

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy**  
**Wednesday, December 18, 2013**  
**2:00 – 4:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Alon McCormick (chair), Gifty Amarteifio, Nicola Alexander, Karla Hemesath (for Barbara Brandt), Thomas Brothen, Lee-Ann Breuch, Elaine Darst, Charlene Ellingson, Timothy Gearns, Janine Grebin, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Kenneth Leopold, Robert McMaster, Nic McPhee, Kristen Nelson, Moshe Volovik, Susan Wick
- Absent: Michael Anderson, Erich Beckert, Gayle Golden, Keith Mayes
- Guests: Professor William Durfee (Campus Writing Board); Kris Wright (Director, Student Finance)
- Other: Suzanne Bardouche, Leslie Schiff (Office of Undergraduate Education), Belinda Cheung, Vicki Field (Graduate School), Tina Falkner (Academic Support Resources)

[In these minutes: (1) categories of post-baccalaureate degrees; (2) Campus Writing Board update; (3) financial aid update]

**1. Categories of Post-Baccalaureate Degrees**

Professor McCormick convened the meeting at 2:00 and turned to Vice Provost Kohlstedt to discuss categories of post-baccalaureate degrees, some of which have been written into policies as exempt from the policy coverage.

Dr. Kohlstedt noted that she had originally been invited to talk about "first professional degrees" but the topic was changed to "categories of post-baccalaureate degrees" in order to explain the particular pattern and definitions of such programs at the University of Minnesota. She started with a thumbnail sketch of history: graduate degrees began in the medieval era but by early modern history Ph.D.s were being granted in universities while doctors and lawyers trained through apprenticeship and proprietary systems. In the 19th century increasing standards brought considerable dispute about what it meant to be a doctor or a lawyer, so leaders emphasized credentials and certifications. Doctors and lawyers did not necessarily attend college. By the end of the 19th century, the Ph.D. was introduced into the American system and across most liberal arts fields as advanced, post-baccalaureate degrees. Thus, historically there were two quite different trajectories for the Ph.D. post-graduates and for doctors/lawyers.

By the early 20th century larger universities also incorporated colleges of law and medicine. In the 1910s and 1920s universities established graduate schools, seeking to meet the needs of often relatively small numbers of graduate students in a variety of departments and to ensure high standards

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

for these advanced degrees. Affiliations and definitions of these programs initially related to the reality that degrees in law and medicine were viewed as practical training for a career that would also require certification by the states while graduate degrees were intended to produce research scholars whose evaluation was through the informal mechanism of peer assessment of their productivity. The federal government designated certain of the career-based programs, most of which began to require a bachelor's degree, as "first professional degrees" to allow for advanced work that went beyond such degrees to include research. The history perhaps helps explain, Dr. Kohlstedt concluded, the particular configuration of current degrees and may also help explain some of the confusion that has developed around definitions in the changing higher education landscape of the last half of the twentieth century.

Today, the "first professional degree" varies by country and institution; in the U.S. it has been standardized by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Dr. Kohlstedt reported, and beginning in 2010-11 NECS discontinued the use of the term. (First professional degrees were recognized in 10 fields, 6 of which are offered at the University: dentistry, two in law, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine.) The "bachelor's degree," "postbaccalaureate certificate," and "master's degree" incorporated all master's degrees, there were technical changes in the "post-master's certificate" category, and the "doctor's degree" category was expanded to "doctor's degree—research scholarship," "doctor's degree—professional practice," and "doctor's degree—other." "First professional degree" category was eliminated. At the present time, many universities continue to use the "first professional degree" category, a practice the University followed; but all institutions must report its data to the federal government using the new categories.

Dr. Kohlstedt turned next to the PeopleSoft academic structure and noted there are three categories: undergraduate, "first professional degrees," and graduate degrees. The "graduate" degrees category has several, including the MBA, M.Ed., MPH, Doctor of Nursing Practice, and so on, that are different from first professional degrees but do on some level seem close to the older definition of that category; many of them also have some requirement for research. She also pointed to the hybrid category of DMS degrees to suggest that here, too, the categories defy simple explanatory logic. The best explanation is that the decision about where to place degrees is largely historical. She suggested that her impression here and elsewhere in the country in the past deans wanted their degrees to be considered graduate degrees because that designator was more prestigious. Now some do not want to be in that category because it can mean they are subject to policies or charges that they do not believe work well for them. Today there are less clear distinctions and perhaps a spectrum from technical, career-oriented degrees to more academic research degrees in which post-baccalaureate students in most programs are encouraged to engage in research and a significant component of Ph.D. students actively seek additional training and experience that will help them pursue careers in a wide range of employment sectors. Degree programs are thus often quite with most of the graduates seeking and experiencing aspects of both training and research.

There has been considerable discussion here and elsewhere about post-baccalaureate education and how to categorize the degrees, given that increasingly many of them incorporate applied or practical experiences as well as academic work. What difference does it make? One explanation for discussion is that administrators must attend to the policies that govern the programs. The University has some all-student policies and there are also specific policies for undergraduates. In the recent past, this Committee developed a set of policies that apply to graduate degrees but which exempted "first professional" degrees. She invited the Committee to look at highlights of the policies and asked why they don't apply to all post-baccalaureate degrees, including first professional degrees.

Dr. Kohlstedt noted that occasionally questions come up because there are no specific, all-university policies at the post-baccalaureate level and wondered why, for example, the policy governing leaves of absence from a program and reinstatement from a leave could not apply to all post-baccalaureate programs. Does it make sense to have a blanket exemption given that all students should have access to such protections and pointed out that it is quite possible to provide very specific exceptions where there is necessity (such as distinctive grading systems). Given the movement toward greater "operational excellence" and efficiency, it seems appropriate to ask about how more consistency might be attained. The question came up in this Committee because of a recent decision by the provost to approve a request from the Carlson School that the MBA program be exempt from graduate education policies. Appropriately, SCEP and the FCC have raised this question about reporting and policy coverage.

In response to questions from Committee members, Dr. Falkner indicated that no undergraduate degrees are considered "first professional degrees" (e.g., nursing, business). That is the historical pattern: nothing at the bachelor's level is a first professional degree.

Professor Leopold asked what graduate education policies the MBA program people were unhappy about that led them to request a change in their status, a request the provost approved. They wanted the MBA to be considered a first professional degree, Dr. Kohlstedt said. They argued this was a designation in about half the management programs in the country; in addition, at the University, programs considered graduate are included in the graduate cost pool to support graduate education. Some programs are interested in not paying into that cost pool. Removing programs from the cost pool does not bode well for the common good, Dr. Kohlstedt said, or for the availability for services for post-baccalaureate students across the University. She said she believes services available for graduate students should be available for all post-baccalaureate students and also that policies should be comprehensive for all of them in terms of fundamental rights as well as standards.

Mr. Volovik asked if there are specific policies the programs do not like, beyond the issue of the cost pool. Dr. Kohlstedt said the reason she prepared the list highlighting graduate education policies was to consider what might apply (or not) to the first professional programs (e.g., the Law School has a different grading system). She said she does not see very much in the policies that would be a problem for most of the professional programs. The conversation about the applicability of these policies is just beginning—and it should take place before further decisions about exempting programs from the policies are made, rather than making decisions on an ad hoc basis. Having multiple categories and coverage is confusing to students and those who work with them.

Professor McCormick suggested it would be helpful to lay out where there are exemptions at present. Some are already written into the policies; some have been approved by this Committee; some are ad hoc. Dr. Kohlstedt agreed.

Dr. Schiff surmised that there would be an effect on the graduate cost pool if a significant number of programs were moved into the first professional category. Dr. Kohlstedt said that any analysis should start with evaluating what all post-baccalaureate students should have and where they should have the protection of University policy. She noted that the Graduate School will help any post-baccalaureate student who asks, irrespective of whether the student is in a graduate or first professional program. Dr. Kohlstedt said that there is no question that Ph.D. programs are very

demanding and, for Ph.D.s require longer time to degree; she maintained that it is a common good for the institution to have high-quality graduate students and, indeed, the quality of graduate programs and faculty are typically the key measures of a research university. She noted that cost pools are designed for the common good. Her view is that there is a dual answer to the question of exemptions, but if there is an erosion of the cost pool, there will be an erosion in the research enterprise as well.

Dr. Hemesath observed that there are many emerging professions in health care; the Doctor of Nursing Practice is one example of a degree seeking recognition and prestige. There are nuances that affect programs depending on whether they are classified as professional or graduate. Dr. Kohlstedt pointed out that there are two kinds of doctoral degrees now recognized by NCES: one designated research/scholarship and one designated professional practice, a distinction that NCES is trying to capture with the new categories. Both of them benefit from all-university attention.

Dr. Falkner commented that while they should not drive educational policy, there are system (information technology) implications for changes in academic structure. Variations in program set up due to allowed differences in policies require code changes in the information system. There would be an expense to doing so and to pay for the upkeep of variations. Dr. Kohlstedt agreed that there would be a transition cost but wondered if the result might not be more efficient in the end—but as with any long-term project, one has to ask what it should like when it is done.

Ms. Bardouche asked if the MBA program, for example, will develop policies to cover any gaps in policy coverage because it is exempt from the existing graduate education policies. Dr. Kohlstedt said that perhaps that would happen but that other programs did not do so. Professor McCormick said that programs could have three options: not request exemption, request exemption but have its own policies that are structured very similarly to existing University policies, or have a different set of policies. Ms. Bardouche said the question then is where students go. If they believe the policies apply to them, but they do not, there is a real possibility for confusion. They need to be easily able to find applicable policies when they contact an office. Dr. Kohlstedt repeated her point that she could find little in the policies that should not apply to all post-baccalaureate students.

Professor McCormick asked whether the University had to follow the federal definitions. Dr. Kohlstedt said that this is such a big change that it is not clear universities are moving very fast in responding; does the University want to be in the vanguard or trailing its peers? It probably wants to be close to the vanguard; the question is worth thinking about. What about the CIC schools, Professor McCormick asked? She has just posed the question to her counterparts, Dr. Kohlstedt said, and hopes shortly to have the information. The University is not alone in dealing with the questions.

Professor McCormick said that one possible next step is for the Committee to examine the policies that contain language exempting certain programs from the policy provisions to see if it still approves the way the policies were written. Dr. Kohlstedt said that the staff in the Graduate School are paying attention to small problems that arise in advance of the regular 3-year review of the policies that will take place next year, so they will be in a position to answer questions about them. It will be important to have that discussion before any further decisions about exemptions are made.

Dr. Kohlstedt inquired what the relationship is between this Committee and first professional degree programs—if they are exempt from policies. The provost decides on some exemptions, Professor McCormick noted. Dr. Cheung said that the policies came from this Committee and govern

the programs that are classified as graduate. The Committee followed tradition in doing so, Dr. Kohlstedt added, by adopting policies that applied to programs under the aegis of the Graduate School. She also noted that the report of the Special Committee on Graduate Education will soon be released; it could have an effect on the discussions.

Professor Durfee had joined the meeting at this point, and as chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee had received the report; he said the report highlights the importance of the issues being discussed and recommends that they be sorted out, but it does not make specific recommendations. Professor McCormick said that to the extent the Committee will be involved in the discussions, he would follow up with Dr. Kohlstedt and Professor Lanyon (who chaired the Special Committee).

Professor McCormick thanked Dr. Kohlstedt, Dr. Cheung, and Ms. Field for gathering the information presented to the Committee.

## **2. Campus Writing Board (CWB) Update**

Professor McCormick now welcomed Professor Durfee to the meeting to talk about the work of the Campus Writing Board (CWB), which has purview over writing requirements for undergraduate students on the Twin Cities campus, and also to discuss the Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC) program.

Professor Durfee distributed handouts providing "quick facts" about the CWB and "Definition of a Writing Intensive Course." He began by reviewing some of the quick facts:

The Campus Writing Board:

1. Evaluates and approves Writing Intensive courses.
2. Evaluates and approves Writing Enriched Curriculum Writing Plans for units participating in the WEC project.
3. Provides guidance, evaluation and consultation on University undergraduate writing policies.

CWB members: Will Durfee (MechE, Chair), Neil Anderson (Hort Sci), Rose Brewer (Af Am), John Cozmazzi (Arch), Cindy Garcia (Theatre), Ken Heller (Physics), Sarah Hobbie (Ecol, Ev, Behav), Beth Lewis (Kinesiology), Scott Lipscomb (Music), Holly Littlefield (CSOM).

CWB ex officio members: Pamela Flash (Cntr for Wrtnng), Laura Gurak (Wrtnng Studies), Nanette Hanks (CLA), Tom Reynolds (Wrtnng Studies), Leslie Schiff (OVPUG).

There are 26 depts and 1 college in the Writing Enriched Curriculum program. There are 591 undergraduate Writing Intensive courses. WI courses are re-certified every 5 years. (Many of them were approved before the CWB was established.)

In the past 12 months, CWB has reviewed 39 Writing Intensive proposals and 12 WEC Writing Plans.

The CWB was established in 2008 as a result of recommendations from the strategic positioning effort a few years earlier. One of the strategic positioning groups examined undergraduate writing and came out with strong statements, which led to the creation of the CWB.

Professor Breuch inquired, apropos of recertification, how the CWB manages the process if all 591 WI courses are recertified every five years. Professor Durfee explained that the reason for recertification is to check to ensure that the course has not drifted from the requirements and that it is still WI. Given that there are nearly 600 courses, neither the CWB or instructors are interested in making a lot of work for themselves so they try to make recertification as easy as possible. They will want a process in place before they begin recertification.

Mr. Volovik looked at the Definition of a Writing Intensive Course and noted the requirement that students must write at least 2500 words for a WI course—but that it also says "maybe not." He asked how strictly that rule is enforced and said that in his experience, WI courses have not usually required the 2500 words. Professor Durfee said the definition was created three years ago and takes the view that writing is discipline-specific, but in order not to leave matters completely open-ended, it starts with a requirement of 2500 words but recognizes that such a standard may not apply in all disciplines. The CWB lets someone proposing a WI course explain why it should not meet the 2500-word criterion.

Professor Durfee outlined six questions that must be answered in order to apply for WI status for a course:

1. How do writing assignments and writing instruction further the learning objectives of this course and how is writing integrated into the course?
2. What types of writing (e.g., research papers, problem sets, presentations, technical documents, lab reports, essays, journaling etc.) will be assigned? Explain how these assignments meet the requirement that writing be a significant part of the course work, including details about group-authored assignments, if any.
3. How will students' final course grade depend on their writing performance? What percentage of the course grade will depend on the quality and level of the student's writing compared to the percentage of the grade that depends on the course content?
4. Indicate which assignment(s) students will be required to revise and resubmit after feedback from the instructor. Indicate who will be providing the feedback. For group-authored documents, describe how each student will benefit from revision.
5. What types of writing instruction will be experienced by students? How much class time will be devoted to explicit writing instruction and at what points in the semester? What types of writing support and resources will be provided to students?
6. If teaching assistants will participate in writing assessment and writing instruction, explain how will they be trained (e.g. in how to review, grade and respond to student writing) and how will they be supervised.

Professor McCormick asked Professor Durfee to review some of the operations of CWB: How is the CWB selected, what are the major difficulties WI course proposers typically face, what will instructors typically face in the recertification process, and how are WI courses aligned with the WEC program?

Professor Durfee said the CWB is appointed by the vice provost for undergraduate education and its members serve 3-year terms; the vice provost asks for opinions from the CWB and the Writing Center, which is the reason CWB membership is spread across the campus. What he sees on the CWB is that it tries to help proposers; it is interesting to be on the receiving end of proposals because sometimes one wonders if some of the proposers have read the directions. They may need to do a better job of disseminating the directions because many who propose WI courses may not be familiar with them. The problem that the CWB faces most often is insufficient information to approve a WI proposal; instructors assume that because a course requires a lot of writing, it qualifies as a WI course, but that isn't true. It is not volume, it is how the writing is tied to a course and whether there is explicit writing instruction as a core part of the course. About half of the proposals they receive are in an expedited category, which means the CWB gets back to the proposer with clarification questions on the proposal, following which a rapid decision on approval is made. Professor Durfee endorsed the work of the Writing Center; he said it is clear when proposers have consulted with it.

Professor McCormick asked if there have been difficulties with the WEC proposals. Professor Durfee said not in general and turned to Dr. Schiff. Dr. Schiff said that the WEC staff provide extraordinary support in helping units draft WEC plans. It is not a one-size-fits-all approach, it is adaptable. In revising and resubmitting plans, the WEC staff are willing to preview drafts and make it easier for units to have plans approved. She said she believes the process works quite well.

There are two models of writing at the University, Vice Provost McMaster said: WI courses, of which four are required of undergraduates and which were established when the liberal education requirements were revised in the 1990s; and WEC. As the campus moves to more WEC implementation, it still has the WI model in place; they have tried to ensure that within the WEC model students are continuing to complete the WI requirements, but as the WEC model becomes more universal, the WI model may be discontinued. The WEC model, however, could be a problem for transfer students, and that difficulty needs to be addressed.

Professor Nelson asked what the longest time a major has had a WEC program. Since 2008, in Political Science and Mechanical Engineering, Professor Durfee said. Are they starting to track the effects of a WEC program on student writing, Professor Nelson asked? There is a longitudinal assessment going on through examination of writing samples, Professor Durfee assured her, and the WEC staff intend to continue to do longitudinal studies. What have been the findings, Professor Nelson asked? Professor Durfee said that the first assessment round demonstrated overall improvement in student writing at the University. However, what is exciting about the WEC program is that faculty are talking about writing and what students need to know in a field, something the faculty can control. A huge benefit of the WEC process is the assessment of student writing, Dr. Schiff said, which leads to faculty conversations that might not otherwise have occurred, which engender discussions about teaching.

Professor McCormick asked what faculty members who teach capstone courses say when they reflect on the WEC experience: are they seeing a higher level of writing skills than they did before WEC, say 10 years ago? Professor Durfee said he believes that is the case in his own department, Mechanical Engineering; they have also refined what they expect in a capstone project report and clarified the criteria. Professor Breuch said the real benefit has been setting clear criteria; in their assessment report, they found a higher level of faculty satisfaction and more students meeting the criteria; "things are beginning to work," she said. Dr. Schiff said that the diversity of units is taken

into account in WEC, such as programs with "flat" versus "vertical" curricula, so asking the question is a problem.

Professor Leopold asked if there is a transcript notation for students who graduate from a WEC program; there is not. He said he would wish to ask if employers have noticed a difference.

Professor McCormick asked if there are things the Committee can do to assist the effort, or if there are policy implications, or if it can help faculty prepare for recertification, or with WEC plans. Professor Durfee said that more departments need to be encouraged to get into the WEC plan; some are not sure it is worth it. The benefit is that it offers a department the opportunity to look at its curriculum, which is good to do periodically. From a policy perspective, the Committee should do the best that it can to tie efforts together: WEC, the Student Learning Outcomes, and program assessment; opportunities to combine and collaborate must be sought. Dr. Schiff suggested that as the CWB thinks about its recertification strategy, if a course is also coming for liberal-education (LE) certification, it would make sense to automatically do the CWB and LE certification at the same time. Professor Durfee agreed.

In terms of policy, Ms. Bardouche provided the context. University policy "Academic Unit Authority over the Curriculum and Major"  
<http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/CURRICULUMAUTHORITY.html>  
provides that "Subject to the final authority of the Board of Regents, departments, colleges, and campuses have the authority to establish their curricula and the requirements for majors and minors, for graduate and professional degrees, and to add to or remove courses from both in accordance with rules established by the college or campus."

The Twin Cities Liberal Education (LE) requirements and the Writing Intensive requirements (WI) are campus-wide requirements. Approval of courses meeting those respective requirements is made by the Council on Liberal Education and the Campus Writing Board. Courses are submitted to those two campus-wide bodies for review; the reviews are separate. A course can meet an LE requirement, a WI requirement, or both. The determinations of the two review bodies are separate. Courses that are not seeking to meet LE or WI do not undergo review by those bodies.

Departments establish the criteria for their major and minor programs, Ms. Bardouche noted. Colleges establish the criteria for a degree from their particular college. Campuses establish the criteria for a degree from their campus. Students must fulfill all those requirements at all those levels to be granted the degree.

Professor Breuch asked how, if the goal is that all departments will be brought into the WEC program, that goal can be accomplished without a mandate. Through the grassroots is one way, Dr. McMaster said: because of the excitement and positive results and energy around WEC programs. The provost's office has let it be known that the campus will move to WEC within the next 10 years and there will be resources to support units, awarded through a proposal process. After that there will be a sustainability issue, but he believes funding will be transferred to units. The provost's office strongly encourages departments to adopt a WEC program and it will be an expectation. But it cannot be noted on a transcript, Professor Leopold asked? Because it is not a requirement, Dr. McMaster said, and it isn't clear that employers would understand it anyway. It is more an attribute of a program rather than an individual student, Professor Durfee added.



About half the departments now have a WEC program, Dr. McMaster reported. Professor Nelson suggested that it would be a good idea if they were universal in less than 10 years.

Professor McCormick recalled that the liberal education requirements were approved by the Faculty Senate; do they see a similar process for the WEC program? Dr. McMaster said he believes it important that this Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the Faculty Senate endorse WEC as the writing program, although whether or not it would have to be enshrined in policy is not clear.

Professor McCormick thanked Professor Durfee for his report.

### **3 Financial Aid Update**

Vice Provost McMaster now continued his discussion of undergraduate student financial aid, begun at a meeting earlier in the fall. He said that a large group is involved in financial aid discussions, a team that meets every 3-4 weeks to talk about policy, practices, and financial aid distribution. The group has developed financial aid principles that (1) are general and guide the University's financial aid programs, (2) that are specific to merit-based aid, and (3) that are specific to need-based aid. The categories of aid are not mutually exclusive, Dr. McMaster observed, and a student may have both merit and need-based aid; these are two meta-categories that they use in allocating the different kinds of aid.

Dr. McMaster noted the relationships between tuition (the tuition model, resident rates, non-resident rates, and incentives/disincentives), financial aid (need- and merit-based strategies, middle income resources, federal and state programs, University aid packaging, and attentiveness to indebtedness), and enrollment management (total undergraduate size, size of freshman class, size of transfer class, undergraduate priorities, and reciprocity), and said that enrollment management drives what happens. Dr. McMaster reviewed the principles to guide financial aid for undergraduates, affordability and financial need, and the types of financial aid available to students.

Dr. McMaster turned to financial aid trends for degree-seeking undergraduate students on the Twin Cities campus. There are three major categories of costs used in calculating the (federally-determined) cost of attendance: resident tuition and fees, room and board, and books/supplies/transportation/etc. The cost of attendance, from 2008-09 to 2013-14, rose from \$21,144 to \$25,124, so it costs about \$100,000 to earn a four-year undergraduate degree—but few students pay the full \$100,000 because most receive financial aid.

Financial support for Twin Cities degree-seeking undergraduates has increased (all sources) from \$295 million in 2008-09 to \$339 million in 2012-13. For 2012-13, \$129 million was gift aid (Pell, grants, scholarships), employment (work-study or other University employment) was \$26 million, loans were \$176 million, and there were about \$8 million in waivers. Except for a two-year period when federal stimulus funds were available, loans as a percentage of the total aid are about 52% (2012-13), down from 53.1% in 2008-09. Of the total \$129 million in gift aid, about half is need-based and the aid comes from a variety of sources (University scholarships, Pell, other federal funds, state and local governments, private sources, athletics, and Regents Scholarships (\$0.8 million of the total)).

Professor McCormick commented that in general the strategy for aid is the president's, after being set by the Board of Regents; the Committee's role is to help the University community discuss these issues, and it is important that the faculty understand financial aid in order to help others understand it. Dr. McMaster agreed that there are no significant policy issues involved and that the relationship between tuition and financial aid is largely an administrative decision. Ms. Wright also noted that while the University's Promise scholarships and money available through the Admissions office is centrally delivered, the remainder is administered by departments, following memos of understanding with donors in the case of private funds. There are constraints (e.g., hypothetically, scholarship funds must be provided to progeny of World War I veterans), so some aid is not given out because of restrictions.

Professor Nelson asked how decisions are made about pockets of funds; are wealthy departments equally competitive with poorer ones? Ms. Wright said that departments decide what students receive—the Admissions office tells her office. The University Promise scholarships are formulaic. Aid also "stacks": a student will generally not be allowed to receive aid in excess of the cost of attendance, so if a student receives a Pell grant that puts him or her over that total, University funding will be reduced (this only happens a few times per year). Students can also bring their own scholarship funding.

Professor McCormick asked how the University compares with its peers in terms of recruiting and funding in line with economic diversity. Dr. McMaster said answering the first question fully is a long conversation, but as a general statement it does well, although it is not at the top in terms of the amount of money it can put on the table. He said he would like to defer discussion of the second but observed that they do try to align tuition rates and the University mission (e.g., preserving access for Minnesota students). Ms. Wright added that the University can also take pride in the number of Pell-eligible students attending: 25% of enrolled students had Pell grants in 2012-13, up from 20% in 2008-09.

Dr. McMaster reported that over 13,600 undergraduates earned \$32.3 million through University employment in 2012-13; over 10,000 on the Twin Cities campus earned about \$26 million.

In terms of the \$25,124 cost of attendance for the Twin Cities campus (resident undergraduate living on campus), Dr. McMaster noted that room and board expenses were second-lowest in the Big Ten. Mr. Volovik commented that there is pressure to lower the cost of attendance—but that if it is higher, students can receive more aid. Dr. McMaster said he would not want to see the University drive up the cost of attendance; he observed that the Board of Regents sets tuition, Housing and Residential Life sets the room and board rates, and so on, so his office has little discretion over the final total. The amount identified for transportation (\$194, the cost of a bus pass) could be increased, but then the University would have to find financial aid to cover the increase—or student aid would be a lower percentage of the cost of attendance. Ms. Wright also pointed out that the cost of attendance is a ceiling on what a student can receive in aid.

Dr. McMaster made a few observations about the financial aid packages from the University (intended to fully meet a student's need; most involve student and parent loans as well as grants/scholarships and work study for those eligible). Many students and parents choose to borrow less than what is offered—or do not borrow at all. He provided examples of need-based aid packages

at various income levels; when the Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) is \$25,000, there is no expected family contribution and gift aid amounts to about 60% of the total aid; when AGI approaches \$100,000, the expected family contribution is about \$15,000 and there is little gift aid; these numbers change on a sliding scale, depending on AGI. Dr. McMaster also reviewed the elements of the U Promise Scholarship program for 2013-14 (for low- and middle-income Minnesota resident undergraduate students, the amount varies from \$570 to \$4000 per year with a guaranteed multi-year commitment, and so on).

Over \$15 million was awarded under the U Promise Scholarship program in fall semester 2013, Dr. McMaster reported; the total estimated awards for 2013-14 is \$30.5 million.

The percentage of students who graduate with no debt was 35% in 2009 and 37% in 2013, Dr. McMaster reported. Of those who had debt, the mean amount in 2009 was \$25,433 and in 2013 it was \$27,158. Overall, the percentage of students with debt (bachelor's degree recipients) appears to be declining. Average loan debt is increasing, but only very slowly. The average loan debt, for all bachelor's degree recipients on the Twin Cities campus in 2012-13, was \$16,838.

Dr. McMaster noted the impact on student debt for those who take more than four years to graduate (Twin Cities fall 2004 cohort). For those who graduated in four years, the percentage who borrow was 60% and the mean debt was \$28,426; for those who took five years, the corresponding numbers were 69% and \$35,958; for those who took six years, the corresponding numbers were 71.5% and \$37,022. The maximum amount borrowed by any one undergraduate student, after six years, was \$132,268—which, Dr. McMaster surmised, was probably not a good investment by that student. He summarized the elements of the financial literacy campaign the University mounts almost from the moment students set foot on campus.

Professor McCormick inquired, on the last point, whether they provide information to the students about the relative merits of borrowing versus working too many jobs: for instance, if working more can mean taking 5-6 years to graduate, which costs much more. That is implicit in the message, Dr. McMaster said, and they do make the point that it is better to take out a loan and then be able to go to work and receive a salary the fifth year—rather than being in school a fifth year.

Professor McCormick asked if the University has bragging rights on access and affordability. Is it able to tell its story in a sound bite? Dr. McMaster said that through the U Promise Scholarship program the institution has maintained access for low-income students. Is that well-known to the University community, Professor McCormick asked? Probably not, Dr. McMaster said. He said the University could also probably show that its merit-aid packages have brought excellent students to the campuses—students who would not have considered the University in the past. But to do that, it must have competitive financial aid packages. Professor McCormick suggested that the University provide the tools to tell the story about access and merit. Dr. McMaster agreed. He added that there is a growing number of middle-income students (AGI falls between \$50,000 and \$100,000) who face problems. The University has the lower part of the income spectrum covered well, but the middle-income bracket not as well. Ms. Wright added that Dr. McMaster has a strategic plan for getting to where the University wants to be; she agreed that it has a good story to tell and said it is one of the few institutions (outside of California) that has such a high percentage of Pell-eligible students.

Ms. Ellingson said that one datum that caught her attention was that two-thirds of graduates stay in Minnesota. Dr. McMaster agreed and pointed out that of the non-resident students who come to the University, a higher percentage of that group also stays in Minnesota, something that is less likely to occur in smaller university communities.

Professor McCormick thanked Dr. McMaster for providing the Committee the opportunity to understand the financial aid picture and ask questions. He wished everyone a pleasant break and adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota