UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA University Senate Consultative Committee
411 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)376-2479

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

February 6, 1986
626 Campus Club
11:00 - 2:45

AGENDA

Approx. time.

11:00 1. Minutes of January 16 (distributed Jan. 30) and January 30 (to be sent).

2. Introduction to Executive Summary of Self-Study Report (if available).

11:20 3. Proposed University research center on higher education with respect to the non-traditional student: report from Professors Merwin and Berscheid on nominations for a study group.

11:40 4. FCC-Regents dinner meeting on March 13: defining the discussion topic.

12:00 Lunch break.

12:25 5. Senate and Assembly agenda for February 20:

A. Rules of procedure for Senate/Assembly consideration of the reports from the Commitment to Focus special committees: final FCC action;

B. Review other agenda items.

12:45 6. Consent Decree and EEOWC issues: discussion with Professor Vera Schletzer, Director Patricia Mullen, and Vice President Stephen Dunham.

1:45 7. Preliminary report of the C_tF special committee on coordinating lower division education on the Twin Cities Campus: discussion with guest Professor William Hanson, chair of SCEP and of the special committee.

2:45 Adjourn.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA University Senate Consultative Committee
411 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone: (612)376-2479

MINUTES
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
February 6, 1986
625 Coffman Memorial Union
11:05 - 2:45

Members present: Ellen Berscheid, Richard Goldstein, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin, Paul Murphy, Irwin Rubenstein, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman (Chr.), David Hamilton (from 1:20).

Guests: Vice President & General Counsel Stephen Dunham, Professor William Hanson, OEO Director Patricia Mullen, Professor Vera Schletzer.

1. Agenda items were shifted so that the self-study summary draft could be addressed late in the meeting and the CtF draft report on coordinating lower division education could be looked at preliminarily early in the meeting.

2. The SCC minutes of January 16 and the FCC minutes of January 16 and 30 were approved with one correction to the 1/16 SCC minutes: On page 5, item 4.B(2), Entrance Requirements, the third sentence should read, "There are presently no all-University requirements."

3. Proposal for a research center on higher education and the non-traditional student.

At the request of President Keller and Professor Stuthman, FCC members Berscheid and Merwin had developed a list of names from which the president might select a number to constitute the study group on the proposed new center. It is expected that the charge to the study group will be written by the president and Dr. Stuthman.

Professor Merwin presented to the FCC the faculty names; they included faculty from the General College, the College of Education, CLA's Departments of Psychology and Sociology, the College of Home Economics' Department of Family Social Science, and administrators from the Graduate School, Office of Research Administration, Academic Affairs, and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

There was a consensus of opinion in FCC to recommend that a faculty member at-large be included, preferably from the Senate Committee on Research.

There was a short discussion of the origins of the proposal and it was noted that it is included in the overall resolution the regents have approved

concerning General College's future under Commitment to Focus. Professor Stuthman anticipated that one probable outcome of having such a center would be collaborative work between General College faculty members and faculty in disciplines in other colleges, contributing to the desired greater integration of General College with the rest of the University.

Professor Berscheid regarded it as advisable for the proposed center to have a continuing advisory board, and recommended it include some of the people who serve on the initial study group. FCC members agreed that the letter outlining the charge to the study group should mention such a successor advisory board.

There was an FCC consensus to forward the set of names to President Keller.

4. Draft Report of the Special C&F Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus. (See also pp. 6-8.)

FCC members expressed strong reservations about the report in its current form. Professor Sorauf observed that it tossed up some old ideas (e.g., integrated courses, tried and discarded decades ago) and that it seemed to add yet another layer of advising.

Professor Berscheid commented that the report's major thrust is to add advisors for lower division students, and that it includes nothing clear about curriculum which was also part of the charge. She added that the only way to get the money to cover the inherent costs would be to streamline the lower division, but the report does not touch on that subject. The report does not really address coordinating multiple offerings such as Composition. The charge, she thought, had concerned how to save money through streamlining, coordinating, and reducing duplication.

Professor Stuthman suggested that FCC could support the proposal for a single contact point for outsiders regarding lower division education. Professor Sorauf noted that recruiting is placed in the proposed center, but the admissions office is apparently not. Yet logically an undergraduate center would be a focal point for prospective students. He saw the report as ignoring many fundamental questions in the areas it takes up and of not indicating the difficulties to be encountered.

Several members of the Committee found the new report lacking in the thoroughness and specificity exhibited in the Page Report on the Quality of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning.

Professors Rubenstein and Sorauf recommended focusing on the proposal for the undergraduate center, getting it fleshed out, and addressing one by one the likely consequences. Professor Rubenstein asked if it could have an admissions center role. He said one needs to take account of the University's large number of transfer students. Professor Stuthman said FCC would want to ask how the new structure would interface with existing structures.

Professor Merwin recommended that FCC at this point not entirely discount the two alternative models which the special committee dismissed. Professor Stuthman reminded members that FCC had already taken a position advocating coordination of support services.

Professor Berscheid found the tone of the report to convey an image of

the center as a service center, a handmaiden, and powerless. Professor Stuthman wondered if such a center would be able to implement any changes, e.g., reducing duplication, which were based upon the results of surveys of offerings.

FCC discussed the report with Professor Hanson later in the meeting (see pages 6 through 8) and reserved a major part of its March 20 meeting to develop the FCC position. (April 1 is the deadline to submit comments to the special committee.)

5. Senate and Assembly agenda for February 20.

Resolution from Senate Library Committee seeking restoration in acquisitions budget: recommendation to withdraw the resolution from the next Senate agenda.

Professor Merwin reported that President Keller had on the previous day told a meeting of several members of the Senate Finance Committee and Professor Brian Job, SLC Chair, that the University is committed to staying on a par with the target four institutions (the Universities of Illinois, Michigan, Washington, and Wisconsin). It is the president's understanding that inflation for published materials have declined and that 5% was a suitable increase to request for inflation (with the addition of 3.2% for parity). A University error resulted in applying to the libraries a lowered University inflation rate estimate of 1.7% which had not been intended to apply to the libraries; the University has restored the $50,000 this error removed. President Keller told the SFC group that if he were provided with the evidence that the price index for library materials had gone up as much as the libraries and SLC assert, he would allocate the extra dollars. This offer is acceptable to Professor Job, and SLC will hold central administration to it. Professors Merwin and Stuthman propose to send a letter to the president stating their understanding of the president's handling of the request and of the Senate committees' reserving the right to resubmit the SLC resolution should they not be satisfied with the outcome.

Professor Sorauf, who had made the motion in the January 16 Senate Consultative Committee meeting to forward the SLC motion to the Senate, moved that on the terms of the understanding the president has agreed to, and with the right to reconsider the question if the equalization with the target four institutions is not achieved, the Consultative Committee defer consideration of the resolution to a time in the future and withdraw it from the February 20 agenda. Professor Murphy seconded the motion, which was then approved without dissent.

Professor Merwin noted that the resolution as drawn up for the Senate had used a larger figure, obtained from Vice President Murthy, than in SLC's original resolution. The chairman reported that the Student SCC, which joined in the affirmative January 16 vote, had been informed earlier on this date of the proposal to withdraw the motion for the time being, and would report back to FCC only if it opposed that move.

6. Consent decree petitions and related issues. Guests: Professor Schletzer, EEOWC Chair; Patricia Mullen, Director of Office of Equal Opportunity and AFfirmative Action; and Stephen Dunham, Vice President and General Counsel.

(This was the second of three such joint meetings scheduled for 1985-86.)

Professor Schletzer reported that EEOWC tries to focus at each of its monthly meetings on one large issue. The committee spent considerable time on the internal tribunal/Academic Staff Assistance Officer matter and finds most of its comments and suggestions have now been written into the settlement agreement. The petition regarding P/A appointments will be high on the EEOWC agenda in the next several months.

Lack of a good data base impedes tackling many sex-bias questions. Because that lack has been used too many times as an excuse, EEOWC has been pushing to get the situation corrected.

Health Sciences conversions of T-appointments: EEOWC's inquiries convinced it that the people affected were satisfied with the way the conversions were done.

Part-time faculty appointments. Faculty on 75%-99% seem to be in a satisfactory situation except that not all are on Social Security; EEOWC would like to see tham all covered. EEOWC is most concerned about those faculty on appointments of 51%-74% time for whom the University is the primary employer. Among the areas of concern are benefits and range of work expectations.

Mr. Dunham then reported on several issues from the legal viewpoint:

- Petition on internal tribunals. The trial period for the position of Academic Staff Assistance Officer has been increased to 18 months; it is an advocacy position up to the point of the hearings, at which time faculty volunteers, trained by the Officer, will take over the advocacy. Mr. Dunham termed this a very interesting experiment. The parties have agreed to everything and have signed; he expects someone will be hired to begin work on July 1.

- Petition on Professional Academic and Administrative class. The study group has produced a long report and Mr. Dunham will send a copy to Professor Stuthman. He noted the University's internal tribunals present a problem in that the P/A class and the faculty have separate grievance systems.

- The database. The necessary money has been allocated to make the database accurate and the job will be completed by next summer.

- Part-time faculty employment. He noted that pending federal tax reform legislation would affect the way part-time people are treated.

- Petition on promotion and tenure (specificity of standards). Mr. Dunham and Ms. Mullen wrote in early January to all deans, directors, and department heads asking for all the sex neutral criteria they use in salary decisions. No responses have come so far. The writers hope that by the March 1 deadline they will have received some good models which they can then offer to departments which lack them. While this may not satisfy the petition, he commented, it will help to get better criteria. He wants all units' criteria in hand by the time the salary decisions are made for 1986-87.

The promotion and tenure standards and indeces should satisfy the consent decree regarding promotion and tenure procedures and decisions, he told FCC, but they will not satisfy with respect to salary decisions in most cases. He reminded FCC that the court had ordered the University to have such criteria by January 1, 1981.

Professor Hamilton remarked on the large number of demands for data and information central administration makes of department heads. Professor Merwin noted that Mr. Dunham's office already has the criteria used in salary decisions from at least those units where the submission on P&T criteria reported that the same criteria applied for salary decisions.

Professor Rubenstein inquired whether the database can tell why people who were hired six or seven years ago have left. Mr. Dunham said documenting why people left earlier in their probationary period is reconstructable, but is not and should not be part of the database.

Returning to the problems which face part-time faculty, Professor Berscheid asked about the level of benefits. Professor Schletzer cited a historical reason why many people on 75%-99% time are not in the University's social security system. Professor Schletzer then reported that in parts of the University system, especially the Morris campus, people have been re-hired annually at the base pay while other faculty members have been hired and promoted around them.

The number of University faculty in the category under scrutiny is about 175. Professor Schletzer said that EEOWC will recommend that, for faculty employed over 50% time, fringe benefits be pro-rated to the percentage of time worked. EEOWC is most concerned about those who work 50%-75%.

She said EEOWC receives a lot of letters from people who believe they have been discriminated against and, in some cases, kept involuntarily in the part-time situation. EEOWC is pretty adamant about relieving this problem.

The faculty, she said, should be concerned about the issue because units, to save money, could actually hire a lot of people in such a part-time capacity, which would diminish the faculty. Professor Melsa pointed out that a department would come out ahead financially when it replaced a regular faculty member on half-time leave without pay with a half-time employee.

Internal tribunal agreement. Professor Sorauf said some very unfortunate precedents were being set: (1) one University constituency (the petitioners) is given veto power over a University employee; (2) the employee is being hired to serve more than that one constituency, yet that constituency (with the veto) may not represent the others who would be served. Mr. Dunham agreed that it is not a good precedent, and described it as a compromise better than the earlier version which would have had the petitioners participating in the selection.

Mr. Dunham said that the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee has essentially been turned into an administrator but only for the one purpose of supervising the Academic Staff Assistance Officer. The Academic Vice President can veto anything that Officer agrees to which is contrary to University policies. This assignment for the SCFA chair is not a new kind of thing for faculty here, since faculty members in many areas also serve in some administrative capacity.

In summary, Mr. Dunham spoke of the usefulness of these joint meetings. The University, he said, has not yet accomplished a lot on the petitions. But he is encouraged by the constructive relationship this year with EEOWC.

7. Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education: draft report. Guest: Professor William Hanson, chair.

Professor Stuthman invited Professor Hanson to describe (1) how the committee had addressed the three kinds of alternatives outlined to it and rejected two of them, (2) what charge it envisions for the proposed undergraduate center, and (3) how the center would interface with other services and programs.

Professor Hanson said the committee had talked about a lower division college into which freshmen would be admitted instead of CLA, IT, etc.; about an "overlay" model, roughly parallel to the Graduate School's; and about leaving the structure unchanged. The undergraduate center model which the committee produced is attractive because it will be able to provide better services for new students, both freshmen and those transferring from outside or inside the University. The cost of having a lower division college appears unrealistic in the current budgetary climate.

He said that on the one hand the committee was very interested in preserving the budgetary and educational autonomy of the various colleges; on the other hand the committee members discovered a host of problems they think can be alleviated by the ndergraduate enter.

Professor Hanson said he saw four parts to the Center's role:

(1) Assisting all new students;

(2) Serving as an advising center to provide referrals for academic advising. There is now no adequate way to let students know what and where all the University's good advising services are. The new preparation standards will probably require even more advising. (Professor Sorauf inquired as to whether that wasn't a good reason to pull together into a single center all advising, and Professor Hanson acknowledged that it was.)

(3) Carrying on admissions-related efforts and the training of TA's;

(4) Holding a collection of other responsibilities (for example, the committee proposes creating a new committee on the teaching of large classes, and it recommends creating integrative classes to help students meet distribution requirements).

In response to Professor Berscheid's question, Professor Hanson said the committee was pretty unified regarding units retaining their budgetary and educational autonomy and were primarily persuaded by the budgetary arguments.

Asked how the coordinating costs would be met, Professor Hanson said the committee anticipates that (1) some funds can come from the money saved by a revamped University Without Wallas under C$_t$F, (2) there could be a transfer of effort of some people in John Wallace's office, and (3) there could be a transfer of some employees and their funding from the collegiate units to the Center.

Asked where all the new preparatory courses would be located, he said it seemed they would not be wholly in General College. The Center's director would work with colleges to divide up and allocate these courses in a reasonable way.

Professor Sorauf saw the proposal for integrative courses as a redoing of

the General Education courses of 30 to 35 years ago. Since after those courses were set up departments came into being, to create these now would be a significant curricular step, he judged.

Professor Murphy noted the absence of attention to coordinating existing curricular offerings such as the various composition courses. Professor Hanson said the committee had not talked specifically about those. They did discuss and quickly dismiss the idea of a core curriculum as not appropriate here. Instead, they proposed the University (1) stick with both the spirit and the letter of its liberal education requirements, (2) create integrative courses, and (3) encourage students to take advantage of the University's diversity.

Professor Rubenstein said there is need for quality control of advising, and for a one-stop center for entering students. But the proposed Center seems instead to perpetuate the scattering of services and hence the sending of students all over the campus. He also recommended assistance to new CEE students. He asked that there be someone in charge of the important function of advising. Professor Hanson said he saw the Center as an improvement over the current situation.

Professor Sorauf declared that the University needs solutions for the very serious problem of the complexity and diversity confronting undergraduate students. We keep coming up with palliatives, he said, but never tackle the complexity itself, and the internal administrative cost of this coping is enormous. He said it was not clear to him that some degree of integration would add costs.

In response to a question about creation of an undergraduate college, Professor Sorauf said he would certainly give serious consideration to a non-curricular, integrated, lower division college into which recruiting, admissions and records, advising for freshmen and sophomores, financial aid, and dealing with high school counselors would go. He added that, with the current set of givens, there probably would be freshmen admission directly into the specific colleges. Professor Hanson responded that creating a lower division college would remove functions and funds from the Office of Student Affairs and the colleges. Professor Stuthman remarked that in many ways having admissions and records as part of the center makes a lot of sense.

Professor Berscheid inquired of the former deans on FCC whether they would have been willing as deans to surrender some of their budgetary and educational autonomy to a center. Professor Sorauf agreed that it would present an extremely delicate and difficult situation and that making the change would require a lot of talks with those involved. He thought he would have been willing to consider it. No one is willing to change structures and budgets, yet if the University is to improve, it must do so.

Professor Sorauf advocated the University's focusing its advising and counseling. Several speakers noted that not only the colleges but also OSA does academic counseling. Academic counseling involves far more people and funds than other kinds of counseling, Professor Sorauf pointed out.

Professor Hanson said the special committee is aware there would be many difficulties regarding the interfaces between the Center and many areas of the Office of Student Affairs. The committee was not ready to recommend shifting OSA responsibilities to the Center.

Professor Merwin held that whatever collection of responsibilities the Center would take on, it should report only to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; the other FCC members chorused agreement. Professor Sorauf commented that admissions could be shifted to the Center while records remained in OSA.

Professor Stuthman inquired as to where the special committee envisaged the home for the integrated courses, since experience has shown that without a unit home new offerings tend to die after the novelty has worn off. Professor Hanson said the special committee had not addressed that question.

Professor Rubenstein advocated omitting other proposals and concentrating entirely on proposing a enter which would work really well. The committee, he hoped, would try to think of all that the Center implies and include that in its report. Professor Stuthman added that without such specificity the proposal would be studied to death and nothing would ever come of it.

Professor Murphy inquired how the special committee sees its role in relation to the work of the Wallace Committee (The Student Experience), and the Page Committee (Quality of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning). Professor Hanson said his committee sees coordination as the main challenge and he termed their recommendation on that as modest in the draft.

Professor Berscheid inquired how the special committee would react if Professor Hanson received advice from many groups to make a real budgetary change. Professor Hanson anticipated that that would be difficult.

Professor Sorauf asked if anyone had proposed merging the Center with General College. Professor Hanson replied that General College spoke for joining its anticipated undergraduate research center and the proposed lower division center under one umbrella. General College would, in such a plan, expand its services now limited to special undergraduate students to include all students.

Professor Stuthman commented that there seems the possibility of some overlap between Center services and what a University hotline, under consideration in another committee, intends to achieve. Professor Hanson agreed that there would be room for integration between the two.

8. Draft of executive summary of the self-study committee. (Professor Rubenstein had distributed copies of this draft at the beginning of the FCC meeting.)

Professor Stuthman asked members to please read the report and communicate any comments to Professor Rubenstein. Professor Rubenstein urged members to look especially to see if the report misses anything regarding issues that are important for the University to address over the next ten years.

9. FCC-Regents dinner meeting on March 13.

Professor Stuthman reported that Regents' chairman McGuiggan had requested discussing the meeting topic with him. If members had further suggestions for defining the general proposed topic of the role of faculty in the governance

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

May 6, 1986

Professor Deon D. Stuthman, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
and
Professor Jack C. Merwin, Chair
Senate Finance Committee
411 Borlaug Hall
St. Paul Campus

Dear Deon and Jack:

You wrote to me on February 17, 1986, outlining your understanding of my position on the library acquisition budget. You asked me to write if I had a view different from that expressed in the letter.

I believe your letter reflects accurately the position I had taken. I would add only that we are treating the acquisitions budgets on the other campuses in the same way as we are treating the Twin Cities budget.

I believe you are aware of all of this. The only purpose of this letter is to complete the written record.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth H. Keller

KHK:kb

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
411 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone: (612)376-2479

February 17, 1986

President Kenneth H. Keller
University of Minnesota
202 Morrill Hall

Dear President Keller:

We are writing on behalf of the Senate Consultative Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to express our understanding of your intended resolution to the matter of the Twin Cities Libraries acquisition budget for 1985-86. It is on the basis of this understanding that the Library Committee chair agreed to temporarily withdraw the resolution that committee had prepared for the University Senate and which was shared with you at the meeting of the Finance Committee on February 5, 1986.

First some background as we understand it. The biennial request included an 8% increase in this budget. It did not include an equity request since it had been concluded that earlier equity allotments had brought the acquisition budget into reasonable balance with the average of those of the state universities of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Washington.

Based on the reduced estimate of general inflation of 3%, the Management Committee intended to reduce the allocation from 8% to 5½% (3% plus an estimated 2½% addition to meet the greater inflationary costs of library materials). This would result in an allocation of $4,080,542, or $114,741 less than the full 8% . Due to an error in processing, $51,000 of the intended allocation was not made and this error has recently been corrected.

It is our understanding that you are now reaffirming your commitment to a budget comparable to the average of the four institutions mentioned above, feel you need evidence that the increase in cost of libraries'acquisitions has indeed been 8% for this year, and if such evidence is forthcoming will provide the remaining $114,741 from internal resources. In

light of the position you have taken on this matter, we trust that if the evidence shows a cost price index greater than 5½% but less than 8%, that you would add the corresponding dollar amount above the 5½% to the budget for the Twin Cities Libraries acquisitions.

We would appreciate knowing if any of the above does not square with your view of this matter.

ORIGINAL sent to Merwin for signature & copying & then forwarding to President & others.

Sincerely yours,

Deon D. Stuthman, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

Jack
Senate Finance Committee

JCM&DDS:mp

c: Brian Job, Chair, Senate Library Committee
William Hanson, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SELF-STUDY REPORT

North Central Association Accreditation Review
April 1986

This Self-Study Report comprises an important part of the decennial accreditation review of the Twin Cities campus by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (Commission on Institutions of Higher Education). The University has been accredited by the North Central Association continuously since 1913. In October 1984, then President Magrath appointed the present North Central Association Accreditation Advisory Committee to prepare for the on-site team visit in April 1986, and charged them with the task of conducting an institutional self-study that goes beyond meeting the official requirements for accreditation. The Advisory Committee was directed to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Twin Cities campus with special emphasis on planning, faculty research, and graduate education. These three areas were selected because of the unique character of this institution in the State and because of the special planning efforts since the last review in 1976.

When Kenneth Keller assumed the presidency of the institution in 1985, he proposed an overall framework for the University's future called A Commitment to Focus, based on previous planning, which was subsequently endorsed by the Board of Regents. The North Central Association Advisory Committee believes that its report, "A University at the Crossroads: Self-Study Report for the 1986 North Central Association Accreditation Review," complements A Commitment to Focus by outlining the current status of programs, faculty, services and facilities, and by suggesting enhancements necessary if the goals articulated in A Commitment to Focus are to be realized. In addition, the committee believes that the Self-Study Report will provide a basis for assessing the success, ten years hence, of the University's efforts toward becoming one of the top five public institutions in the country, an avowed goal articulated by President Keller.

When the eight-member Review Team from the North Central Association visits the Twin Cities campus April 14-16, 1986, they will find an institution in the midst of significant change, deeply involved in discussions and activities related to issues such as: increased and unified entrance standards for undergraduates; greater coordination among the many units that provide undergraduate instruction; a new fund-raising initiative to expand the number of endowed chairs; and renewed efforts to recruit minority students and faculty.

At a time when the University is looking forward, the accreditation self-study must provide a view of the University's present status as well as describe the changes that have taken place since the last review. As the Self-Study Report suggests, the University of Minnesota, like other institutions of higher education in 1986, finds itself at the crossroads. The University grew dramatically in the 1960s and early 1970s, reflecting a national trend in increased enrollments in higher education. New programs also were added in response to pressures to resolve societal problems. Large numbers of new faculty were hired to meet the instructional needs and to develop these new programs of study. Now, faced with the prospect of decreasing enrollments and shrinking financial support, the University has decided to take this opportunity to become a more clearly focused institution, engaging in activities for which, as the only comprehensive Ph.D.-granting institution in the State, it is more clearly fitted, and to leave other activities to the many two- and four-year postsecondary institutions in the State.

SELF-STUDY PROCESS

The Advisory Committee has based the Self-Study Report on the following sources: six internal task force reports prepared in the last four years (See Appendix E); national trends in the funding of university research; the compilation of assessment efforts on various topics (e.g., program support and expenditures at the University versus

other Big Ten public universities); recently collected data from departments on issues ranging from visiting professorships to special incentives for faculty development; summaries of academic personnel records of relevant faculty characteristics (e.g., institutions from which faculty received their doctorates); characteristics of undergraduate, professional, and graduate students on the Twin Cities campus; summaries of evaluative studies of University faculty (e.g., sabbatical and single quarter leave experiences) and students (e.g., Former Student Survey Project); special focus group discussions with students and faculty; and the experience and opinions of University faculty and administrators on topics ranging from the libraries to the availability of secretarial support for research and instruction.

CONTENT OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The resulting Self-Study Report contains three sections. The first section includes an introduction and institutional overview, a summary of the University's responses to the last accreditation review, and a description of significant changes since the 1976 review, among other general topics. The second section provides the University's response to the criteria for accreditation mandated by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools: the general institutional requirements and the evaluative criteria. The third section provides a detailed framework for describing the unique character of the University: its comprehensiveness; the planning process; the undergraduate education mission; the professional education programs; the faculty, resources, and programs that make it a prestigious research institution; and the structure and programs that support the University's graduate education mission.

The three areas in this section that receive special emphasis are the sections on planning, faculty research, and graduate education. The discussion of planning includes a summary of the major planning activities of the past decade and a discussion of current planning issues.

The section on undergraduate education includes the following topics: enrollment trends; high school and University connections; recruitment of undergraduates; high ability students; minority students; demographic changes; changes of colleges and registration patterns; retention and graduation rates; quality of learning environments; advising; physical surroundings; employment opportunities; extracurricular activities; programs that improve undergraduate education; evaluations by undergraduates; and events affecting undergraduate education.

The section on faculty research, the most detailed of the three areas chosen for special emphasis, includes five topics: 1) faculty characteristics relevant to the University's research mission; 2) faculty workload issues that affect time available to do research; 3) outside financial support for faculty research; 4) University programs that facilitate faculty research; and 5) services that support faculty research (e.g., libraries, equipment, physical facilities).

The final section on graduate education is closely linked to the section on faculty research and includes the following topics: organization of the Graduate School; graduate faculty; programs of study available; Graduate School curricula and degrees awarded; policies and procedures of the Graduate School; recruitment activities and resulting applicants; special programs and services; employment opportunities; demographic characteristics including statistics on doctoral graduates; graduate student evaluations; reviews of graduate programs; and descriptions of several highly rated graduate programs.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In spite of serious financial constraints during the past decade, numerous significant changes have made the Twin Cities campus a more vital, better institution. Although the many new buildings on the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses are the most visible changes, other less obvious changes are

beginning to reshape the institution. Changes in the University's governance and personnel policies, such as the new Senate constitution in 1982 and a new tenure code in 1985, have been widely debated and subsequently endorsed. The University's planning process and other forces of change have affected faculty research and graduate, undergraduate and professional education.

In the area of planning, significant accomplishments include: the linking of budgeting and planning that began in 1979; initiating an early retirement program for faculty to reduce the number of tenured faculty, and the closing of units (e.g., the Library School) based on programmatic plans. Planning has had a significant impact on the University during the last decade.

The past decade includes numerous University initiatives to remove barriers to faculty research and to develop new programs to facilitate faculty research efforts. Among the accomplishments during the past decade are the following: the initiation of the Bush Sabbatical Program in 1981 to fund faculty sabbatical projects that list faculty research with undergraduate education; the use of special retention funds, beginning in 1983, to prevent the loss of the University's best research faculty; the initiatives taken to increase all faculty salaries to compensate for inflation losses; the actions taken in 1984 to enable the University to use the permanent endowment fund, together with funds from the Capital Compaign, to increase the number of endowed chairs; the increased use of indirect cost-recovery funds from sponsored research to facilitate faculty research (e.g., more funds to help with equipment needs); an improved patent office, now part of the Office of Research and Technology Transfer; several new research institutes and centers (e.g., Institute for Human Genetics, Supercomputer Institute, Center for Advanced Feminist Studies; a $7.5 million grant from IBM, called Project Woksape to expand the use of microcomputer work stations; and improvements in services that support faculty research, including University Libraries (e.g., increased allocations for book purchases, the beginning of automation, and the

change to the Library of Congress classification system) and the Computer Center (e.g., the microcomputer purchase program.) Most of the above changes have had a significant positive effect on graduate education, and some (e.g., the Bush Sabbatical Program and Project Woksape) have positively affected undergraduate education as well.

Other initiatives taken during the last decade have improved the University's competitiveness in recruiting highly qualified graduate students and in providing them with high quality educational experiences. Among these initiatives are the following: increased recruitment funds, including greater attention to departmental publicity to recruit graduate students; increased funding for the Graduate School Fellowship Program and the Dissertation Fellowship Program; an improved tuition structure that makes the University more attractive to out-of-state students; the 1985 tuition waiver program for graduate students employed 25 percent time or more; and streamlined PhD policies and procedures. Additional changes will occur as the recommendations in the report of the 1984 Task Force on the Quality of Graduate Education and Faculty Research are implemented.

During the past decade, the University's obligation to provide high quality undergraduate education received new attention. The two major related forces were the appointment of the Task Force on the Student Experience in 1983 and the creation of a new central officer in 1982, the Vice President for Undergraduate Education and University Outreach. The final report of the Task Force contained over 250 specific action steps to improve the quality of undergraduate education, approximately 15 percent of which have been implemented.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED

The Advisory Committee's analysis of planning activities during the last decade underscores the importance of formal planning processes in establishing

clearly articulated institutional goals and in developing strategies for achieving those goals. The success of that effort relies on University leadership that presents a vision for the University, such as that outlined in A Commitment to Focus, a vision that is shared widely among faculty on campus. That vision must be translated, however, by departmental units into the pursuit of excellence in each of their disciplines. The Advisory Committee's analysis of high quality University departments, not just excellent in research productivity but excellent in undergraduate and graduate instruction as well, underscores the key importance of departmental administrators in helping to create an environment in which excellence is expected and reinforced. Related planning concerns centered on the time required for overall institutional planning and the current absence of central administrators devoted solely to planning, the possible need for a planning advisory group, the role of the Management Committee (consisting of the University President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Finance and Operations) in planning and budgeting, and the absence of sufficient interface between program reviews and central planning and budgeting.

A second concern is the University's tendency to be less diverse in its student and faculty populations than other large research universities. This particular concern was noted in the two previous North Central Reviews: the 1966 Review Team stated that students would benefit from association with more high-quality outsiders. However, in spite of attempts by the University to recruit students from outside the State, currently 88 percent of the undergraduates and 50 percent of graduate students are from the State of Minnesota. A similar tendency is evidenced in statistics on institutions from which faculty received their doctorates: 29 percent of the PhD holders on the Twin Cities campus received their doctorates from the University of Minnesota.

A third theme revolves around setting standards that will enable the University to improve educational quality: strengthening the process of evaluating probationary faculty; increasing the recruiting efforts for the very best students and faculty; and being more effective in retaining the best and most productive faculty.

An additional issue centers on changes in University funding over the past decade, some of which were the direct result of the State's financial status. Although the University is trying to protect academic programs as much as possible from serious long-term damage, problems still exist in available funding. Expenditures per Full Year Equivalent (FYE) student fell from $4,344 in 1976-77 to $3,769 in 1983-84 in constant 1984 dollars, a decline of 13 percent. Also relevant are comparisons between this University and other Big Ten public institutions that indicated Minnesota's support per ranked faculty was seventh out of eight; the amount the University spends is $7,651 compared to $18,368 and $13,379 for the top two schools. The University of Minnesota ranked at the bottom of the list in expenditures for instructional equipment, with $11.67 per FYE student compared to $30.93 for the next-to-bottom institution.

How to enhance faculty members' research and scholarship without relinquishing the University's important undergraduate instruction mission is a fifth issue. The reality, that the University is the only public institution in a metropolitan area with a population of slightly over 2 million, dictates that the University must continue its heavy involvement in undergraduate education. Although the University of Minnesota hopes to become a more highly ranked graduate institution and to lower somewhat the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students it must do so by developing and expanding programs that simultaneously benefit faculty research (and, therefore, graduate education) and undergraduate education. More programs that achieve these dual purposes, such as the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program sugggested by the Task Force on

the Student Experience, are needed to link faculty research with undergraduate education.

Another issue relates to the various personnel and human resource issues that affect faculty quality, productivity and morale. A comprehensive system involves four processes: hiring promising faculty or those with proven track records; retaining the best faculty; providing resources and opportunities to keep faculty current, and developing procedures and options for counseling unproductive faculty. The University has made progress in its hiring practices and has initiated new steps to keep faculty. Members of the Advisory Committee expressed concerns about the perceived high percentages of probationary faculty who receive tenure at the University compared to percentages at institutions we aspire to be like. The University also has several programs available to keep faculty current, although some of these options (e.g., sabbaticals) are underused. The University's sabbatical and single quarter leave programs provide development opportunities that are not always provided elsewhere. There have been few attempts, however, to develop programs for retraining or stimulating faculty who have become less productive. In regard to this last issue, no systems are available, for example, to identify faculty who should no longer have graduate faculty status. Another issue that concerns graduate faculty is a system of dual certification that requires faculty to apply for graduate status.

Employment related concerns for undergraduate and graduate students is also an issue, the nature of which differs for the two groups. For undergraduate students, the primary concern is the high percentage of undergraduates who work, out of necessity, a significant number of hours in jobs that have no educational value. For some students, work comes first and school comes second; for some students high pay rates for campus jobs are an incentive for them to attend the University. The concern for graduate students involves the low level of financial support for graduate students which forces many to seek non-University employment that is detrimental to their graduate study.

The general conditions of physical facilities on the Twin Cities campus is a serious concern, in spite of recent additions to the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. The University has excellent facilities in some areas, but is decades behind in facilities in other areas, especially modern classrooms and laboratories for both undergraduate and graduate students. Extensive refurbishing is necessary if the University is to keep up with the technologies available to enhance research and teaching activities.

The final issue, support for faculty members' research and instruction, especially library resources, computer facilities and resources and laboratory equipment, involves two related points. The first point, one supported by comparative data as well as the sense of the faculty, is that the University's resources in these areas do not compare well with those at institutions we hope to emulate. The second point is the widespread opinion among faculty that the support services that are provided are not effectively implemented. The important issue here is that the University has no ongoing system to monitor the effectiveness of services (e.g., libraries and computing facilities) that are intended to support faculty research and teaching.

-- -- -- -- -- -- --

The Advisory Committee hopes that this Self-Study Report will generate discussion within the University community and with the Review Team of ways in which to further the pursuit of excellence outlined in A Commitment to Focus.

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION ACCREDITATION REVIEW

Professor Irwin Rubenstein, Department of Genetics and Cell Biology, College of Biological Sciences, Chair

Professor Mark Brenner, Department of Horticultural Sciences and Landscape Architecture, College of Agriculture

Professor Patricia Broen, Department of Communication Disorders, College of Liberal Arts

Professor Gary Gray, Department of Chemistry, Institute of Technology

Mr. Tony Hill, Undergraduate Student

Professor Warren Ibele, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology

Professor Frank Irving, Department of Forest Resources, College of Forestry

Ms. Ruth MacDonald, Department of Food Science and Nutrition, Graduate Student

Professor Shirley Moore, Institute of Child Development, College of Education

Mr. Keith Morton, Department of American Studies, Graduate Student

Professor Betty Wallace Robinett, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Central Administration Coordinator

Professor John Sullivan, Department of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts

Dr. Darwin Hendel, Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Staff

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the University Attorney
330 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-3446

January 16, 1986

TO: Professor Boylan
Chair, SCFA

FROM: Stephen S. Dunham SSD

RE: Rajender Settlement - Internal Tribunal Petition

Enclosed is a revised settlement agreement which more clearly defines the proposed role for SCFA (and makes other changes as well to reflect comments of other committees). I will come to your 1/24/86 meeting to discuss the document and the Committee's reactions. If any of the individuals copied by this memo have further comments, I ask that they give me a call.

SSD:amf
Enclosure

cc: Greg Fox, Chair, ASAC
Deon Stuthman, Chair FCC
Vera Schletzer, Chair EEOWC
Roger Park, Chair SJC
Samuel Krislov, Chair, Tenure Committee
Associate Vice President Robinett
Director Patricia Mullen

1/3/86 DRAFT

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND GENERAL RELEASE

The individuals who have signed Exhibit A ("petitioners") and the Regents of the University of Minnesota ("University") agree to settle the cases listed in Exhibit A as follows:

1. The University agrees to fund a one-half time academic position called the Academic Staff Assistance Officer ("Officer"). The Officer will begin work as soon as an appropriate person can be selected. If the Officer is currently an academic employee of the University, he or she shall be given one half released time from other University duties to carry out the responsibilities of the Office. The University agrees to provide the Academic Staff Assistance Officer with reasonable secretarial staff, equipment and supplies. The University agrees that the Officer shall be a free standing position, independent of University administration, and shall report to and work under the direction of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs ("SCFA").

The Chair of the SCFA, after consultation with the Committee and the Chair of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee, shall make decisions on all matters affecting terms and conditions of the Officer's employment, including initial salary, salary increases, disciplinary actions, scope of authority, job responsibilities, fringe benefits, termination,

and the like. If the Officer is a current University employee, terms and conditions of employment, including salary and fringe benefits, shall be consistent with the individual's regular appointment, except that the Officer shall be employed on an 11-month basis (i.e., an "A" appointment if a faculty member). The Vice President for Academic Affairs may reject any decision of the SCFA Chair if he or she concludes that the action is contrary to University policy or law.

The initial Officer shall serve an 18-month term. The Officer shall be selected by a committee comprised of two members chosen by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and one member chosen by the Academic Staff Advisory Committee. The committee's selection shall be subject to approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the petitioners. If the University decides to continue this position beyond the initial 18-month term, the method of selection shall be set at that time, but it is not anticipated that the petitioners would have a continuing role in the selection.

The Officer shall provide information and assistance to all academic employees ragarding internal University grievance procedures (whether or not arising out of a Rajender claim) with the understanding that this includes assistance with both discovery and assessing the merits of the grievance. Beyond that, the Officer shall help the academic employee in securing

either mediation or a faculty advocate to advise her/him through the grievance process. The Officer shall also recruit and train volunteer faculty advisors to represent parties in the discovery process, during mediation and at hearings.

The University and petitioners agree to review this position and its possible continuation before the end of the initial 18-month term. As part of this review the SCFA should make a recommendation concerning continuation of the position, whether it should be full-time or less, whether the secretarial assistance and supplies are adequate, the proper scope of the Officer's responsibilities, etc.

2. Individuals who have filed Rajender claims which the University has referred to an internal tribunal and the University may choose whether a decision of an internal tribunal will be binding or advisory. The decision will be binding only if both parties select that option. When any such internal tribunal committee has reached a decision that is advisory, the President of the University or his or her representative will make a decision in writing to accept or reject such a decision within thirty calendar days of receipt of the decision or provide written reasons why further time is necessary.

3. The University may refer claims to the Judicial Committee as provided by existing procedures under the Consent Decree. The University and an individual claimant may also

agree on any other form of internal tribunal or other dispute resolution process, including arbitration, ad hoc committees whose members are selected by the parties or by lot, reference to the Academic Staff Advisory Committee with respect to a professional or administrative staff employee, review by a designated individual or mediation.

4. The University will set up procedures for non-binding and voluntary mediation of any and all disputes involving Rajender claims. With agreement of the parties, the mediation procedure may include any or all of the following steps:

(i) meeting and discussion with the appropriate department head;

(ii) meeting and discussion with the appropriate dean or director;

(iii) meeting and discussion with members of central administration or their representatives;

(iv) meeting and discussion conducted by an independent academic employee. The mediator could be selected by the parties from a list of mediators maintained by the Academic Staff Assistance Officer or could be an individual otherwise agreed to by the parties. It is contemplated that in most instances the mediation process will be completed within 30 days.

5. The University administration agrees to send a letter to the Judicial Committee recommending that the Judicial Committee give serious consideration to the changes in Judicial Committee operating procedures recommended by the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Internal Tribunals at pages 4-16 of Part II

of the Report. The letter will also recommend that the Judicial Committee meet and confer with the petitioners, if the petitioners so request, on or before January 1, 1987 to establish a schedule for decisions on those items contained in pages 4-16 of Part II of the Report which are within the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee. If the petitioners so request in writing, a representative of the University Attorneys Office will meet with petitioners on or before January 1, 1987, to discuss the status of the Judicial Committee's review. Any changes in the Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Committee must be approved as well by the Tenure Committee.

6. The parties agree to enter a Stipulation of Dismissal without Prejudice to be filed with the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. The petitioners agree not to file a petition based on substantially similar allegations for 18 months after the date of this Agreement.

7. The University will pay to petitioners and their attorney, Carol A. O'Toole, _____ for legal fees and costs.

8. There are no covenants, promises, undertakings or understandings outside of this Settlement Agreement and General Release nor other than as specifically set forth herein.

9. The undersigned, by execution hereof, state that this Settlement Agreement and General Release has been read by them and by legal counsel, and that the undersigned understand and fully agree to each, all and every provision hereof and acknowledge receipt of a copy hereof.

Dated:_____ _____
Betty Wallace Robinett
Associate Vice President for
Academic Affairs

Dated:_____ _____
Carol Campbell
Treasurer and Controller

Approved as to form:

Dated:_____ _____
Stephen S. Dunham
General Counsel of the
University of Minnesota

Dated:_____ _____
Carol A. O'Toole
Attorney for Petitioners

INTERIM REPORT
OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
COORDINATING LOWER-DIVISION EDUCATION
ON THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS

University of Minnesota

January, 1986

For Review and Comment

Members of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower-Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus:

William Hanson, Professor and Chair, Department of Philosophy, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and Chair
Thomas Daniels, Student, School of Management, and Student Representative to the Board of Regents
Sandra Flake, Associate Professor, General College, and Member, University College Assembly
Patricia Gearrick, Student, Institute of Technology, and Member, Senate Consultative Committee
Russell Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology
Kenneth Howey, Associate Dean, College of Education
Fred Lukermann, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Ian Maitland, Associate Professor, School of Management, and Member, Student Academic Support Services Committee
William Rempel, Professor, Department of Animal Science
Steven Schomberg, Director, Summer Session
Alexander Sellers, Student, College of Liberal Arts
Eleanor Sullivan, Associate Dean and Associate Professor, School of Nursing
Patricia Swan, Professor, Department of Food Science and Nutrition, and Member, Senate Planning Committee
Elizabeth Wales, Director, Student Counseling Bureau
John Wallace, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs
George Wright, Professor, Department of English
Kenneth Doyle, Research Associate, Educational Development Programs, and Staff

THE CHALLENGE OF PROVIDING HIGH-QUALITY LOWER-DIVISION EDUCATION ON THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS

The charge of this special committee was to "examine goals and means for improving lower-division education" at the University of Minnesota. Specifically, we were charged with determining how best to implement those recommendations in Commitment to Focus that concern coordinating lower-division education on the Twin Cities Campus. We were asked to examine and make recommendations on four areas: advising and counseling, curriculum, co-curricular activities, and standards for transition to the upper division; and to take up such matters as the feasibility of establishing an administratively distinct lower division, possibilities for improved coordination of resources in colleges and other units that serve lower-division students, guaranteed admission to the upper division for a selected group of new freshmen, access to the University for underprepared students, and the possible roles of the General College in a coordinated lower division.

In carrying out our charge we reflected on the major goals of lower-division education, which we take to be three: to introduce students to life in an academic community; to provide them with the beginnings of a sound liberal education; and to prepare them for, and facilitate their transition to, the more specialized phase of their undergraduate work, the upper division. Each of these goals poses special difficulties and challenges on the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota.

Helping students to function effectively as members of an academic community involves both introducing them to appropriate habits of thought, study, and communication and helping them become integrated socially into the community. These are of course related, and they pose special challenges on the Twin Cities campus in view of the size and diversity of the student body, the fragmentation of many student careers due to part-time and discontinuous registration, and the fact that most students are commuters.

Providing students with the beginnings of a sound liberal education involves ensuring that they acquire certain basic skills and that they become familiar with the methods and the results of inquiry in several areas of learning. The latter goal is often pursued by means of distribution requirements, a core curriculum, or courses that attempt to integrate the subject matter of several disciplines. (Not all of this needs to be accomplished during the first two years of study, but it seems reasonable to expect that a good deal of it will be.) The challenge here is to decide on an approach or approaches that best meet the needs of the diverse student body described above and that make optimum use of the resources available at a major research university.

Preparing students for and facilitating their transition to the more specialized part of their undergraduate education is integrally related to

provision of the skills and background just mentioned, since all have traditionally been thought of as important parts of a liberal education. The sheer size of the Twin Cities campus and the large number of different programs it offers make it essential that students be well apprised of the range of opportunities and that they receive good counsel in making their choices.

We believe that a balanced approach to lower-division education on the Twin Cities campus requires recognition and creative use of the unique resources that are available here. These include: a high-quality faculty actively engaged in research; a large graduate-student population, many of whom play important roles as teaching assistants; a collection of fields of study that is by far the largest of any available in the state; and the cultural opportunities available in the metropolitan area. By creative and efficient use of these resources the Twin Cities campus can offer a program of both lower- and upper-division education that is sound, attractive to students, and unavailable at any other institution in the state, public or private. Indeed, to a considerable extent the undergraduate program on this campus already fits that description.

We believe the undergraduate program can be improved significantly,however, and this report contains a number of recommendations for doing so. Before getting down to specifics, however, we want to make five rather divergent points as a background to everything else that is said in this report.

1. **When implementing changes in the present system, we should take care not to deplete the resources of valuable programs that are already seriously underfunded.** Funding for instructional expenditures in the undergraduate colleges on the Twin Cities campus is low, and in some colleges these funds have decreased significantly in recent years. Yet these same colleges bear the major responsibility for lower-division education, and under the recommendations of this report they will continue to do so. There are many valuable programs that need more funds if the number of students they serve stays the same, or fewer students to serve if the level of funding remains constant. One of the main principles of Commitment to Focus is that ways must be found to increase the level of funding per student. This principle must be borne in mind when implementing the recommendations of this report.

2. **The focus on research and graduate education on the Twin Cities campus can be used to advantage in lower-division education.** Too much has been made of the tension between this focus and the goal of undergraduate--and especially lower-division--education. Undergraduates can play an active role in the research mission of the University (witness the success of the recently initiated UROP program), and graduate teaching assistants are an unduly maligned group of teachers. With proper training and supervision graduate students can be effective teachers. They often approach their work with enthusiasm and, being not far removed from their own undergraduate experiences, can readily understand and empathize with their students' problems.

3. **A new state law makes it particularly important that special attention be paid to lower-division education at this time.** Under the Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Act of 1985, Minnesota high school students in grades 11 and 12 may register for courses at colleges and universities in the state and use the state aid that would ordinarily go to their school districts. There are already nearly 200 students at the University under this act. The act has the potential to bring many more young students to the University and seems to be part of a trend to soften the present sharp boundaries between secondary and post-secondary education. In these circumstances it is important for the University to review carefully its plans and procedures for educating beginning students.

4. **New entrance standards are likely to be adopted that will change the University's opportunities and responsibilities with respect to lower-division students.** The Special Committee on Unified and Increased Freshman Entrance Standards is considering recommending a number of standards (i.e., four years of high school English, three years of social studies, three years of mathematics, three years of science, two years of a foreign language, and one year of fine arts) that students would be strongly encouraged to meet before entering the University and would be required to have met at a subsequent point in their careers, perhaps before entering upper division or declaring a major. If such recommendations are adopted the University will need to: provide appropriately challenging courses for entering students who meet the standards; provide more basic courses for those who do not; provide advising that is sensitive to these standards and helps students satisfy them in a way that is least disruptive of their college-level work.

5. **The recent reports of two other special committees bear heavily on lower-division education and should be considered in conjunction with this report.** The reports of the Task Force on the Student Experience (1984; "the Wallace Report") and the Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (1985; "the Page Report") contain many excellent recommendations, the implementation of which would substantially improve lower-division education on the Twin Cities campus. We see our role as differing from that of these two committees in a number of ways, the most important being that our charge focuses on lower-division education, and that we are specifically charged with considering the feasibility of establishing an administratively distinct lower division. We nevertheless think of this report as complementing the two reports just mentioned.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The special committee's recommendations fall into two parts. First, we recommend the creation of an undergraduate center which, by being actively involved in a number of related educational activities, would come to serve

as a focal point for certain aspects of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. This center would be, in our opinion, the most effective of the educational coordination models we studied, and among the least expensive. It strikes us as an excellent locus of responsibility for many of the more specific recommendations contained in our report, in the Wallace and Page reports, and in Commitment to Focus. Second, we recommend a large number of other, more specific improvements, many of which deal especially with lower-division education. These recommendations are aimed at raising the quality of teaching and advising that students receive, encouraging students to take advantage of the broad range of opportunities available on this campus, and helping to involve students in the intellectual life of the University.

I. An Undergraduate Center

We recommend that an undergraduate center be created on the Twin Cities campus. A major role of the center would be to provide a single point of contact for prospective students, new students, and students who need special help in transferring within the University or between the University and another institution. The center would also provide leadership to support and coordinate teaching, advising, and co-curricular efforts that are intended primarily for large numbers of new students. In all of its activities the center would work closely with the several undergraduate colleges and would be careful to avoid duplication of effort. The result should be a significant enhancement of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus at a modest cost. The center would be a valuable resource not only for lower-division students, but also for prospective students and their parents, transfer students, and students who have not formed strong collegiate or departmental associations.

Much of the center's effort would be devoted to advising. Its staff would be thoroughly informed about the advising services available on the Twin Cities campus and so would be a major source of advising referrals. It would also have some advising services of its own that are not available elsewhere, and it would work to coordinate undergraduate advising on the Twin Cities campus. More specifically, the center would be responsible for providing or coordinating the following advising services:

Pre-college advising

Advising for students enrolled under the Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Act

Advising concerning transfers into, within, and out of the University

Drop-in advising

The center's role in advising would be to supplement but not supplant existing advising services. In particular, major and pre-major advising would continue to be provided by the several colleges.

In addition to its responsibility for advising, the center would play an important role in other areas of undergraduate education. These would include recruitment and orientation of new students, and coordination among offices responsible for special student needs (e.g., commuter, extension, minority, handicapped, transfer). They would also include coordination of planning for the preparatory courses that will have to be offered because of new entrance standards, and encouragement of a reduction in restrictions that limit the extent to which students may use credits taken in one college to satisfy the requirements of another.

The center would be headed by a director reporting to the vice president for academic affairs. The director would be advised by a committee consisting of deans representing each of the undergraduate colleges on the Twin Cities campus, a representative of the vice president for student affairs, and representatives from the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy and the Assembly Committee on Student Academic Support Services. In addition to the operation of the center, the director would be responsible for coordinating certain collegiate and student affairs activities. In particular the director would:

Hold regular meetings of directors of collegiate prospective-student advising offices

Work closely with departments to coordinate teaching-assistant training, especially the orientation of non-native teaching assistants to American educational practices and social mores

Hold regular meetings of officers responsible for student-life and academic-service programs for new students (e.g., OSA unit heads, directors of undergraduate studies)

Encourage and organize workshops on student life, teaching strategies, and other academic issues

Convene and chair a committee on the teaching of larger classes

Work to provide optimum integration of the resources and services available in the restructured General College with other units of the University

Encourage appropriate departments to offer courses of the sorts described in II-5-b, below.

The special committee believes that an undergraduate center of the kind just described can be effective without being large or costly. Some funds may become available as a result of restructuring done in implementing Commitment to Focus (e.g., by reducing the number of personnel in University Without Walls), and some of the staff currently working in the Office of the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Outreach might be

reassigned to the center. The center should also be staffed in part by sharing personnel with the undergraduate colleges and student affairs. We strongly endorse the principle that funds for the center should not be obtained by retrenching colleges that have major responsibilities for undergraduate education and that have already been heavily retrenched in recent years.

II. Other Recommendations

Our remaining recommendations fall into five groups. Many of these recommendations could be implemented in whole or in part by the undergraduate center. The five groups are: Recommendations concerning advising; recommendations concerning quality of teaching; recommendations concerning full use of educational opportunities; recommendations for involving students; and recommendations concerning the General College.

A. Recommendations Concerning Advising.

1. Several different kinds of academic advising are needed, and these are often best provided by different kinds of staff: content advising by faculty, university-requirements advising by professional advisors, etc. The University should catalogue the kinds of advising that are available and communicate that information to students.

2. In order to help improve performance and increase the status of advising done by faculty we recommend:

   a. Increasing the relevance of advising in hiring, promotion, tenure, and salary decisions;

   b. Providing appropriately adjusted work loads in selected cases for faculty who have heavy undergraduate advising responsibilities.

3. With respect to both faculty and professional advisors we recommend:

   a. Increasing the frequency of public testimony by top administrators on the value and significance of high-quality undergraduate advising;

   b. Creation of a comprehensive and regularly updated information source (e.g., a notebook or a computerized data base) that would be available to all advisors and contain information on such things as registration procedures, courses, majors, distribution and graduation requirements;

   c. Ongoing evaluation of advisors and the advising system;

   d. Ongoing training and refresher courses for advisors;

e. Provision of limited financial support for attendance at conferences on advising;

f. Recognition of the importance of reasonable advisor/student ratios;

g. Support for a collaborative network and newsletter for advisors;

h. Institution of a widely accessible information system for students (e.g., a campus phone system) that would provide brief and accurate advice on where to go and whom to contact for help in solving commonly encountered problems.

B. Recommendations Concerning Quality of Teaching.

4. The University should emphasize its particular strengths in lower-division teaching (e.g., enormous range of courses, teaching by scholars of national and international repute) and at the same time work to remedy the deficiencies that often correspond to those strengths (e.g., large classes, limited faculty/student contact). In order to improve teaching and learning in the lower division and to increase the status of lower-division teaching in the University, we recommend:

a. That the University take steps to assure that quality of teaching is accorded substantial weight in tenure and promotion decisions in all departments. We endorse the view of the Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (Roger Page, chair) that changes in the University's formal reward system are a precondition of any lasting changes in the emphasis faculty members give to undergraduate teaching. We do not propose a radical restructuring of the criteria for tenure, promotion, or salary increases, but even modest changes in incentives may help to improve teaching in some colleges. Specifically, we recommend that teaching be accorded more weight in faculty evaluations.

b. The establishment of a standing committee on the teaching of large classes, as proposed in the final report of the Task Force on the Undergraduate Experience (John Wallace, chair; p. 56; see also the Page report, p. 11). This committee would be composed of representatives from the Twin Cities campus's largest courses and would be chaired by the director of the undergraduate center. It would serve as a clearing house for the collection and dissemination of the best practice for teaching large classes. It might also supervise the implementation of Wallace and Page recommendations where appropriate. It would have special responsibility for the development and diffusion of active learning strategies.

c. That departments provide their graduate students, especially those

who are preparing for academic careers, with supervised teaching experiences and other training as teachers.

d. Substantially increased funding for teaching assistants and for their training on methods for organizing small learning groups in large classes (Wallace report, p. 56). Better use of graduate students would help to overcome the supposed impersonality of large classes. Moreover, this represents one area where synergy can be realized from the University's often competing missions.

e. That graduate assistants who are not native speakers of English be required to meet minimum cultural familiarity and English language proficiency standards set by the ESL program. All costs of instruction and testing would be borne centrally, not by the graduate assistant's home department.

f. More extensive use of undergraduate teaching assistants, in classroom teaching as well as individual tutoring. We believe that undergraduate assistantships not only help the University economically but also play a major role in involving students in the educational process.

C. Recommendations Concerning Full Use of Educational Opportunities.

5. One of the University's great strengths is the breadth of educational opportunity it offers its students. In order to take advantage of that breadth we recommend that:

a. A general bulletin or similar resource listing and describing all courses offered in the Twin Cities should be compiled and made available to students and faculty;

b. A small number of integrative courses should be offered in each major area (science, social science, and humanities) that would count toward the satisfaction of the basic CLE requirements. These should be designed cooperatively by departments and the six freshman-admitting colleges (but only by departments and colleges that want to participate in the development of such courses). Whether or not such courses should be required by departments or colleges is a question that can be answered only after the courses have been designed and tried out. If they were required, probably it would be sensible (at least to begin with) to require them only of new students entering directly from high school (i.e., not from late-arriving transfer students).

Alternative models for such integrative courses might be considered: for example, thematic courses that raise questions or invite solutions across the whole spectrum of humanistic, social-scientific, and scientific disciplines; or a basic course or courses in each of the four groups (A, B, C, D). Such alternative

models might have the advantage of stressing content less than method of inquiry. But each such model has weaknesses as well as strengths.

These courses should be taught by both senior and junior faculty rather than by teaching assistants.

c. A wider variety of humanities, arts, and social science courses might be offered on the St. Paul campus by Minneapolis departments, programs, and colleges. In addition, we would urge a review of the completeness of curricula offered through our evening and summer programs.

d. A review of current home-college restrictions against registration in other colleges should be undertaken by the office of academic affairs.

e. The University should reactivate the Senate plan whereby SCEP is responsible for policy on CLE distribution requirements and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is responsible for implementation and monitoring. Regular review of distribution requirements should focus on the spirit of the regulations as well as on the letter.

D. Recommendation for Involving Students.

6. The University should take steps to involve lower-division students, especially commuters, more deeply in the life of the Twin Cities campus. We advocate making the University a more personal organization, involving students more fully in their education, and devising ways for faculty to play a more active role in involving students in campus life through academic programs. To this end we recommend that the University develop many small communities around the activities of academic departments; organize (when feasible) advising and counseling into smaller, more comprehensive centers; and teach introductory, survey, and core courses in such ways that students have greater opportunity for personal intellectual exchange with one another and with an instructor.

E. Recommendations Concerning General College

7. General College has a long history of special contribution to the teaching mission of the University as well as particular experience in advising undergraduate students, in developing and offering introductory, integrative, and cross-disciplinary courses, and in research and experimentation with teaching. In the light of that history and experience, we see the following as activities that might be emphasized in the General College:

a. Developing and implementing new preparatory or remedial courses that could be required by new University entrance standards, as well as those integrative courses described in Recommendation II-C-5-b, above;

b. Disseminating knowledge gained from research and experience in undergraduate instruction (e.g., on active learning strategies, on teaching to students with different cognitive styles, and on teaching large classes);

c. Working with the undergraduate center to facilitate transfer of General College courses to other colleges;

d. Consultation on the training, evaluation, and use of graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants and advisors.

APPENDIX I: THE PROCESS THAT LED TO THIS INTERIM REPORT

The special committee's fall-quarter work proceeded in three stages. In the first stage we studied the current state of affairs in the six freshman-admitting colleges. As a committee of the whole, we interviewed representatives from each of these colleges--Liberal Arts, Technology, General College, Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics--and we studied documents that these people provided.

In the second stage, we divided into subcommittees that studied and made recommendations on some important educational problems and concerns. One subcommittee focused on quality of advising on the lower division; a second focused on quality of teaching, especially in large classes; a third addressed ways to maximize breadth of educational opportunity for lower-division students; and the fourth studied ways to involve undergraduate students in university life. (These areas of concern had been suggested to us by a group of faculty, administrators, and administrative staff [Richard Heydinger, coordinator] that spent part of the summer examining issues related to Commitment to Focus.) The subcommittees' study of these four areas, which included interviews of key University personnel and examination of relevant data and documents, resulted in written reports that were distributed to the whole committee.

In the third stage of our fall-quarter work, we examined the subcommittee reports and addressed issues of lower-division coordination germane to those reports. In particular we studied three models for administrative coordination, two of which had been suggested by the Heydinger group, the third by one of our subcommittees.

One of these models, one which our charge explicitly asks us to consider, is the "unified college" model. This model features an independent lower-division college that would be the point of entry for all freshmen. Under this model students would spend their first two undergraduate years in the lower-division college and would transfer to other undergraduate colleges at the beginning of their junior year. The new college would be responsible for all aspects of lower-division instruction and advising, but it would not have a separate faculty. Rather it would arrange to purchase the instructional services its students required from the existing undergraduate colleges.

The second model we considered was the "overlay" model, after the fashion of the University's Graduate School and explicitly mentioned in Commitment to Focus. Under this model, students would be admitted to existing undergraduate colleges, but there would be a new collegiate unit that would assume many of the responsibilities for lower-division education that are now assigned to those colleges. This new college would also have a voice in some decisions that at present are internal matters in existing colleges, such as allocation of funds for teaching assistants and some personnel decisions.

The final model we considered was the "undergraduate center" model that is described in some detail in the "Recommendations" section of this interim report.

Our study of these three models led us to the conclusion that creation of an undergraduate center of the kind we describe, along with implementation of our other recommendations, would result in important improvements in undergraduate education at all levels, not just at the lower-division level. We preferred the undergraduate center to the other models for several reasons. One of these is our reluctance to create costly new administrative structures at a time when instructional funds for several existing undergraduate colleges are inadequate and have been decreasing for a number of years. Another is the fact that many of the students who would benefit most from the kinds of services and opportunities that a lower-division college is intended to provide are those who are transferring (either into, within, or out of the University) or returning after a break in their study. Not all of these are lower-division students. The undergraduate center that we propose would be able to help them, but a lower-division college would not. Still another reason is the fact that the distinction between lower and upper division is growing less sharp over time.

We reached consensus on this interim report toward the end of fall quarter. This report is to be circulated widely for reaction. Our final report is due at the end of winter quarter, 1986.

APPENDIX II: DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF THE CURRENT STATE OF AFFAIRS REGARDING LOWER-DIVISION ADVISING, TEACHING, USE OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, AND INVOLVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN UNIVERSITY LIFE

A significant part of the special committee's work was to investigate the current state of affairs in the six freshman-admitting colleges with respect to academic advising and counseling; quality of teaching, especially in large courses; access to the full breadth of curricular opportunities; and involvement of lower-division students in the undergraduate experience. Part of this study we pursued as a committee-of-the-whole, part as subcommittees corresponding to those four areas of inquiry. We provide this summary of what we learned as both background and rationale for the discussion and recommendations that appear in the body of our report.

Advising

The six colleges have developed a variety of approaches to advising that reflect the needs of their respective kinds of students and the characteristics of the colleges. To meet the widely divergent needs of a very large number of lower-division students, the College of Liberal Arts uses professional and paraprofessional advisors with assistance from faculty. The Institute of Technology, with its large number of pre-professional students, uses a combination of faculty advising and peer advising. The General College, to meet the needs inherent in an open-admissions college, uses faculty advisors supplemented by full-time professional advisors and peer advisors. College of Agriculture advising is done principally by regular faculty. The College of Home Economics assigns new students to paraprofessional advisors before transferring them to faculty advisors. And the College of Forestry assigns all new students to paraprofessional advisors, later transferring them to faculty advisors. Graduate students are widely employed as advisors in the majority of colleges.

The principal strengths of the lower-division advising system reside in the commitment and competence of many of the advisors and especially in the closeness with which some of the comprehensive advising programs work with students (e.g., OMMSA, MLK, General College, CEE, and the honors programs). The principal weaknesses are that faculty advising is neither recognized nor rewarded by either the salary and promotion processes or the general University cultures; that inservice training and evaluation are spotty; that career-planning programs and back-up advising services (e.g., during vacations) are very limited; and that an accurate and continually updated information system for advisers is lacking. We note two different studies which show that fully half the undergraduates surveyed described the performance of their major advisors as only "fair to poor"; we also note, however, that data on major advisors do not, strictly speaking, apply to lower-division advising.

Teaching

Although teaching formats vary perhaps almost as much within the larger colleges as across them, we did note some trends in type of instructor in entry-level courses and in class size. In general, the larger the college (in terms of total teaching hours), the larger the percentage of entry-level class hours that are taught by instructors who are not regular faculty. This fact needs to be tempered by additional information, however; namely that many students from the smaller colleges take their basic courses in the larger colleges, and that in the larger colleges many of the courses have regular faculty teaching the main sections, other instructors (usually TAs) teaching laboratory and recitation sections. Although average entry-level class sizes are consistently quite small in the freshman-admitting colleges (median 22-25, including lab and recitation sections), the majority of students in CLA and IT experience at least one extremely large class (300+ students) in their freshman year, and virtually all students experience at least one large class (80+ students). On the other hand, virtually all freshmen also experience at least one small class (fewer than 39 students), though many of these small classes are laboratory or recitation sections.

The principal strengths in lower-division instruction seem to be the enormous range of courses, many of them taught by nationally or internationally noted scholars, and the cost-effectiveness of much of the teaching program. The principal weaknesses seem to be the widespread perception that the lower-division teaching program is accorded lower priority; that large classes too often involve passive instruction and inaccessible instructors; that the University reward system discourages faculty effort, involvement, and instructional creativity; that some non-native teaching assistants still lack English fluency and familiarity with American culture; and that cheating on papers and examinations continues.

Breadth of Opportunity

There are relatively few formal barriers to cross-college registration, except for occasional home-college limitations on the number of credits that may be taken in other colleges. The letter of the law regarding CLE distribution requirements is apparently being observed throughout the campus, but the spirit of the law is not. Few faculty and fewer students, it seems, recognize the essential purposes of the CLE requirements. Moreover, the number of credits minimally required for a given distribution group varies substantially across colleges, and the list of courses that satisfy the different group requirements seems to be growing with little control. Finally, there is no convenient and visible information system for telling students and faculty what courses are available outside their home colleges.

The principal strength of the University with regard to curricular opportunity is also the sheer number and variety of course offerings, enhanced by the paucity of administrative constraints that operate against taking full

advantage of these opportunities. The principal weakness seems to be that there are other strong disincentives for doing so: the current job-oriented student culture; the absence of readily available information about alternative courses; the geography of the campus; and the lack of faculty and staff encouragement to seek breadth.

Involving Students

The University offers an enormous number and range of opportunities for lower-division students to involve themselves in the undergraduate experience: fraternities, sororities, residence halls, campus jobs, recreational sports programs and a myriad of student-interest clubs and associations. Indeed there are more than 500 student organizations formally recognized by the Student Organization Development Center. The Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs provides extensive support for these organizations and for the many thousands of students who participate in them. On the other hand, some 30-35 percent of lower-division students apparently neither work on campus nor affiliate themselves with any of these organizations. Moreover, questions about the academic value of various of these student programs and organizations are periodically raised.

Approximately 65 percent of lower-division students live a mile or more from campus; indeed, slightly more than half live four or more miles away. Many of these students, for whatever reason (jobs, transportation, competing demands, personal preference), spend little more time on campus than their class schedules require.

The principal strength of the University with regard to lower-division student involvement in the undergraduate experience is the breadth of the extracurricular opportunities, aided by the extensive student organization support system. The principal weakness seems to be that the system does not reach deeply enough into the student body. Some of the impediments to greater student involvement are largely beyond the control of the institution: many students must live off campus; many students must work; the campus is large; the student services systems are highly routinized; the winters discourage lingering outside; and some students just do not want to be involved. Other impediments are perhaps more remediable: there is an unnecessary chasm between curricular and extracurricular experiences, between academic efforts and student-affairs efforts; students, despite being physically massed together, are psychologically isolated from one another; inside lounge space is very limited; and there is limited opportunity for personal exchange in perhaps the majority of lower-division classes.

APPENDIX III: SELECTED DATA USED BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In this appendix we present various sets of data that were of particular interest to our committee or its subcommittees.

Tables 1 and 2 refer to class size. Table 1 describes mean and median class size for 1-, 3-, and 5-level courses. Table 2 describes the class sizes experienced by freshman and sophomores in the freshman-admitting colleges on the Twin Cities campus. The figures in the first table come from enrollment data supplied by Management Planning and Information Services. The figures in the second table come from a study conducted at the request of the Task Force on the Undergraduate Student Experience.

Tables 3 and 4 refer to instructor rank. Table 3 describes the number of class hours taught in 1-, 3-, and 5-level courses by college and instructor rank. Table 4 breaks these data down by course level instead of instructor rank. These figures come from the 1982 Admissions and Records' Course Inventory.

Table 5 refers to student satisfaction. It describes the satisfaction ratings from students in a larger study of student experience sponsored jointly by the vice presidents for student affairs and academic affairs (1985).

Table 6 refers to resource allocation. It shows patterns of instructional budget increase/decrease by college and across time. It was provided by Dean Lukermann of the College of Liberal Arts. The figures represent General Maintenance Funds plus soft monies specifically allocated for instructional purposes minus sponsored research funds minus central administrative/coordinate campus funds.

TABLE 1
Number of Offerings
and Average Class Size for
Undergraduates at the University
for 1977-78: 1XXX, 3XXX, and 5XXX Level Courses[a]

College	1XXX Level			3XXX Level			5XXX Level		
	Number of Sections	Mean	Median	Number of Sections	Mean	Median	Number of Sections	Mean	Median
Agriculture	334	37.1	23.3	210	25.4	20.3	284	17.2	12.5
Biological Sciences	339	38.8	24.0	177	34.8	21.1	154	17.5	14.0
Business Administration	96	41.7	43.4	260	50.4	44.0	55	35.8	34.5
Education	550	20.3	17.7	607	20.4	14.3	576	13.7	10.5
Forestry	20	34.1	27.0	5	53.8	24.5	51	39.2	26.7
General College	708	28.8	21.8	82	20.5	18.7	--	--	--
Home Economics	115	34.4	26.6	97	20.4	18.0	102	21.2	10.3
Liberal Arts	2,592	32.6	22.4	1,542	27.0	16.0	1,336	17.8	12.3
Institute of Technology	1,492	42.7	26.8	752	33.5	21.5	883	21.5	16.1
Duluth	1,524	34.5	23.6	994	19.8	14.6	641	12.0	8.1
Morris	407	31.3	23.1	365	17.1	12.9	--	--	--
Crookston	991	16.5	15.3	--	--	--	--	--	--
Waseca	547	20.1	16.5	--	--	--	--	--	--

[a]Special data analysis in a report "A Summary of Average Collegiate Class Size from 1975-76 through 1977-78" based on enrollment data supplied by Management Planning and Information Services.