the outset, to make the budget model much more complicated, in order to accommodate certain peculiarities of the system, but they decided not to try to measure actual use of many services and use proxies instead. (One problem with making the model more complicated is that it would cost so much to administer that it would consume more resources than it would save.) Dr. Schroeder reported that the University of Michigan measures water usage; Ms. Tonneson said the University DOES measure utility usage by building—but those are the only direct charges in the system. Professor Chervany said he could understand that some use can be measured and some must be by proxy, but it should be possible to have multiple models. He agreed that would be more complicated. Biological Sciences might have huge lab costs, which might not be true for other units, and there could be variations on the tuition split to account for these differences (50/50, 100/0, etc.). Ms. Tonneson said they could talk about whether that would be possible, based on a student-by-student level. They will need to determine if they could use system-generated data. The fact that a college had a great teacher that it cannot afford is a glaring example of something wrong with the system, Professor Chervany concluded.

Professor Chervany inquired about the box on the chart for the state funds. The idea, Ms. Tonneson said, is that the President reserves the right to hold part of the state appropriation and direct it to priorities and initiatives.

A critical point is the need to talk about quality of service, Professor Chervany commented (e.g., technology). Are units receiving good service? The cost pools exist and services are allocated, but they could be a trap in allocating resources; the University needs to be sure units are receiving good service.

Professor Brothen thanked Ms. Tonneson for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota