

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
February 10, 1967

INTRODUCTION

1. In the spring of 1966, President Wilson, acting at the request of the Ad Hoc Committee on Long-Range Planning for the St. Paul campus, established a Task Force on Academic Programs. He asked in his establishing memorandum that the Task Force develop, for consideration by its parent group, the Ad Hoc Committee, an academic program for an expanded St. Paul campus. This the Task Force has done. The program it would like the Ad Hoc Committee to consider is outlined in this report.
2. It was part of the Task Force's charge that it stay within the planning guidelines set out by the parent Ad Hoc Committee in its preliminary report of November 4, 1965.^{1/} And this it endeavored to do. More particularly, it never attempted an evaluation of the guidelines, although on occasion during the course of the Task Force's deliberations there was some questioning of their wisdom. The Task Force believes its proposed academic program for the St. Paul campus is entirely faithful to the spirit of the Committee guidelines and, more importantly, not inconsistent with what it understands to be the University's mission.

ST. PAUL CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

3. The accepted view on University growth appears to be this: physical limitations of the Minneapolis campus preclude the University's serving all those students whom, come 1975 or 1980, it should be serving;

^{1/} In his establishing memorandum, President Wilson wrote: "Your assignment will be to develop for recommendation to the Ad Hoc Committee proposals for the long-range program development on the St. Paul campus within the guidelines presented in the preliminary report submitted to me by the Ad Hoc Committee." (The emphasis has been added.)

MAG
8/20/57

TABLE
10/1/57

consequently, some geographical decentralization is necessary; and the optimum way of achieving the necessary decentralization is by making greater use of the St. Paul campus than the University is at present. Thus, the problem of the Ad Hoc Committee was to decide how best to make greater use of the St. Paul campus.

4. What the Ad Hoc Committee proposed for consideration was:

first, that "a reasonably complete lower division program be offered in St. Paul," a program comprised of the courses of "several administrative units, especially CLA and IT";

second, that "four-year programs in some major fields in CLA be offered in St. Paul"; and,

third, that even with the proposed expanded St. Paul campus academic program, there should be no duplication of administrative units on the St. Paul campus.

The Committee left for the Task Force to decide, however, what in detail the reasonably complete lower division program should be, what four-year CLA programs should be offered on the St. Paul campus and how the expanded St. Paul campus program should be staffed.

INTRA-CAMPUS TRANSPORTATION

5. It was apparent to the Task Force from the beginning that what kind of transportation between the present Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses can be assumed is of the essence. If it could have counted on the University's acquiring, within a very few years, a transportation system capable of getting someone from any point on, say, the West Bank to any point on the St. Paul campus within 15 minutes, which currently is the amount of time allowed for changing classes, then its assignment would have been trivial. The Task Force was told, though, by Dr. Learn that even a 20-minute transportation system, although feasible, is probably many years away and,

further, that for the intervening years the University will have to be content with a transportation system not greatly different from the one it has. The Task Force therefore took as a basic working assumption that, for the transporting of relatively large numbers of students, only a somewhat improved system will be available, at least through the years of development of the St. Paul campus.

RELOCATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

6. In the course of its work, the Task Force came--not at all reluctantly, it would emphasize--to the conclusion that expansion of the St. Paul campus should involve the transfer of some administrative units presently located on the Minneapolis campus. It therefore investigated this possibility, if necessarily in a tentative way, and found, rather to the surprise of some of its members, that the prospect of relocating does not horrify all administrative units on the Minneapolis campus. Indeed not: in some instances there was a positive interest in exploring this possibility with responsible University officials.
7. At one point, an officer of the School of Business Administration informed the Task Force that it could be interested in relocating. But subsequently the Dean of the School, who had been away on leave, indicated that this was not true. Evidently it could not now be interested. The Task Force, however, believes still that relocating this administrative unit on the St. Paul campus is a possibility worth considering further and recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee do so.
8. For one thing, the program of the School of Business Administration has evidently changed greatly in recent years, to the point where now its physical arrangements are far from satisfactory. And a new building--an

integrated office-classroom building, to be exact--could more easily be provided on the St. Paul campus than, for example, on the West Bank. (The Task Force would point out that this is not a matter of adding buildings, but rather of deciding what kind shall be built; University growth, whatever its form, will inevitably require more buildings.) Also, the School of Business, if located on the St. Paul campus, would be closer to the St. Paul business community than it is at present and no more removed from the Minneapolis business community.

9. Even when willing to consider relocating, the School of Business was, though, quite clear that it would have to be reassured about transportation. Perhaps the firm promise of a 20-minute system for sometime in the future would suffice. It may be that the promise to modify the present system in the way recommended below (see paragraph 41) would do. That is something that warrants additional investigation.

10. In not recognizing the School of Business's present position, the Task Force, as it readily admits, is treading a fine line between responsible and irresponsible behavior. Being responsible would seem to require that the Task Force, in suggesting administrative units for relocation, look not only to consistency with the University's mission, but beyond to the willingness of the units involved to consider relocating. And, in fact, this is what the Task Force has done. But only to a point, for being responsible would also seem to require that the Task Force set out in some detail an academic program for an expanded St. Paul campus. And this it could not do without suggesting that the School of Business or a roughly equivalent administrative unit be relocated. The Task Force is convinced, first, that

expansion of the St. Paul campus must involve more than the transfer of large numbers of CLA and IT lower-division students and, second, that if the School of Business or a substitute unit is not relocated, doing anything else will likely prove impossible.

11. The Task Force would not want to deny that a substitute administrative unit-- a unit sufficiently like the School of Business--can be found. It would stress, however, that to be a feasible substitute, this unit must be of comparable size. And it must be prestigious, as the School of Business undeniably is.
12. In its preliminary report, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended against relocating the General College on the St. Paul campus, but largely because it felt that moving just the General College would serve neither the College's interests nor those of the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics. With this the officers of the two colleges were agreed. These same officers have indicated to the Task Force, however, that if the relocation of the General College were to be part of a major relocation, there could be no objection. In this connection, it is well to keep in mind that, with the centering of the College of Biological Sciences on the St. Paul campus, there already has in the important sense been some relocation. If, moreover, the School of Business or a substitute administrative unit were to relocate, the force of the previous objection to moving the General College would be that much more diminished. The establishment of four-year programs on the St. Paul campus (see paragraphs 16-18 below) would likewise diminish its force. And with a considerable number of CLA and IT lower-division courses being offered on the St. Paul campus (see paragraph 28 below),

General College students in the Combination Programs would not, even with present transportation arrangements, be seriously inconvenienced.

13. If the General College is adequately to serve the State of Minnesota's growing junior college program, it must have new facilities. These could be provided easily, perhaps least expensively, on the St. Paul campus.
14. Those responsible for the General Extension Division have suggested to the Task Force that relocating could serve the Division's interests. With the new freeways and connecting highways, the locating of some Extension Division programs and activities on the St. Paul campus makes more sense than formerly it did. In addition, a St. Paul location for some of its programs and activities would apparently give the division greater visibility; and for it, this is of great importance. Here therefore is another possibility to be considered--the relocating, whether in whole or in part, of the General Extension Division.
15. What the Task Force regards as most significant is that it has discovered a self-interest, expressed in a willingness to consider relocating, which can possibly be made to serve the University's need for space. And relocating based on self-interest is so much to be preferred to relocation based on administrative fiat. Admittedly, the School of Business is apparently no longer willing to consider relocating. But, as noted above, other units are. And a more complete survey than the Task Force has been able to conduct could well turn up additional administrative units interested in relocating.

FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMS FOR ST. PAUL

16. The Ad Hoc Committee--recognizing that there already are two St. Paul Departments of the College of Education, Agricultural Education and Home Economics Education--suggested in its report that Education be considered as a possible source of four-year programs for the St. Paul campus. This the Task Force did. Further, it found that officials of the College of Education might well look with favor on relocating some of the Education programs. As was pointed out to the Task Force, the Agricultural and Home Economics Education faculties, although located in St. Paul, do not now encounter any serious operating problems. Nor apparently would the Trade and Industrial Education faculty, if it were relocated. And given the historical working relationships of its faculty, this program would appear to be an obvious choice for relocation. It too is presently in need of new facilities. So are the Agricultural Education and Home Economics programs. (In fact, the Agricultural Education program has been included in the Coffey Hall remodeling plans.) Thus, considering the relocation of the Trade and Industrial Education program now, before housing it with allied education programs is precluded, would seem to be highly desirable.
17. Originally it was felt that the Business Education and Distributive Education programs, being so dependent on the School of Business, could not be relocated on the St. Paul campus. But if the School of Business itself were to be relocated, then shifting these programs would make considerable sense.^{2/}

^{2/} Were another administrative unit to be substituted for the School of Business, then of course these programs could not conveniently be relocated; but possibly substitute programs could be found.

18. It is the Task Force's view that serious thought should be given to relocating the School of Physical Education on the St. Paul campus. With some of the new programs being developed by this school, the St. Paul campus would be a natural home for it. The School itself needs new facilities and the St. Paul campus, as it grows, will need expanded athletic facilities. Indeed, the present facilities are sadly inadequate, even for the present relatively small St. Paul campus population. So, again, there may be some opportunity for intelligent economizing here.^{3/}
19. There has been mention of the desirability of establishing somewhere within the state's total higher education complex a four-year degree program in Engineering Technology. For the University, this program is nothing more at the moment than a long-range possibility. The present IT administration has no plans for establishing such a program. Still, it is a possibility to be kept in mind, for according to an IT official from whom the Task Force heard, the St. Paul campus would be a likely home for a University degree program in Engineering Technology.
20. In sum, there appear to the Task Force to be several vocational-technical teacher education programs in the College of Education--the programs in Trade and Industrial Education, Business Education and Distributive Education--which the Ad Hoc Committee should consider recommending for relocation on the St. Paul campus. It appears as well that the School of Physical

^{3/} The Task Force is aware that the possibility of relocating the School of Physical Education on the St. Paul campus has been discussed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletic Activity Planning, but because of the press of time was not able to consult with its members. It assumes, though, that if its parent committee wants further to consider this possibility, it will do so in consultation with the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletic Activity Planning.

Education should also be seriously considered. In some instances at least, there is interest in moving on the part of the faculties which would be involved, for the move holds promise of facilities more adequate than those they have. The Task Force feels that this interest should, as it were, be exploited.

FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMS UNDER CLA AND IT

21. The Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation, as noted previously, was that some four-year programs in major fields under CLA be established on the St. Paul campus. In investigating this possibility, however, the Task Force found considerable persuasive opposition. It found as well soundly based opposition to establishing some four-year programs in major fields under IT on the St. Paul campus. Of course, the Task Force would not want to suggest that the establishment of CLA and IT four-year programs on the St. Paul campus be forgotten about forever. It may well be that as the St. Paul campus grows, some CLA and IT departments will come to see great advantages in relocating on that campus. But the Task Force is inclined at this point to let nature take its course--to wait on expressions of interest by the departments themselves. This is in part because the Task Force is aware that if just the administrative units and programs already recommended for relocating were actually relocated, a very considerable body of students would also be relocated.
22. The Task Force has heard, although not officially, that the press of space and population will one day require a 15,000 St. Paul campus student population. The student populations of the administrative units now located on the St. Paul campus will, though, increase as the years go by. It is reasonable to suppose that, come 1975, these units will have a student population

of 5,000, so the margin for expansion is something like 10,000 students. And relocation of the School of Business, the General College, the School of Physical Education and the above-mentioned Education programs could well mean an increase, come 1975, of 5,000 in the St. Paul campus student population. Relocation of these units and programs would therefore leave room for but 5,000 CLA and IT freshmen and sophomores.

LOWER DIVISION PROGRAMS FOR ST. PAUL

23. With the School of Business located on the St. Paul campus, it would be natural to have pre-Business freshmen and sophomores in daytime residence there.^{4/} For one thing the student advisers would be spending most of their time on the St. Paul campus. Also, it would be reasonable to locate freshmen and sophomores in Biology-based curricula--pre-Medical, pre-Dental and Medical Technology students--on the St. Paul campus. Recent years have witnessed a considerable shift in the location of activity in the Biological Sciences, so it is not as if a major break with history were being proposed. Actually, Biology courses are increasingly being offered on the St. Paul campus.
24. Were pre-Business students and those in Biology-based curricula to be located on the St. Paul campus, there would result, come 1975 or thereabouts,, an increase of 3,000 to 4,000 in that campus's student population. To reach the 15,000 student total would therefore require an additional 1,000 to 2,000 lower division students. And it is the opinion of the Task Force that

^{4/} With a substitute administrative unit, one would, in a manner of speaking, lose these lower division students; but possibly with another administrative unit, there would be another group of lower division students.

with a reasonable set of courses being offered on the St. Paul campus, lower division students in sufficient number would decide on the basis of self-interest to take up daytime residence there. The St. Paul campus would certainly have its attractions--to name but a few, a long-standing interest in undergraduate education, relatively new buildings, better parking facilities than are available in Minneapolis and, depending on where the student lives, easier access.

ST. PAUL COURSE OFFERINGS

25. Making it possible for the great majority of St. Paul campus students to accomplish their (St. Paul) educational objectives without commuting at all between Minneapolis and St. Paul--other, that is, than for special lectures, social events and the like--strikes the Task Force as very sensible. It is simply that with the present or a modestly improved transportation system, having teachers rather than students doing the commuting presumably gives the smallest combined teacher-student inconvenience. (But see paragraphs 37-39 below.)
26. The Task Force is not recommending that the Ad Hoc Committee slavishly pursue the objectives of minimizing student travel and duplicate for students relocated on the St. Paul campus all those courses they would have taken had they stayed on the Minneapolis campus. This, the Task Force feels, would be too costly. It is easy to imagine circumstances under which duplication on the St. Paul campus of all relevant courses now being offered on the Minneapolis campus would involve no increase in, say, teaching costs. But it is unlikely that in the University of Minnesota's situation these conditions obtain. There could well be lower division courses which now have too few students to warrant two sections, the minimum number needed

for duplication without cost, and which, even assuming some University growth, will continue to have too few students for costless duplication. And it must be kept in mind that if the above Task Force proposals are implemented, there will be upper division students on the St. Paul campus and consequently a demand by St. Paul campus students for upper division CLA and IT courses.

27. It remains to be determined which upper division courses are taken by School of Business students and those Education students who would under the above recommendations be relocated on the St. Paul campus. To repeat, though, the Task Force's impression is that simply duplicating these courses on the St. Paul campus would be quite costly. (Perhaps this is in part why the School of Business was so interested in the transportation outlook.) Yet the Task Force recognizes that to demand considerable travel of upper division students located on the St. Paul campus could drastically reduce the attractiveness of the St. Paul campus to the administrative units and programs recommended previously for relocation. There is need, then, for some sort of compromise--a compromise between, on the one hand, concern for teaching costs and, on the other, the convenience of School of Business and Education students.
28. In the course of its work, the Task Force undertook to find out how the list of courses offered on the St. Paul campus would affect the amount of student between-campus travel. Briefly, it found that some 50 or so courses, if offered on the St. Paul campus, would make travel unnecessary for a very considerable group of students--thousands of students, actually, roughly one-third of all CLA and IT freshmen and sophomores. The Task Force's experimenting was based, however, on the assumption that the St. Paul campus

student population would differ not at all in its academic interests from the present Minneapolis campus population. And the above recommendations for developing the St. Paul campus could amount to a denial of this. Whether it does, the Task Force has not yet determined. But one thing is clear: it is possible to get, for any student population, a list of courses which among all possible lists of equal length minimizes student travel.

29. What the Task Force proposes at this point, then, is not a detailed list of courses to be offered on the St. Paul campus, but a way of getting this list. It would in a way have been presumptuous of the Task Force to proceed to a list, since its function was to recommend an academic program to the Ad Hoc Committee and, as it suspects, what the exact composition of the program is affects importantly the best list of courses. But, of course, should the Committee want the Task Force to carry on to a detailed list, it will gladly oblige.

30. The way to be followed is, in sum, this:

first, determine the demand for upper division courses by School of Business students and students in the recommended Education programs and then, for those courses the duplication of which would involve a significant increase in teaching costs, work out with the interested administrative officials an appropriate compromise;

second, determine for pre-Business students and those in Biology-based curricula what courses would have to be offered on the St. Paul campus to keep travel for these freshman and sophomore students within reasonable bounds; and,

third, determine what additional courses would have to be added to the list of courses offered for Business, Education and pre-Business students and those in Biology-based curricula in order to accommodate with little commuting the 1,000 to 2,000 "free" freshmen and sophomores the Task Force has recommended serving on the St. Paul campus.

31. The Task Force would add here that there is one difficulty associated with avoiding duplication of courses which should be kept in mind. Departments

with offerings on only one campus might regard themselves as being put at a disadvantage. Possibly any reasonably complete list of St. Paul campus course offerings would include all the various departments. But there is the chance that the desire to avoid duplication of courses could conflict with the desire--shared, the Task Force feels, by most departments--to have a chance with lower division students.

32. Before getting on to the issue of staffing, the Task Force would observe, since the use of television seems such an obvious way of keeping teaching costs down, that it regards this as a matter of departmental policy. It regards the use of TV as something for each department to decide on the basis of educational considerations. In the opinion of the Task Force, for it to urge greater use of TV out of concern for keeping teaching costs down would be inappropriate.

STAFFING ST. PAUL COURSES

33. There remains the issue of how to staff courses offered on the St. Paul campus. In thinking about this, the Task Force naturally began with the Ad Hoc Committee guideline, set out previously, that there should be no duplication of administrative units on the St. Paul campus. But if the establishment of duplicate departments on the St. Paul campus has been ruled out by this guideline, the locating there of staff officers of CLA and IT presumably has not. This the Task Force would urge as being entirely necessary. It would urge, in addition, that college student services--advising and the like--currently being provided on the Minneapolis campus, be provided as well on the St. Paul campus. This would be quite in keeping with the trend, evident in CLA, to decentralized provision of student services.

34. The Task Force would expect that those CLA and IT courses offered on the St. Paul campus will, in almost all instances, be taught by faculty members based on the Minneapolis campus. It would suggest, however, that the Ad Hoc Committee keep an open mind on this matter of staffing St. Paul campus courses, for in its judgment only experience, accumulating over the years, can reveal how best to staff these offerings. Experience could well dictate different arrangements for different offerings. It could dictate having some CLA and IT staff members located on the St. Paul campus. What the Task Force would urge, then, as sound practice as well as principle, is that the staffing of St. Paul course offerings be left for concerned departments and deans to work out.
35. There may even now be St. Paul-based faculty members entirely qualified to teach one or more of those CLA and IT courses which, if the Task Force's recommendations are implemented, will be offered on the St. Paul campus. But whether such qualified individuals as there may be should teach the relevant courses is not for the Task Force to say. Again, this is something for the departments concerned to decide. Similarly, it is not for the Task Force to say whether St. Paul campus course offerings should be taught by junior or senior faculty members. It is for the Task Force to say, though, that departments should not staff Minneapolis campus courses one way and the same courses offered on the St. Paul campus in another way. To do this would be to change educational policy and in an improper manner.
36. As should be apparent, the Task Force looks forward to having the Minneapolis-based faculty do more than teach on the St. Paul campus. It looks forward to their taking part, as they do on the Minneapolis campus, in St. Paul campus extra-curricular programs and, more immediately, holding office hours on the St. Paul campus. It is not that recognizing this changes anything said thus

far. The Task Force, did, though, want to be explicit on what it regards as the desirability of not making it harder than it already is for the students and faculty members to get together outside of the classroom.

STAFF ARRANGEMENTS FOR ST. PAUL TEACHING

37. Under existing or modestly improved arrangements most Minneapolis-based teachers would, the Task Force feels, find it an inconvenience to have to give courses on the St. Paul campus. Undoubtedly there are Minneapolis-based faculty members who for one reason or another would prefer to teach on the St. Paul campus. And in making assignments departments would be foolish to overlook this. But, in the Task Force's opinion, the University cannot count on preferences being such as to result in the needed distribution of teaching assignments. It has got to assume that teaching on the St. Paul campus would be a bother for the great majority of Minneapolis-based faculty members.
38. In the judgment of the Task Force, it would be proper for the University to recognize this and to work toward making St. Paul campus teaching assignments more attractive than, in present circumstances, they would be. The University administration has an obligation to see that the inconvenient teaching assignments are not passed on in disproportionate numbers to junior faculty members. Then, too, it decided on the St. Paul campus expansion and therefore, by implication, that one group, students or faculty, is going to have to do more traveling than at present. But if it makes economic sense, given present or modestly improved transportation facilities, to ask the faculty to do the traveling, then there must in effect be a pool of funds to defer the cost of making St. Paul campus teaching assignments more attractive. (The Task Force would add, if only as an after-thought, that

compensating faculty members in one way or another for travel could turn out to be a much cheaper way of meeting the St. Paul campus expansion than investing in a gigantic new transportation system.)

39. Nor, incidentally, would it be valid to argue that, as compared with getting from the West to the East Bank, getting to the St. Paul campus hardly seems difficult. For one thing, it is by no means clear the present arrangements are fair or, more to the point, consistent with the present state of the academic market place. To be sure, any university administration can ask what it will of faculty members: but then it must accept the consequences. Moreover, as time passes, going from the West to the East Bank to teach will become less and less common. And the comparison should be, not with what obtains presently, but with what will obtain a few years from now.
40. The obvious way of compensating Minneapolis-based faculty members for St. Paul campus teaching assignments is by reducing their teaching loads. The Task Force would emphasize, though, that given the intense competition for graduate students it should not be automatically assumed that only senior faculty members need be compensated in this way.
41. The administration should, in the opinion of the Task Force, look to providing free, centrally located parking facilities on the St. Paul campus for Minneapolis-based faculty members teaching there. To give Minneapolis-based faculty members free St. Paul campus parking keys when they buy their Minneapolis keys would do the trick. But there are faculty members who choose even now not to drive to work: and it would hardly be fair to ask them to start. Also, there is an easy alternative. Adequate automobile transportation to and from the St. Paul campus would not be unreasonably expensive.

42. Were the School of Business and certain Education program faculties to be relocated on the St. Paul campus, it would be reasonable to provide them with free, centrally located Minneapolis campus parking and adequate auto-transportation to and from the Minneapolis campus. The promise of these conveniences could ease concern about the transportation outlook, concern which could hold up development of the St. Paul campus.

SUMMARY

43. In brief summary, the Task Force would recommend:

first, that the Ad Hoc Committee explore further the possibility of relocating on the St. Paul campus the School of Business Administration, or a roughly similar substitute administrative unit, the General College, the School of Physical Education, the College of Education's programs in Industrial Arts Education, Business Education and Distributive Education and, finally, some of the activities of the General Extension Division;

second, that if there should develop an interest (at present there evidently is little or none) in the University's having a program in Engineering Technology, the Committee explore locating it on the St. Paul campus; and,

third, that the Committee consider locating pre-Business students, freshmen and sophomores in Biology-based curricula and, in whatever numbers are appropriate, students with varied lower division educational objectives on the St. Paul campus.

44. The Task Force would recall here its having outlined what it regards as the best way, given the above recommendations, of obtaining a detailed list of courses offerings for the St. Paul campus (see paragraph 30) and a way, in its judgment the most reasonable way, of staffing these course offerings (see paragraphs 33-36).
45. Good luck.

TASK FORCE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

John H. Kareken,
Chairman

Phillip J. Tichenor,
Ex Officio Secretary

Elmer W. Learn,
Ex Officio

Hugh G. S. Peacock
Ex Officio

Dominick J. Argento

Hyman Berman

Z. Z. Hugus, Jr.

A. Orville Dahl

Richard J. Donnelly

George A. Donohue

Edwin Fogelman

Roxanna R. Ford

Archie L. Good

Walter H. Johnson

Albert J. Linck

Robert K. Lindorfer

Cotton Mather

Keith N. McFarland

Ralph G. Nichols

Gordon W. O'Brien

Roger B. Page

Donald C. Rasmusson

Vernon W. Ruttan

Elmer L. Thomas

Hugh L. Turrittin

Alvin F. Weber

Gerhard S. Weiss

Roger E. Wilk