

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Tuesday, January 24, 1995
1:45 - 3:30
Room 626 Campus Club

Present: Kenneth Heller (chair), Jeff Bauer, Anita Cholewa, James Cotter, Megan Gunnar, Sara Hornstra, Robert Johnson, Laura Coffin Koch, Judith Martin, William Van Essendelft, Darren Walhof, Gayle Graham Yates

Regrets: Elayne Donahue, Manuel Kaplan

Absent: Darwin Hendel, Ryan Nilsen

Guests: Acting Vice President Mark Brenner, Professor Marvin Marshak

[In these minutes: Action on Morse-Alumni award and preparation requirement changes; report on the Residential College; (with Dr. Brenner:) discussion of graduate education, the Graduate School, and the draft Conflict of Commitment policy]

1. Policy Recommendations

Professor Heller convened the meeting at 1:45 and began by recalling that the Committee has had for several meetings consideration of two policies on its agenda: changes in the Morse-Alumni awards and changes in the preparation standards.

After quick review of the changes in the preparation standards (now joint between the University of Minnesota and the Minnesota State University system) adding a requirement for geography and a participatory art, they were unanimously approved for submission to the Senate Consultative Committee for placement on the docket of the University Senate.

He distributed a draft resolution forwarding to the Senate the changes in the Morse-Alumni award. Since there was not agreement on whether the award should be added to the base salary or be a permanent augmentation, he asked for discussion on that matter.

There is no reason to delay action on the proposal, argued one Committee member; the PRINCIPLE should be taken to the Senate, and if it is accepted by the administration, there can be further consultation on the means of delivering the award. The amount is small, in the context of salary increase funds, and should not be delayed further.

It was then unanimously voted to approve the recommendation, with slight revisions in wording. The document will be forwarded to the Committee on Finance and Planning, and then to the Senate

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

Consultative Committee for placement on the docket of the University Senate.

2. Report on the Residential College

Professor Heller then turned to Professors Graham Yates and Marshak for a report on the Residential College. Professor Marshak began by noting that there has been a great deal of research done in the last 25 years or more on students in higher education; what stands out is that the most important factor leading to good student outcomes is student-student contact on academic matters. Students spend a great deal more time outside class than they do in it. The second most important factor is faculty-student contact.

The Twin Cities is an urban campus and has problems with community, he pointed out; to improve undergraduate education, the University needs to encourage student-student and student-faculty contact. There has been discussion of a residential college for some time; last year, Vice President Hopkins appointed a committee, which he chaired, that recommended starting a prototype residential college in Territorial Hall.

There are a number of ways for the University to improve undergraduate education by enhancing opportunities for student-student and student-faculty, Professor Marshak observed, that do not cost a lot of money. One is to reorganize the way faculty teach--which students and which classes, not MORE classes. Another is that there is a lot of interest in the Twin Cities in public-private partnerships; improvements in undergraduate education could be advanced through them with very few dollars required. One such partnership is being considered that SCEP should know about, he said.

Dinnaken Properties, which owns two housing units near the East Bank campus, is interested in building a residential college facility for the University (behind Ramp C, on Delaware and Ontario). The University hasn't built new student housing in 25 years, even though 73% of first-year students live on campus and there is a waiting list of 300 for campus housing. If Dinnaken and the University were to reach an agreement, it would be the first new housing since Middlebrook Hall. The facility would include two small classrooms, some faculty offices for advising, by zoning requirements would have underground parking, and it would have apartments for resident faculty (it is unlikely, he speculated, that this would be the kind of facility in which faculty members with children would want to live). Dinnaken would charge no more than rates charged in the dorms, have a diversity in residents would be at least equal to that in the dorms, and would provide academic space at no charge to the University. The University would run the residential college program, including teaching (e.g., a recitation section for an existing class for residential college students).

The University has also received inquiries from fraternities and sororities and their alumni about similar public-private partnerships. The Greek houses along University Avenue are not in good shape. The University could ignore them--but they house the University's students. If organizations are willing to have academic programs, the University ought to think about the possibilities, Professor Marshak maintained.

Professor Graham Yates then described what has been occurring in the Residential College program. The pilot, she recalled, is for first-year students in IT and CLA; they have two wings in Territorial and have 94 students. Nearly all are just out of high school, so are the same age, and have

committed to be full-time students. They have two resident advisors, as with other parts of the residence hall system. The program is funded out of Anne Hopkins's office and is overseen by Dr. Linda Ellinger. The "staff" is small and volunteer, and includes the two faculty mentors, she and Professor Marshak.

She described how student-student interactions were enhanced (for example, how study groups were organized quickly, including with other students in Territorial who are not in the Residential College). She also described the rich interactions she and Professor Marshak has with the students. There seem to be high performance expectations among the students, she reported. She and Professor Marshak provided academic advising, working with CLA offices. There were some problems, but things have generally worked out well, she concluded.

They have no statistics to report, she told the Committee, but they have anecdotal evidence about the value of the program. The residence hall director reports that the residential college students have had NO behavior problems, where a typical group this size would have had several. One senses that the students have paid more attention to academic standards and helped each other understand the importance of academic accomplishment. Students have indicated that they feel they have resources that their peers do not, and have a sense of security they would not otherwise have. Having some courses in common seem to be important, along with the common housing.

With the departure of Vice President Hopkins, sponsorship for the Residential College is unclear; Dr. Ellinger, along with Associate Deans Russ Hobbie and Peter Reed will oversee the program for the remainder of the year. The plans now call for a second group in Sanford Hall next year; she and Professor Marshak will continue as faculty mentors. The program, however, is off to a good start, serving students well, and accomplishing what it was hoped it would.

Dr. Ellinger complimented the enormous amount of work that Professors Graham Yates and Marshak have put in to the Residential College.

Asked about what happens to the students who were in the program this year, Professor Marshak said that still needed to be resolved. Dr. Hopkins argued that the literature suggests the first year is the most important, and establishing the college for first-year students would get the most leverage out of investment. Other institutions run them for longer periods, although participation drops off quite a bit in the junior and senior years.

Questions and answers followed the discussion.

- Dinnaken would not be expected to achieve diversity in the residents on its own; the University would select the students.
- There will be no requirement that students already live in the residence hall; this year, students were picked from those already assigned to Territorial. Next year they will be picked from the entire incoming population who wish to be assigned to a residence hall.
- It is an "average" group of students, similar only in age; it is not an "interest" or an honors house. Such an interest or "honors" house would be a possibility in the future, however.

- Dinnaken wishes to move quickly, and would have a facility available in September, 1996; there is a reasonably concrete proposal already in place. The University is in the process of putting on the market the property Dinnaken needs. There is no guarantee that Dinnaken will bid highest on it, but that is the hope.
- The advantage of the public-private partnership to the University is that it gets the money from the sale of the land and it gets new student housing. Dinnaken, moreover, is owned by a member of the Cargill family who is probably not in it for the money but because he's interested in students. The University itself cannot take on this kind of project because it is borrowed and bonded to the limit. It hasn't the capital to put into student housing, even if there were going to be a return on it.

Campus master plans call for rebuilding Ramp B (on the river road); if possible, new dorms may be built on top of a new ramp. That, however, is part of a longer timetable.

- Dinnaken would have the right to fill up any spaces in the facility with non-Residential College students, if the University had not filled it by an agreed-upon date. Residence in the facility, however, would be restricted to University students.

Professor Heller thanked Professors Graham Yates and Marshak for their report and commended them and the administration for their rapid action in moving forward this important part of the U2000 plan.

3. Discussion with Acting Vice President Brenner

Professor Heller welcomed Acting Vice President Brenner to the meeting to discuss issues of graduate education and the draft Conflict of Commitment policy. They turned first to Graduate School issues.

Dr. Brenner began by informing the Committee that a number of changes are being made in the Graduate School, as a result of the recommendations of the review committee appointed by Vice President Anne Petersen (the Johnson committee).

- Appointment to graduate faculty status is now the responsibility of the individual programs. In the past, programs have made RECOMMENDATIONS to the Policy and Review Councils, which in turn voted on whether or not to accept the recommendations. That status is NOT an entitlement, but the Johnson committee said the decision should be a program responsibility and the Graduate School should not be a gatekeeper.
- Student admissions are changing. Applications, test scores, transcripts, letters, and so on, are compiled by the Graduate School and forwarded to the programs. Each program is expected to follow a program management plan on what it will do to improve quality and to set directions. Once that plan has been approved, a program has the authority to admit graduate students. All programs are expected to establish a threshold for admissions; if a student is below that threshold, the Graduate School will verify that the program has documentation about why the student should be admitted; if the documentation and explanation is adequate, the Graduate School will send a letter admitting the student to the Graduate School. The programs now have much more authority

in this area than in the past. (About 100 programs have had their plans approved; the Graduate School has asked the deans for help with those that have not yet submitted them.)

These changes represent a shift, because the Graduate School, supposedly a coordinating college, had total control over graduate programs. When program plans are received, the Graduate School sends copies to the dean and asks for a review for consistency with college plans. For example, do program aspirations match the resources it will have? The deans have been respectful of the process, he said, and there should be constructive collaboration.

-- For the last four months, the Graduate School has had a facilitator working with their staff to do more with increased efficiency, to be more customer-oriented, and to reduce errors. If the changes are made, the Graduate School should be able to perform its functions with greater efficiency.

Dr. Brenner was asked about the issue of tuition remissions and waivers. He reviewed what had taken place up to now, including the appointment of the committee chaired by Associate Vice President Peter Zetterberg. The biggest cost, about \$12 million, is graduate student tuition remission, begun in the mid-1980s. It was funded from fringe benefits and assessed of all academic employees--of which, 80% of the money came from faculty. As indirect costs were renegotiated with the federal government, and with new regulations, the federal government held that if a fringe benefit uniquely benefited one subclass of employees, that subclass had to pay for it. Minnesota was one of only five institutions assessing the cost over all academic employees.

The University felt, as indirect costs were being negotiated, that it had to move quickly. A Graduate School group recommended continuing to pay for tuition remission as a fringe benefit and charge it to graduate assistants; as a result, their fringe benefit rate went from 11% to 36%. This was a shock to those who employed graduate assistants, of course, and since it began in July, 1993, the outcry has increased. Employer behavior is changing as well, he told the Committee; they are tending to hire postdocs rather than RAs, and are using other employee classes for instruction, rather than TAs.

The committee appointed by Vice President Peterson recommended changing the system, to having graduate student tuition directly charged to the employer. The Zetterberg committee has been looking more closely at the issues--and has concluded that they are SO complicated that no change should be made this year.

What has been learned, from a survey of the CIC institutions (the Big Ten plus the University of Chicago) is that some charge tuition remission as a fringe benefit, some as a percent of salary, and some charge the employers directly. The fundamental question, Dr. Brenner observed, is what will the bottom line cost for a \$15,000 graduate assistant be if on a sponsored grant? What is important is that all institutions are close on this point. That is, while the method of recovering tuition costs varies, the bottom-line costs for graduate assistants is similar. Dr. Brenner cautioned, however, the survey is not complete and responses from six of the twelve institutions are still expected. The University does not appear to be out of line with its peers.

The net cost to the University is the same, it was said, under either method of determining it; the issue is how the cost is assessed? There is a second point, Dr. Brenner responded: the current system disadvantages units who support students on sponsored grants who have high salaries; the advantage

accrues to units that support TAs. If a direct charge system were instituted, that relative advantage and disadvantage would flip. With the direct charge system, there would be a \$2 - 3 million shortfall for TAs.

What about reverting to the old system, Dr. Brenner was asked? The federal government is firm on that, he said; they have set the rules. If other institutions do not want to make the argument, along with the University, then it will be impossible to get the attention of OMB. The issue of indirect costs is what has gotten all the attention. No action will be taken by the University for 1995-96, he said, and they are still collecting information.

The educational implication, recounted one Committee member, is that in fields where graduate students are educated by doing sponsored research, those departments will have to take on fewer graduate students. With TAs, however, the implications are less clear, depending on what the University will choose to do. If there is a move to Responsibility Centered Management, and each unit is charged for resources, those that use TAs heavily could have higher costs than those that use TAs less. In an environment of constant budget cutting, departments that hire TAs would be forced to hire fewer TAs, which would adversely affect both graduate and undergraduate education.

The turns in the economy are forcing universities to downsize, Dr. Brenner observed, with the market for some graduate students very soft. The problem is that the University would rather make those adjustments more in a planned manner; it should plan, he said, for the number of graduate students it will support. Is it fair, he asked, to let a student do five to seven years worth of work and find nothing after completing the degree? There is information suggesting that people with Ph.D.s are the most underemployed professionals, and there is clearly an oversupply in some fields. It has been pointed out that faculty members replace themselves many times in the course of their careers; where are all those Ph.D.s going when funding is declining? There are 200 research universities; what is the right level of Ph.D. production? Last year Minnesota produced 685 Ph.D.s, out of 36,000 nationally (that number may be higher than normal; a "steady-state" number for the University is probably in the mid-600s). The CIC produces over 6,000 Ph.D.s per year, or about one-sixth of all Ph.D.s in the United States, so it is a major player. There needs to be discussion about the number of students being enrolled in Ph.D. programs.

The short-term incentive, Dr. Brenner agreed, is for departments to hire a greater proportion of postdocs or part-time help, even though that may not be in the long-term interest of their graduate programs. The role of graduate students in the University is important, Dr. Brenner said. Strong graduate programs are the hallmark of a great research university, and it cannot rely exclusively on contributions of postdocs.

Does a shortage of TAs drive class scheduling, asked one Committee member? Is there now one TA where before there might have been two? Dr. Brenner said he has not heard of that occurring, and the problem might be corrected by other mechanisms. He said he did not know but would inquire.

Asked what percent of graduate students pay tuition out of their own pocket, Dr. Brenner said he thought it was about half, or perhaps slightly less. About one-half of graduate students are graduate assistants. The Zetterberg committee is looking at other benefits; he and Dr. Zetterberg will come back to the Committee in a month or so, Dr. Brenner said. This is an important issue, Professor Heller concluded, because graduate education is one of the primary missions of the University.

Discussion turned next to the draft Conflict of Commitment (hereinafter COC) policy.

Dr. Brenner explained that two other committees, Faculty Affairs and Research, are also consider the COC policy, but there are elements of it that have an impact on educational activities, so he wishes SCEP to review it as well. This policy would supersede the existing consulting policy, he explained, which does not address instruction or research. The consulting policy allows one day in seven for consulting, but does not make it an entitlement and it counts some professional activities as consulting. The proposed policy provides that certain professional activities are part of the job and, if approved, need not count as consulting time (e.g., serving on an editorial board). The draft COC policy treats internal and external teaching (that is not part of a faculty member's regular responsibility and for which he or she receives extra compensation) the same as consulting.

The draft COC policy provides that faculty have a professional responsibility to the University; if they choose to do more, in an entrepreneurial fashion, the meter starts to run. Many consulting activities are rewarding and enhance the faculty members. The University WANTS faculty to engage in them. This is NOT an attempt to discourage such activities, but the COC policy says there are limits.

Dr. Brenner drew the attention of Committee members to Section 5, which describes the activities that require permission or approval before a faculty member may engage in them. The intent is to avoid a bureaucratic process, he said; approval of the department head is required. Section 5.5 speaks to possible conflicts in instructional activities, such as academic employees teaching at another educational institution during their time of appointment. This could be a conflict both in time and competition with the University, he observed. The notion of time applies to full-time employees; the notion of competition applies to both full- and part-time employees who are more than 50%; for those who are appointed less than 50% time, the policy does not apply. Is it, for example, in the interest of the University to have one of its faculty offer a course through Walden University? Or at another Twin Cities college, advertised as a course offered by a University of Minnesota faculty member?

Is there any impact on official exchange programs with other universities? There is not, Dr. Brenner affirmed. This is intended to be a positive statement, and not bar legitimate activities. What has been needed is clarity, and this policy is sought to address issues that have not been dealt with; one only needs read the DAILY, he observed, to understand what some of these issues are. In many cases, the activity is desired; this policy only requires that there be discussion and the department know about it. This policy also only speaks to activities that are compensated; if a faculty member takes on something that should be counted in workload, that is a different issue.

Dr. Brenner agreed that some clarification of language may be needed in the section that deals with international projects administered by the University

One section that has raised eyebrows, Dr. Brenner commented, is one that addresses teaching in CEE. It provides that each credit hour taught per quarter for CEE will be considered the equivalent of three days of "extra professional activities." That is, out of a possible 39 days per academic year for a faculty member on a nine-month appointment. This is true only in the case of overload pay. Inloaded CEE teaching is part of a regular appointment, so would NOT count as overload or consulting. CEE teaching in the summer is not counted as an "extra activity" for someone who has a nine-month appointment. The policy says that there is no difference between CEE teaching and consulting, because

both are activities that go beyond the regular faculty appointment and compete with the responsibilities of the job.

This means, observed one Committee member, that teaching three 5-credit CEE courses will exceed the limits allowed by the policy. Dr. Brenner agreed, and even if one taught slightly less--within the allowable limit--then no other consulting would be permissible. The question is whether or not that is the right algorithm, he said. This will drive CEE towards more inloading or CEE will have to hire more adjunct faculty. At present there is the same ratio of faculty teaching courses in CEE as there is in the day school; the difference is that CEE uses adjuncts rather than TAs for the other courses. This policy could lead to fewer faculty teaching in CEE.

Most faculty who teach in CEE teach one to two courses per year, it was pointed out, so one can doubt there will be significant change. There are some faculty, Dr. Brenner pointed out, who teach four to seven courses per year in CEE; some are also consulting more than the allowed one day in seven. These problems need to be addressed; the question is whether or not this draft COC policy is too repressive for the total faculty.

Should not the limit on teaching for another institution be the same as teaching for CEE or another department within the University, asked one Committee member? It should be, Dr. Brenner agreed. The algorithm of three-days-per-credit-hour-taught is based on the assumption that instruction requires two hours of preparation (plus grading, advising, etc.) for every hour of instruction. One could argue for a multiplier of four, rather than three, he agreed. It is one thing to teach at the same institution, pointed out one Committee member, where one has an office and resources at hand; it is something else to go to another institution, and one could argue that instruction at another institution should count MORE heavily. Dr. Brenner agreed.

The University also benefits when a faculty member teaches in CEE, but does not when the faculty member goes to another institution. Dr. Brenner agreed that the point was worth noting; competition is not an issue within the institution. One could also reconsider the issue of preparation time, he noted, if the same course is taught in day and CEE.

Does the policy make sense, Dr. Brenner inquired? The point is to have a level playing field for all faculty members. Probably 40 or 50 faculty will be annoyed by this part of the policy, remarked one Committee member. Other parts will annoy others, Dr. Brenner commented; the question is what faculty expect of their colleagues.

Something will be lost, said one Committee member, if a faculty member who loves to teach is forced to give up a 5-credit course and CEE must hire an adjunct faculty member. The faculty member could still do that teaching, Dr. Brenner pointed out, if it were inloaded. There are some faculty, he observed, who--for whatever reasons--have chosen to teach more than to do other things, and some cannot now get out of that corner.

The issue, agreed one Committee member, is overall department workload, which should be shared. Now some faculty members decide to de-emphasize outreach and research without taking on more departmental teaching duties, which is not fair.

Some departments mandate that no more than a certain number of credits may be taught in CEE, Dr. Brenner said. This policy requires that department head approval be obtained, and essentially calls for the department to be in control of course staffing.

Accountability is required by the State of Minnesota, said one Committee member, and service is a commitment required of a faculty member at a land-grant institution. Where the State is paying, there must be time devoted to the tripartite mission. The department, said another Committee member, should manage the allocation of time; the problem is when faculty stop some activities and begin teaching for extra pay. Dr. Brenner agreed that workload is aggregate, and all understand that faculty career tracks include different emphases at different times. The problem is that some take on CEE teaching to such an extent that it competes with regular responsibilities. The question is whether or not this should be regulated.

The policy is silent on level of compensation, Dr. Brenner said in response to a question; the issues are time and competition.

How does this policy relate to the U2000 goal of increased access through CEE? The problem, said another Committee member, is that what one faculty member does at 6:00 at night on an inloaded basis is what another faculty member does at 6:00 for extra pay. If the policy is well-crafted, observed another Committee member, the faculty member teaching at 6:00 at night, but not for extra pay, should have compensatory time elsewhere for other activities.

If this policy is taken seriously, said one Committee member, it will FORCE departments to talk about inloading. Dr. Brenner agreed. The intent, he said, is NOT to undermine CEE or the proposed University College. For example, the Graduate School is talking with CEE about how to offer new masters' programs and how CEE credits might be accepted. The Graduate School wants to be sure that University College works as a place for part-time graduate students.

One can worry about equating consulting with extension teaching. There is an advantage to the University in fostering interdepartmental activities, especially in education. This only speaks to extra activities for pay, Dr. Brenner pointed out. Faculty in some units help others as part of their job; it is other activities that start the clock.

Professor Heller thanked Dr. Brenner for his presentation.

4. Calendar

The Committee next turned its attention to two draft calendars for the Twin Cities campus for 1997-98. Professor Koch, who had agreed to work on the issue, pointed out that one provides for a September 8 start, with Fall Quarter concluded by Thanksgiving; the other is the standard calendar. Unlike the discussion last year, she said, this version of the early start contains no clash with the major Jewish holidays. The biggest problem is the payroll; nine-month faculty would have to begin by September 1. The spring quarter would end at the usual time.

The other alternative, she pointed out, would be to break Fall Quarter into two pieces, an option which no one finds desirable. She also said that consideration has not been given to the number of

students in Agriculture or the biological sciences who would be affected by an early start. One advantage to the early start is that the quarter begins on Monday; many students treat the first Thursday-Friday as not important, it was said, but it does allow faculty to complete course paperwork.

Professor Heller asked Committee members to talk to their colleagues about the two options, and said the issue would be brought back in the new future for recommendation to the Steering Committee and the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. He then adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota