

Daily 5-29-84

# U should provide remedial education to remain accessible to all, HECB says

By Dan Ness

If the University wants to maintain its policy of accessibility in admissions, it should provide instruction and support services for underprepared students, the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) has concluded.

The HECB, after a yearlong study, made a series of recommendations this month designed to reduce the need for remedial education in post-secondary educational institutions.

Gov. Rudy Perpich's Commission on the Future of Post-Secondary Education in Minnesota recommended in April that students pay more for remedial education courses. The HECB did not agree with that recommendation.

"The board's position is that if in fact an institution is admitting a student, they have a responsibility to educate the student according to his or her needs. The institution has a responsibility to fund it," said Phil Lewenstein,

HECB's assistant director for communications.

If students had to pay extra for remedial courses, the cost might be prohibitive, Lewenstein said. "We felt this (HECB's recommendation) was consistent with the idea of equal opportunity."

University officials will consider the recommendations within the next few weeks, said George Robb, associate vice president for institutional relations. The University is not required to follow any of the recommendations.

"As far as specific actions go, that's something that will have to be looked at more," Robb said.

Deciding which courses are remedial is one problem with studying the issue, Robb said. What is considered "remedial" for some students might be advanced for others, he said.

Many of the board's recommendations were aimed at secondary-

school systems. "I think the idea is to really make a concerted effort to communicate with students in junior and senior high and let them know what is expected of them," Lewenstein said. "The board's recommendations emphasized that schools locate students who need extra academic assistance and help them early on so when they get to high school, they won't need remedial courses."

The HECB also recommended that high schools establish standards for graduation that would prepare students better, particularly those planning to attend post-secondary institutions.

The state board of education has established only the "very minimum" of standards for high school graduation, said Ruth Randall, Minnesota's commissioner of education. But individual school boards can impose tougher standards, she said. "We have to set some rigorous examples so that other school districts will

## Remedial to 13

## Remedial from 3

follow suit," she said.

But "simply setting standards doesn't get the job done," Randall added. Identifying and aiding students who need remedial education before graduating should be emphasized, she said.

People often put too much emphasis on facilities and materials without considering how much students have learned upon graduation, Randall said. "I'm a proponent of focusing on what comes out of the education system as well as what is put into a system," she said.

This "learner-outcome" concept will play a larger role in education decisions in the future, she said. "It could be that this might be something we will recommend to the Legislature in

their next session," Randall said.

The HECB's recommendations will have an effect only if the school districts choose to act on them, said Minneapolis Public Schools Superintendent Richard Green. "I happen to think our high schools have high standards now," he said.

A student's need for remedial education doesn't necessarily mean the high school was negligent, Green said, noting that a student may have made a change in career plans that required different classes. But he said he is "willing to listen to ideas that may improve our system."

Circ Sec 3/31



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs  
213 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
(612) 373-2033

March 21, 1983

- Professor William E. Gardner, Dean, College of Education and Chairperson
- Professor Annie P. Baldwin, Department of Psychoeducational Studies
- Professor Thomas C. Buckley, Associate Dean, General College
- Mr. Luther Darville, Interim Coordinator/Administrator, Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs
- Professor Sandra M. Flake, General College
- Dr. Carol H. Pazandak, Assistant to the President
- Professor Donald Ross, Department of English
- Professor George L. Shapiro, Department of Speech Communication
- Professor Edwin F. Stueben, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology
- Professor Arthur E. Walzer, Department of Rhetoric
- Professor David M. Wark, Student Counseling Bureau
- Professor Donald R. Zander, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
- Ken Webster, Student
- Randall Chun, Student
- Frank Sanchez, Student

Dear Colleagues:

Last spring as part of the University's comprehensive process of setting institutional priorities, four issues emerged which span college boundaries and have significant impact on the way in which programs and services are offered at the University. One of these issues is the provision of tutoring and special services for the development of academic skills necessary for college-level work.

I am writing to ask if you would serve as a Task Force to examine the programs and services offered on the Twin Cities campus in support of the development of academic skills. Our planning to date has led us to conclude that a careful examination of current services and their interrelationship could benefit the students served by improving both their effectiveness and efficiency. Specifically I would like the Task Force to accomplish the following:

- Develop a brief inventory for the skill development programs and services which are currently offered on the Twin Cities campus. This need not be an elaborate survey but only a listing gathered from the testimony of knowledgeable campus practitioners like yourselves.
- Draft a policy statement on the appropriate extent of the University's responsibility to offer pre-college or remedial work. This statement should also contrast the University's responsibility with that of individual colleges. Finally, this policy statement should lay out the budgeting practices which would be consistent with this policy.

Task Force on Academic Skills Programs  
March 21, 1983  
Page Two

- Recommend, as appropriate, reassignment of functions and organizational changes that would achieve better integration and coordination of these services, thereby benefiting the students involved.

I suggest that you include the programs offered through General College in its Skills Center, the HELP Center, the Department of Mathematics in IT, the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs and its Learning Resource Center, the Martin Luther King Program in CLA, and the Reading and Study Skills Center within the Student Counseling Bureau. This list, however, may be expanded to other related programs on the Twin Cities campus as you deem appropriate.

Because this issue relates to the articulation of college curriculum and the high school curriculum, I encourage the Task Force to receive testimony from knowledgeable practitioners in the State's school system. Because such programs are often built on external funds, testimony from people knowledgeable about the future funding of such programs would also seem appropriate.

The task I am asking you to perform is extremely important to the University and its students. I request that you submit your report by June 15, 1983. I have asked Dean Gardner from the College of Education to chair the group; he will arrange a meeting schedule for you. I have asked Dr. Darwin Hendel of our office to provide the necessary staff support. If you believe it would be helpful, I would be happy to meet with you at one of your early sessions to discuss the charge or to answer related questions.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,



Kenneth H. Keller  
Vice President

KHK:jhh

cc: Dr. C. Peter Magrath, President  
University Vice Presidents  
Professor Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs  
Professor Fred E. Lukermann, Dean, College of Liberal Arts  
Professor Jeanne T. Lupton, Dean, General College  
Professor Roger W. Staehle, Dean, Institute of Technology  
Professor Keith Wharton, Acting Dean, College of Agriculture  
✓ Professor Patricia B. Swan, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee  
Professor Wesley B. Sundquist, Chair, Senate Finance Committee

Report of the Task Force

Concerning Support and Development of Academic Skills

October, 1983

Task Force Members

Dean William E. Gardner, College of Education, Chairperson  
Professor Annie P. Baldwin, Department of Psychoeducational Studies  
Professor Thomas C. Buckley, Associate Dean, General College  
Mr. Luther Darville, Interim Coordinator/Administrator, Office of Minority  
and Special Student Affairs  
Professor Sandra M. Flake, General College  
Professor Russell Hamilton, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts  
Dr. Carol Pazandak, Assistant to the President  
Professor Donald Ross, Department of English  
Professor Edwin Stueben, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology  
Professor Arthur E. Walzer, Department of Rhetoric  
Professor David Wark, Student Counseling Bureau  
Professor Donald Zander, Associate Vice President, Student Affairs  
Ken Webster, Student  
Randall Chun, Student  
Frank Sanchez, Student  
Darwin Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs, ex officio  
John Wallace, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs, ex officio

✓ Phyllis Freier  
W. D. Spring  
✓ Phyllis Freier  
W. D. Spring

C. Traylor  
J. Merrin  
✓ L. Rubenstein  
Maw Mattson  
Van C. Harper  
P. G. Miller

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Task Force Members . . . . .	i
Introduction . . . . .	1
I. Summary of Task Force Discussion and Consensus on Major Issues . . . . .	2
II. Inventory - Academic Skills Programs . . . . .	5
III. Task Force Policy Statements . . . . .	7

Appendices

A. Inventory for Skill Development Programs and Services. .	13
B. Inventory of Academic Skills Programs, Courses, and Services . . . . .	15
C. HSR and Verbal Score Means, 1959-82, University of Minnesota and All Minnesota Colleges Combined, Entering Freshmen . . . . .	24
D. Entrance Requirements for General College, Institute of Technology, and College of Liberal Arts for 1953, 1963, 1973, 1983 . . . . .	25

October, 1983

Early in spring quarter, 1983, Vice President Keller charged this Task Force to examine the programs and services offered on the Twin Cities campus which support the development of academic skills. This Task Force was one of four task forces identified during the University's 1981-82 planning process. Specifically, this group was asked to perform the following tasks and to submit a report by the end of the quarter:

1. Develop a brief inventory for the skill development programs and services which are currently offered on the Twin Cities campus. This need not be an elaborate survey but only a listing gathered from the testimony of knowledgeable campus practitioners like yourselves.
2. Draft a policy statement on the appropriate extent of the University's responsibility to offer pre-college or remedial work. This statement should also contrast the University's responsibility with that of individual colleges. Finally, this policy statement should lay out the budgeting practices which would be consistent with this policy.
3. Recommend, as appropriate, reassignment of functions and organizational changes that would achieve better integration and coordination of these services, thereby benefiting the students involved.

To fulfill this charge, the Task Force held six meetings at which the relevant issues were discussed and/or debated. In addition, through the staff work of Darwin Hendel, the Task Force collected information from 25 departments, offices, or programs on the Twin Cities campus responsible for the conduct of academic skill development or the offering of pre-college work.\* The information collected in this survey was the basis for Task Force discussion and for the inventory presented later in this report. Major portions of several meetings were devoted to discussions of the policy recommendations that the Task Force wished to make to the Vice President. The group worked through several drafts of issues and prospective policy statements before reaching a consensus on those included in this report.

The report is in three parts: (1) a brief summary of the major issues discussed by the Task Force; (2) an analysis of information in the inventory of skill development programs on the Twin Cities campus; (3) a set of policy

---

\*A copy of the form used to collect information from each of the units is included as Appendix A to this report.

recommendations related to the University's responsibility to offer pre-college or remedial work and to reassignment and organizational changes necessary to achieve better coordination.

I. Summary of the Task Force Discussion and Consensus on Major Issues

The Task Force began its work by discussing some of the "big picture" data available to us and by preparing an inventory of skill development programs.

The Task Force then addressed other aspects of its charge and gathered and examined data on the several issues involved. Since the Task Force's recommendations are linked to these discussions and the emerging consensus among the group on these issues, a brief review of the major points of discussion and agreement is necessary.

1. It is important to note the social context of the basic issues explored by the Task Force, a context of important changes in higher education during the last two to three decades. For a variety of reasons, this period saw a tremendous expansion of opportunities in higher education, and a changing clientele anxious to take advantage of new opportunities. Events within the state of Minnesota and at the University of Minnesota have mirrored these changes. In Minnesota, as in the nation as a whole, college entrance rates for new high school graduates increased from less than 40% in the mid-1950s to about 55% in 1968, in which year leveling became apparent. The effects on enrollment have been dramatic. The total enrollment of the Twin Cities campus, for example, increased from about 29,000 in 1962 to more than 47,000 in 1982. Much of this increase was related to the growth in population and to the rate of high school graduates, but of considerable importance also were active attempts by several heretofore underrepresented groups to cause the doors of the University to open. Thus, one found increased numbers of students who needed help from the institution in meeting their social and learning needs (students with academic deficiencies, minority students, those from populations who were re-entering higher education, foreign students, those who were handicapped, and so on).

2. Contrary to popular notions, these enrollment changes have not been accompanied by significant declines in test scores or high school rank among new entering freshmen to the University. While average PSAT scores for Minnesota juniors have declined slightly across the last several decades, those for freshmen entering all campuses of the University of Minnesota remain at about the same level. As Table 1 (Appendix C) shows, the HSR and



PSAT verbal scores both rose between 1959-1971 and have declined since that time to the current level which is about the same as in 1959.\*

This situation has not obviated concern over the quality of the student body at the University. Considerable dismay exists over the linguistic abilities of incoming students in both English and foreign languages and the math and science backgrounds. Most probably, these concerns are generated both from a sense that student achievement is less than it should be in an absolute sense and from a belief that a higher academic standard should be demanded of incoming students. There are similar concerns about students who are approaching graduation from the University.

3. Universities, including ours, responded to the needs of new clienteles by attempting to meet their learning needs in new and significant ways. These new students did not necessarily lack basic ability but specific skills; they needed help from the University. The range of activities instituted is astonishingly broad. They included tutoring arrangements, individualized programs, support groups, formal courses, and psychological services. The set of activities was designed to help students identify and deal with their own educational needs by acquiring the necessary academic and personal skills. Today, the University offers programs in developmental skills for freshmen who read at a junior high level and has a skills course for students already admitted to Medical School. It offers help in composition to freshmen on a non-credit basis and to graduate students preparing dissertations. It offers courses in "remedial math" to those whose math skills do not exceed arithmetic and to those who lack trigonometry. It offers courses in English as a second language to college graduates from other countries and "how to study" courses to freshmen who may be past the age of 40. It offers a "bridge" program to help Native Americans to make the transition from high school to the University. There has never been a time when total agreement existed on what skill level or pre-college experiences people should have to qualify for admission to the University (or which high school subjects were needed to begin college work). It is certainly unarguable that less agreement exists today than ever before.

4. The initial operational question generated for the Task Force out of all of this was a definitional one. What portion of this extensive activity should be included in our inventory? There is no consensus view as to what constitutes either skill development or pre-college work. University policy is silent on the topic, and the policies of those colleges which enroll freshmen provide guidance only by implication: that is, they most frequently state requirements for entry by freshmen into those units but not

---

\*Data used in the table are not strictly comparable, since the tests were changed during these years and equivalent mean scores used.

information about specific course requirements beyond general discipline labels (see summary in Appendix D).

After considerable discussion, the Task Force decided to rely on the credit mechanism as the major determining criterion for inclusion. Our specific criteria were as follows: If the course in question is awarded credit and if a college allows that credit to count on a degree program, then such work should not be defined as "pre-college" or skill development, and it was not included in the inventory. An exception was made in that we did not exclude all of the credit courses in General College which are allowed toward a degree by that unit. Rather, certain credit courses were included in our inventory on the recommendation of General College administrators because of the unique nature of that college's mission and admission requirements. Also, the Task Force decided that skill development experiences provided by professional schools should not be included, except in cases where the program was designed for groups of special needs students or where such students were a large part of the client group (e.g., Project Technology Power designed to recruit and assist minority students into IT was included as was the Health Sciences Minority Opportunity Program which provided study skills for students on several levels of achievement). Our definition of pre-college and skill development work, then, is related basically to our interpretation of the intent of the admissions policies of the individual University colleges. Applying the definition led to the following specific decisions: (1) Non-credit work was assumed by definition to be "pre-college" in nature; (2) Work for which graduation credit was awarded was not "pre-college," again by definition of the individual colleges from which a student graduates; (3) Services provided in skill development for University students generally by the Student Counseling Bureau or the Vice President for Student Affairs Office were included in the inventory; (4) Courses in mathematics considered as "remedial" by the School of Mathematics in IT are not so considered by other freshman-admitting colleges the Task Force did not include these courses in the inventory, although we did, of course, include the non-credit math courses taught by the School.

This typology is obviously not totally accurate and will not be satisfactory to all. The Task Force believes that it fits reality fairly well, however, and is clearly superior to other typologies we considered.

5. Our determination that non-credit work would constitute most of what would be included in the inventory begged the important issue of whether the academic preparation of incoming students was sufficient. Obviously, policies of the various colleges might seem to mask inadvertently the weak preparation of new students by offering "pre-college work" for University credit.

Although the question of entrance requirements is beyond a strict interpretation of the Task Force's charge, the topic could scarcely be avoided. The issues of pre-college preparation and entrance requirements are certainly among the most widely discussed topics on this campus. There is deep concern about these matters among the various colleges. The recent Task Force Report on Higher Education and the Economy of the State called for raising entrance requirements. A CLA Task Force has recently proposed that entering students bring a second language as part of their academic equipment or take non-credit instruction to meet the graduation language requirement. IT and CBS have long held that better preparation be required in the basic sciences and have sought to specify what that preparation should be. The times appear very propitious for a reconsideration of what the total University requires for entrance and a clearer statement about the nature of those requirements.

The Task Force discussed the problem of pre-college preparation and will recommend steps in Section Three to revise entrance requirements. At the same time, considerable sentiment exists for maintaining equity gains made by students from disadvantaged minority backgrounds and working class groups.

## II. Inventory - Academic Skills Programs

In Part II of this report, the Task Force presents an inventory of the skill development programs and services which are currently offered on the Twin Cities campus. As noted earlier, a questionnaire was distributed to the colleges, departments, programs, and other units identified by members of the Task Force and others as skills development programs (Appendix A). Data from these questionnaires are presented in the Inventory (Appendix B).

1. The inventory includes data from 25 programs lodged in 7 colleges, Continuing Education and Extension, and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. More than 40,000 student contacts were made with these programs in 1981-82; this figure seems astonishingly large but less imposing when the number served by voluntary undergraduate students (about 20,000) is subtracted. Obviously, an extremely wide range of services and modes of delivery are available to students.

2. The agencies offering services are sponsored by collegiate units, for the most part, although their services typically are available to students from colleges other than the sponsoring one. Some of the agencies (e.g., CLA's Writing Laboratory) have the provision of skill-building work as a single purpose. Other agencies are not multi-dimensional in that they provide support services for particular groups of students (e.g., the OMSSA service centers).

3. The programs are funded from a variety of sources. In 1981-82, expenditures for all programs totaled \$1,554,325. Fifteen of the programs received 0100 support, and the total of this support was \$770,878. The 0100 resources identified by each program are actual budget figures, except where the agency allocated funds to purposes other than skill development. In those cases, program directors listed for our inventory only those funds allotted to skill development.

Six other programs are funded entirely by student fees. Programs which depend on student fees for support uniformly provide non-credit instruction which is considered pre-college in nature (ESL, Composition, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, job skill and general study skill upgrading). A total of \$454,209 was collected in 1981-82 in these programs, with \$185,900 received by the largest program, ESL. Another five programs receive support through federal grants or from small grants within the University, totalling \$329,238. For the most part, these programs provide study skills instruction and counseling for disadvantaged or minority students.

4. Students access these programs in a variety of ways. In the General College and CLA programs, students are advised or required to take the courses in the development of a variety of skills. ESL students are basically international students required to achieve a certain level of English proficiency to enter or continue in a program. Other students simply drop in (or are encouraged to do so by peers or instructors) at a center or laboratory. Still others become involved because they are strongly urged or required to do so by their academic advisors.

5. The programs do not appear to have a great deal of "connectedness" in terms of students, at least. Directors or program heads may be well aware of the nature and scope of similar programs housed elsewhere, but there is no formal "paper trail" established for the clients of a particular program so that their progress can be monitored and assessed.

6. About one-third of the programs and almost one-half of the total course enrollments are in General College, which admits students on the basis of criteria and standards different from those of other colleges. This situation indicates a substantial effort on the part of General College to serve the needs of students admitted to General College as well as students admitted elsewhere in the University.

7. While they possess diversity in the scope and nature of their work, the 25 pre-college and skill development programs share two fundamental purposes: (1) They provide courses, workshops, laboratories, advice, and counsel in helping students identify and meet their learning needs; (2) They are pointed toward helping students persist and ultimately succeed in meeting their educational goals; as a set, these programs constitute the only formal

attempt at "drop-out" prevention on this campus. The group believes the effort to be appropriate and the goals to be necessary.

8. The quantity of the work offered and the large number of students needing these services do not seem excessive to the Task Force. On the basis of the preliminary cost analysis done by the Task Force, it seems clear that these programs do not constitute an inordinate drain on University resources. The largest single budget share is borne by 0100 monies, but that amount needs to be offset by fees collected by the University for courses offered by these programs. With this adjustment, it is likely that the programs create no cost to the University, at least for direct expenditures.

It is interesting to speculate on the possible effects of higher entry standards on the quantity of work offered by the University in skill development or pre-college work. The answer to the question is not clear one way or another. If entrance requirements were revised and all incoming students had all the appropriate courses, such work could, of course, be reduced greatly or eliminated. If, however, entrance standards were increased without time for the high schools to change their requirements, the need for "remediation" would increase. Obviously, the future of some "pre-college" or "remedial" work will depend upon general University policy decisions regarding the composition of the student body. If the University, for example, encourages international enrollment, it is likely that the demand for ESL will increase. If the University continues to support the underlying concept of General College, a considerable amount of skill development will continue to be necessary. Again, the direct costs associated with that instruction is not large and, in fact, may be totally offset by tuition payments. The only obvious areas of reduction related to entrance requirements would be some of the non-credit course requirements supported by 0100 funds (composition and mathematics, primarily). Even here, the gain to the University would probably be negligible because such programs may be needed to serve older students returning to continue college work and international students.

### III. Task Force Policy Statements

On the basis of discussion and analysis of the key issues, the Task Force unanimously adopted the following recommendations and forwards them for consideration and action.

1. The University should continue its programs of skill development and those involving "pre-college" work to about the same extent as at present.

Strong pressure currently exists within higher education to eliminate or reduce drastically coursework and programs designed to provide "remediation" for students. This pressure arises largely from the belief that such work should be required for entrance to the University and/or that it carries unduly high costs for the institution.

Neither of these beliefs seems to pertain to the situation at this University. As we noted earlier, there is presently no clear agreement as to specific requirements that students must meet or characteristics that they should possess in order to enter the University as freshmen. Consequently, the term "pre-college" has a general meaning only. Unless a more standard definition is adopted, students will continue to be admitted to the various colleges of the University from a variety of backgrounds. Moreover, raising and/or standardizing entry requirements for the various colleges will not immediately obviate the need for continued attention to pre-college and skill development work. Indeed, if entry requirements are modified, a new class of "pre-college" courses (e.g., mathematics, foreign languages) will have been created for the short range at least. Moreover, there will continue to be the need for skill development (speed reading, composition, computer work) among the very able and otherwise well prepared populations, which currently include medical students, foreign graduate students, and so on.

The extent of work which the University should support in pre-college skill areas is difficult to gauge, related as it is to questions of market (e.g., what does the "competition" do), general University policies (e.g., how many foreign students will be enrolled and what is their competence in English), and the desired and political need to maintain access to the University for a very wide variety of students from our state. Moreover, "remedial" work at the University of Minnesota appears to be at least reasonably inexpensive. Earlier, we noted that expenditures for skill development and pre-college activities totalled \$770,878 of 0100 monies, but that a large percentage of this total is recaptured through tuition or student fee receipts. Obviously, the Task Force did not follow an exact cost accounting procedure, nor did we attempt to do a sophisticated cost-effectiveness analysis of these programs. It is apparent to us, however, that the direct cost to the University for these 25 programs is small. The committee believes that there is no compelling financial or budgetary need to reduce the quantity of pre-college work or to change its nature at the present time.

2. Students who take "pre-college" work should continue to pay fees to cover the costs of instruction. Programs concentrating on continued student involvement (e.g., the writing laboratories, the walk-in servies) should continue to be offered on a non-fee basis.

Essentially, this recommendation continues current, unstated policies and is consistent with definitions adopted by the Task Force and discussed earlier. The rationale for the recommendation on pre-college work is obvious: students who need pre-college work should bear the full cost of the direct instruction with no University subsidy. The rationale for our recommendation on student development funding is less clear. It could be argued that students who need or want help from a tutor or who do not have sufficient skill in writing or in mathematics, for instance, should pay for those services. Such an argument would be a strong one if these services were narrower in scope than at present. But, such is not the case; and there appears to be no way of imposing a fee schedule on the services without incurring substantial and even oppressive administrative costs. Many of the services, for instance, are provided by offices which offer a very wide variety of activities. It is simply impractical to attempt to impose any kind of financial fee structure on these activities. Furthermore, it is probably the case that many students would be discouraged from taking advantage of such services if they were charged. Finally, as noted in the previous section, the cost of such services is not excessive and part of these costs are often borne by external funding agencies.

3. The University should seriously consider the feasibility and desirability of establishing common floor requirements for all colleges on the Twin Cities campus currently enrolling students as freshmen.

Currently, the colleges which admit freshmen to the Twin Cities campus have different formal requirements (Appendix D). Some colleges admit on the basis of high school rank combined with aptitude test scores, some on the basis of rank and completion of specified high school subjects, and still others on the basis of specified high school subjects and specific scores on the subsets of standardized achievement measures. The wide variations in admissions policy mean, of course, that incoming students have less in common in their academic backgrounds than is desirable from the perspective of the Task Force.

The common floor requirements could be expressed in terms of (1) high school subjects completed (e.g., similar to the recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education); (2) more specific skills and knowledge necessary for college study (e.g., similar to the outline presented recently by the College Board); (3) a particular level of performance on one of the measures conventionally used to determine college aptitude; (4) high school rank; or (5) some combination of these. Under our recommendation, the "floor" or common requirements could be exceeded and higher specific requirements could be instituted by individual schools or programs.

We expect that several positive outcomes could flow from the adoption to establish common floor requirements. The current confusion about

requirements may be substantially alleviated. Also, the process of developing such a common list would necessitate considerable discussion and agreement among colleges as to what constitutes pre-college work, and such a discussion across college lines, we think, has considerable value in and of itself. Finally, we think that common standards might well serve to enrich the academic environment of the University by raising the level of discussions between and among faculty and students.

Establishing common floor requirements may also raise some issues and problems. This University has generally assumed that there is considerable value in enrolling students from different backgrounds and that the University community is enriched thereby. The common floor requirement may mitigate against the relatively open access we have maintained in that people from small schools, minority students, those who are atypical in age or ethnicity whose educational backgrounds may be disadvantaged. However, the Task Force believes that the advantages of floor requirements outweigh the disadvantages.

4. Whether or not floor requirements are adopted, colleges which enroll students as freshmen should put high priority upon the clarification of the requirements they have established for entering freshmen and seek additional ways of communicating these requirements to prospective students.

While we did not take testimony on the issue, our impression is that University entrance requirements are perceived as highly ambiguous, causing confusion among high school counselors, principals, and students as to what students should take or what they should know to prepare to enter the University. It would seem most appropriate to attempt to specify entry requirements in a reasonable amount of detail so as to reduce the confusion. In addition, we feel this recommendation addresses the current concern among University faculty over the academic quality of incoming students. Such concern may be legitimate and valid, but it seems preferable that expectations for academic performance in basic skills be established before students are admitted.

Considerable effort will be needed to communicate the nature of these recommendations to schools, students, and parents. We especially recommend the development of a handbook for prospective students which illustrates the kinds of academic qualifications for incoming freshmen. The proposed handbook would be a kind of "normative syllabus" containing examples of the kinds of mathematical processes necessary to begin certain courses, scientific terminology and understandings necessary for work in college science courses, the types of library or computer skills needed, the language abilities required, or the kinds and levels of humanity and social science knowledge deemed appropriate to begin University work. Such a hand-



book should be developed with the cooperation of high school teachers and administrators.

5. The University should continue its present practice of making entrance decisions on transfer students on an individual basis.

Currently, we have thousands of students transferring each year to the University from various colleges and universities. When new entry standards for entering freshmen are clarified, the implications for transfer students should be considered. It is tempting to recommend the application of the same standards to both incoming new high school students and transfer populations, but it does not seem practical to hold transfers to the same standards. There is simply no easy and direct way of applying such standards to these populations.

6. The University should provide incentives for high school students and other adults to do college work by expanding the opportunity to earn college credit toward graduation for work completed in high school or elsewhere.

If the University community is serious about the need to clarify and standardize entry requirements, it would seem logical to expand the possibilities for prospective students to earn viable college credits. The University offers considerable work of a "pre-college" nature that benefits those not presently equipped to begin college work. But we have not dealt with the opposite side of this question and extended benefits to those competent students who, while in high school, have or can complete college level work. Nor have we dealt adequately with other adult students who have learned college-level material in non-formal settings but who have lacked the opportunity to accredit that learning. Current arrangements allow the award of credit or successful completion of advance placement courses or CLEP tests, but there is little encouragement to do so, and the number of students involved is small. Adoption of this recommendation would be a powerful way to stimulate advanced work in the high schools. The Task Force urges that the University in concert with high school representatives aggressively pursue ways to expand the effectiveness of these programs.

7. Responsibility for providing pre-college and skill development work should continue to follow "mission lines"; that is, the College of Liberal Arts should be responsible for providing services which are consistent with its instructional mission (e.g., composition, foreign languages), and the Institute of Technology should continue its instruction in mathematics. General College should continue to provide pre-college work in both communications (reading and writing) and mathematics, and the Office of Student Affairs should provide campus-wide reading and study skills assistance as well as developmental services for minority, handicapped, and other nontraditional students.

The Task Force was charged to recommend the reassignment of functions and other organizational changes which might achieve better integration of services for students. The current set of programs we examined emerged within collegiate structures in response to student needs as identified by the faculty, administrators, and students, rather than from a conscious attempt to assign responsibility from a central source. The Task Force believes such development to be healthy and natural and while better communication and coordination between and among programs would be desirable, that need would exist under any organizational framework. There is, of course, the possibility that under the current structure, the services would continue to be offered long after the need for them has been met. There appears to be little danger of this happening, however, since most of the services are not required from students and thus have no built-in protective tariff. Those services which require University resources are under the control of deans and other administrators who are very conscious of budget restrictions and are unlikely to allow continued expenditures for redundant or unneeded services. The interrelationships and cooperation among these units should continue in order to enhance the effectiveness of all services and to minimize redundancy and issues of responsibility.

INVENTORY FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES  
Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota

TITLE OF PROGRAM/SERVICE:

COORDINATOR OF PROGRAM/SERVICE:

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM/SERVICE: (Summarize the nature and goals of the services provided)

HISTORY OF PROGRAM/SERVICE: (Indicate when the program/service was initiated and briefly describe how the program/service has changed since it began.)

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: (Please indicate the total number of students served for the 1981-82 academic year and, if the data are available, classify the students into appropriate categories [i.e., minority/non-minority, undergraduate/graduate] and according to students' college of enrollment within the University.)

TYPICAL SERVICE PROVIDED: (Please describe the nature/length of the typical service provided in each of the major types of services provided within your program, e.g., one-quarter course, two one-hour sessions, etc.).

ACCESS BY STUDENTS: (Briefly describe the process, e.g., referral by advisor, from application procedure, self-selection, by which students typically come to use the services provided by your office.)

BUDGETARY HOME OF PROGRAM/SERVICE:

BUDGET (1981-82): (Please summarize budget figures for the program/services described above.)

	<u>Amount</u>
Academic/Professional Staff	\$ _____
Support	\$ _____
Supplies, Expense, & Equipment	\$ _____

UNIQUENESS: (Please indicate how your program/service meets a need that is not currently being met.)

CONNECTIONS WITH COLLEGES AND OTHER PROGRAMS: (Please describe the ways in which your program is connected to other services within the University and describe other cooperative arrangements that might exist with other parts of the University.)

EFFECTIVENESS: (If information is available on the effects of programs and services on students, briefly summarize relevant data.)

FACTORS INFLUENCING EFFECTIVENESS: (Please list the factors/problems that inhibit maximum effectiveness of the services.)

OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION:

## INVENTORY OF ACADEMIC SKILLS PROGRAMS, COURSES, AND SERVICES

15.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
Reading/Writing Skills Ctr. (GC)	Provision of course-work and tutorials to assist nontraditional students to develop reading and writing skills:  a. 8 reading, writing and study skills courses b. walk-in tutoring	2078	1206 -921 day (90% GC stds.) -285 CEE stds.	872 walk- in tutor- ials			58,150 (plus 13,000 from CEE)	--	--	Services used by students from other colleges.  Some supplemental work for students using the Reading and Study Skills Ctr. in Student Counseling Bureau.	Referral to courses on basis of GC Placement Program, self-selection, and instructor referral.  Tutorial and walk-ins from self-selection, referral by advisors, instructors, and other students.	
Reading Laboratory (GC)	Opportunities to practice and improve reading rate and comprehension in a one-quarter course:  a. reading machines b. reading exercises	218	218	--	--	--	1,883	--	--	Discussions with instructor of Efficient Reading course on St. Paul campus.	Self-selection of students registering for GC 1403.	Course offering through Arts, Communication and Philosophy Division of GC.
GC Mathematics Program (GC)	Improvement of skill level in basic math, including:  a. placement testing b. basic math courses c. tutorial center	7340	2340 for 8 courses in day school (80-90% GC stds.)	5000			165,483	--	--	Day school program controlled by GC. Parts of program offered to other programs on campus (Math Anxiety in CEW, Summer Institute of OMISA, and Community Programs).	Primarily from placement testing, but referral from other instructors, advisor referral, and self-selection.	The program also serves CEE students.

16.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
HELP Ctr. (GC)	Retention of minority and disadvantaged students by peer advising.	1030 -830 GC -100 CEE -100 Other	--	--	--	1030	\$12,000	--	--	Network relationships with other units: Minority Learning Resource Center, Handicapped Resource Office, MLK, Financial Aid and PEP and TRIO Programs in GC.	Walk-ins and direct referral from counselors and faculty members.	Emphasis is on "advocacy" in many areas and is not limited to academic skills.
English as a Second Language (CLA)	Provision of 21-25 different English language courses to graduate and undergraduate students who are not native speakers of English:  a. class size of 10-18, meets daily for 10 weeks; b. basic communication skills and advanced academic skills are emphasized.	976-1076	976-1076 ESL Fr. Comp. -300  Intensive Eng. -100-120 summer  Extension -150  Other non-credit -426	--	--	--	--	\$185,900 (self-supporting for past 2 years)	--	Work with ISAD advisors, graduate departments and undergraduate advising.  Use videotape lab of Committee on Language Programs.	All international students are required to take TOEFL. Students whose scores fall below standard are referred by Admissions, academic advisors or the Freshman Composition Program.	
Composition/Preparation for Writing Practice (Comp. Program, CLA)	Preparation of students for demands of University writing assignments:  a. Comp 0011 (3 times/wk.) b. frequent individual conferences and small group sessions.	250	250	250	--	--	--	\$23,000	--	Composition Policy Advisory Board meets to cooperate as needed with Rhetoric and General College.	Admitted freshmen in Category 4 are required to take Comp 0011.	

17.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Std. Fees	Other			
Writing Laboratory (Composition Program, CLA)	Provision of supplemental instruction to assist students with writing assignments: a. tutorials for students in composition courses b. drop-in services for upper division and graduate students	163	--	163	--	--	\$22,000	--	--	Serves new admitted freshmen in CLA and IT.  Upper division students from CLA, IT, Management and other colleges on Mpls. campus.	Formal referral by composition teachers (specific referral form is used), walk-in at specified times, some general advertising in all composition classes.	
Non-Credit Writing Classes for Evening Extension (Composition Program, CLA)	Provide no-credit courses that meet weekly.	220	220	--	--	--	--	\$12,705	--	All courses serve mostly adults in business or industry who want a review of basic writing skills.	No prerequisites. Students pick courses from Extension bulletin.	

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
Martin Luther King Program (CLA)	Admission and retention of minority, disadvantaged, and marginal students:  a. academic support b. counseling and advising c. other student personnel activities.	700	--	150	--	550 development services	\$129,470 (\$37,000 comes from OMSSA)	--	--	OMSSA in the Office of Vice President for Student Affairs. Special support and programmatic relationship for students wishing to transfer to CBS, Management, and Health Sciences. Courses and tutorials are a joint venture with particular academic departments.	All certifiable OMSSA students are eligible, referral by faculty and advisors, self-referral for students who meet developmental criteria.	Emphasis is <u>not</u> on basic skills but on total set of student development services.
IT Central Advising Program (IT)	Provision of exemplary faculty and peer advising geared to:  a. selection of major for undecided students.	525	--	--	525 -100 prospective  -425 current (90% IT)	--	\$13,500	--	--	Advising to students in ICP in UC, to pre-IT students in CLA, and to prospective students in Minnesota high schools and colleges.	Self-selection and from many other sources.	Not focused on any aspect of academic skills training.
Undergraduate Teaching Assistant Tutorial Program (IT)	Provision of supplementary instruction by junior and senior honors students in math, physics, chemistry, computer science:  a. daytime on campus b. evenings in residence halls and 6 metropolitan high schools	19069 contacts	--	19069 -80% IT -15% CLA -5% GC	--	--	\$47,200	--	--	Services available to all students from all colleges enrolled in IT courses and students in math and science courses taught by other colleges.	Tutorial schedules distributed to all students in undergraduate mathematics courses. Faculty in other science classes announce availability of tutorials.	Marked improvement in retention in IT during the past decade.



19.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
Project Technology Power (IT)	Provision of diverse services to assist in recruiting and graduating under-represented groups in IT.	70	--	70 (All are IT undergraduates)	--	--	\$65,500	--	--	Referrals among minority programs on campus.	Minorities applying to IT are identified by Admissions and Records through high school counselors and through personal contact.	
Non-credit Mathematics Program (IT)	Preparation for credit mathematics courses: a. all non-credit courses.	1091	1091	--	--	--	\$88,198	--	--	Courses are prerequisite and entrance requirements for courses and programs in other colleges.	Placement based on prediction equation from Admissions. Some take diagnostic exams.	
Remedial Mathematics in Evening Classes and Summer Session (MGMI, IT)	Provide remedial instruction for students in Extension and for students in Summer Session.	1247	1247	--	--	--	\$121,864 CEE \$110,899 Summer \$10,965	--	--			
Special Tutorial Sections of Rhetoric (College of Ag)	Identification of students in required freshmen courses who have special problems: a. special sections with fewer students and proceed at a slower pace.	40	40	--	--	--	\$7,000	--	--	None at present.	Students in regular sections of Rhet 1101 and 1102 take a diagnostic test during the first week of class.	

20.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
Continuing Education for Women (CEE)	Provides courses for adult women: a. job skills and b. upgrading of basic skills	414	216 -176 Arith & El Alg -16 Math 1111 -24 CC 1445	--	--	198 (Diagnostic Clinic)	--	\$22,542	--	Work with departments and faculty to teach courses.	Referral (advisors and counselors in Extension Counseling), newspaper notices and brochures.	A small portion of their overall enrollment is in academic skills courses.
Reading and Study Skills Center (SCB)	Provision of services to maximize academic achievement by: a. sharpening learning skills b. teaching efficient learning techniques	7995	729 in PO 1001 -575 day -154 CEE	875 for individual work	--	6391 for hand-outs and walk-ins	\$95,187	--	--	Special work for OMSSA, MLK, Health Science Minority Program, and Athletic Dept., and connections to services in most of the colleges on the TC campus.	Self-referral from student orientation program, from college advisors, faculty and counselors, and from other students.	Also does some limited training of graduate students.
Office for Minority and Special Student Affairs (Office of VP for Student Affairs)	Provision of support services to promote learning of under-represented racial groups through four learning centers and a summer institute: a. American Indian LRC b. Asian/Pacific American LRC c. Black LRC d. Chicano/Latino LRC e. OMSSA Summer Institute	790-925	90 in Eng 0001	425-525 tutorial 150-180 TA help	--	130 in Summer Institute	\$39,200	--	--	Departments of OMSSA work with collegiate units in planning and coordinating programs.	Referral by instructors, counselors and advisors, drop-in and by community agencies.	Budget and program description focused on direct academic services, a small part of overall service.

21.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
Handi-capped Learning Disabilities (SCB, Office of Student Affairs)	Provide services for students with learning disabilities: a. test skills b. learning techniques	74	--	--	--	--	\$14,563	--	--	Work with Handi-capped Resource Office, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, Disabled Students Counseling & Information Office and collegiate offices.	Self-referral and referral from DVR, high schools, college advisors and faculty.	Budget is work with learning disability students only not for other kinds of disability, i.e., deaf, blind, physically handicapped, etc.
TRIO Special Services for Disadvantaged Students (GC)	Provides set of services to low income and handicapped students: a. integrated course of study b. tutoring c. special counseling and reading/writing.	383 -252 AY GC under graduates (33% non-caucasian)  -131 Summer Institute (100% non-caucasian)	383	383	383	--	--	--	\$120,113	Primarily a GC program; 11.3% of TRIO budget underwrites OMSSA Summer Institute.	Federal eligibility used in registering students in integrated course of study; walk-in for special counseling and tutoring.	Funded by a federal grant through 1984. The Summer Institute is described in OMSSA description.
General College Upward Bound Program: "Bridge" Student Component (GC)	College preparatory program including: a. courses together b. tutors c. seminar on studying	15-25 -75% GC	15-25	15-25	15-25	--	--	--	All Fed. Funding \$167,000	Certified for OMSSA, learning resources, HELP, RSSC.	Recruited through high school and community referrals while freshmen and sophomores in high school.	Federally funded program.

22.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
Personalized Education Program (GC)	Provision of integrated 3-qr. set of modules to increase retention and improve achievement of minority and non-traditional students; one for each of four minority groups:  a. skills development courses b. subject-matter cultural courses c. career planning, advising, and counseling.	238	238	238	238	--	\$98,591	--	\$10,200	Cooperative arrangements in teaching with Chicano Studies and American Indian Studies.	Most students enter via OMSSA Summer Institute, some from CC counseling and referral from LRC's in OMSSA.	
Tutoring Minority Students (CBS)	Offers tutoring by CBS graduate students.	15	--	15	--	--	\$1,151	--	\$1,425	MLK Program in CLA, OMSSA and Health Sciences Minority Program.	Students interested in biology identified by MLK program.	
Health Sciences Minority Opportunity Program (Hlth. Sci.)	Provision of reading and study skills and tutoring for:  a. high school seniors b. undergraduates c. professional school students	75-125	--	75-125	--	--	--	--	\$24,500	Informal relationship with MLK, OMSSA and Student Counseling Bureau.	Self-referral and access through other programs.	Scheduled to terminate June 30, 1983 unless grant is refunded.

23.

Program Title	Program Description	1981-82 Students Served					Source & Amount of 1981-82 Budget			Connectedness	Student Access	Other Comments
		Total	Courses	Tutorial	Advising	Other	U Funds	Sdt. Fees	Other			
Community Programs (CEE)	Extend educational opportunities to persons encountering barriers to higher education:  a. Neighborhood Programs b. Programs in Correctional Facilities	82	82 -44 in GC courses  -38 in prison	--	--	--	--	--	\$6,000	General College offers courses, counselors from Extension Counseling.	Brochures sent within targeted neighborhoods.	

## APPENDIX C

HSR and Verbal Score Means 1959-1982  
 University of Minnesota (all campuses)  
 And All Minnesota Colleges Combined, Entering Freshmen  
 (data collected Junior year in high school)<sup>1</sup>

	$\bar{X}$ HSR		$\bar{X}$ Verbal Score <sup>2</sup>	
	U of M	All Colleges	U of M	All Colleges
1982	69.70	65.92	43.10	41.69
1980	70.31	66.13	42.46	40.70
1979	71.38	67.55	41.90	40.67
1977	69.78	67.19	43.91	42.35
1975	68.94	69.24	43.79	43.15
1973	70.81	62.48	45.0	42.5
1971	70.96	64.72	46.1	42.7
1968	70.44	63.60	46.1	42.7
1965	68.69	65.01	47.5	45.3
1963	66.20	64.58	44.5	43.3
1961	65.25	65.39	42.9	42.2
1959	66.77	66.87	42.2	41.2

1. Data from HECB Reports: Characteristics of 1979 Minnesota High School Graduates Who Entered Minnesota Post Secondary Institutions, and 1980, 1982 reports, Minnesota Freshmen Profiles.
2. Tests used for verbal scores are: 1959-1973: estimated PSAT; 1973-1979: PSAT/NMSQT or SCAT; 1980 and 1982: PSAT/NMSQT and SCAT converted to a "Minnesota" scale.

TK:ib

	from accredited high school or satisfactory performance on university entrance tests.	strate sufficient academic ability on scholastic aptitude tests.	graduated from accredited high school or satisfactory performance on scholastic aptitude tests.	
IT	High school preparation to include elementary algebra, plane geometry, and high algebra or solid geometry.	Recommend completion of 4 years of high school math; graduation from high school.	Complete high school math including beginning and intermediate algebra, geometry of 2 and 3 dimensions, and trigonometry. Strongly recommend physics and chemistry; HSR and ACT or SAT math-science.	Completion of high school math including beginning and intermediate algebra, geometry or 2 and 3 dimensions and trigonometry; physics and chemistry also required. Also, HSR and ACT, PSAT, or SAT math tests.
CLA	High school graduation with college aptitude rating of 40 or over.	High school graduation with college aptitude rating of 40 or over.	High school graduation with college aptitude rating of 50 or over.	Top 10% HSR of graduating class automatic admitted. Others admitted based on PSAT or ACT scores.