



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

January 6, 1986

TO: Meredith B. Poppele, Executive Assistant, University Senate

FROM: Gretchen Kreuter, Assistant to the Vice President
for Academic Affairs *gk*

SUBJECT: Implementation of Page Committee Report on Quality Undergraduate
Teaching and Learning (CQUL)

As you know, in 1985 the Council of Undergraduate Deans charged a special committee with the task of studying and making recommendations about undergraduate teaching and learning on the Twin Cities campuses of the University.

The Committee submitted its report in August 1985, and in October I was charged with initiating the implementation of its recommendations.

On January 15, 1986, I will present, to Assistant Vice President John Wallace, a status report on each of the 32 recommendations. As an interim measure, let me report to you on those upon which I have focused my attention:

1. University Chair for Undergraduate Studies: The CQUL Committee recommended that such a chair be established as a focal point for projects in the improvement of undergraduate education. The chair would be occupied for a period of three to five years by faculty members who were distinguished for their undergraduate teaching ability and who would be able to use their position as holders of the University Chair to expand and disseminate to the wider University community their ideas and experience. A proposal for such a chair has been submitted to various groups for discussion and is attached.
2. Documentation of the Quality of Teaching: The CQUL committee urged that attention be paid to the documentation of the quality of undergraduate teaching in the assessment of faculty members for purposes of promotion and tenure. The committee suggested possible models upon which documentation could be based, in the absence of the Koffler-Ibele Memorandum which offered guidance under the old tenure code. I have adapted one such model for the University, and it is attached.

Meredith Poppele
January 6, 1986
Page Two

3. Classroom Environment: Among the barriers and impediments to quality teaching and learning is the simple one of inadequate or substandard classroom space. The CQUL committee found that there is great need for classroom renovation and great need for keeping instructional facilities and equipment in good repair. The task is enormous and requires the commitment of significant resources if the problems are to be solved. (It has been 14 years since a major item for space renovation has been included in the University budget request.)

We are, however making some small beginnings with a pilot project to monitor the condition of heavily-used classrooms in one building on the Minneapolis campus. The proposal is attached.

4. Departmental Cultures: Section 2 of the CQUL report makes a number of recommendations for getting departments to give higher priority to undergraduate teaching and learning. One recommendation, for example, urges that attention to undergraduate teaching be made a part of all departmental reviews. Another proposes financial rewards to departments that give high priority to effective undergraduate teaching.

Proposals to respond to these recommendations are currently being discussed and developed, but none is available at this time.

The Special Committee on a Unified Lower Division, charged in fall 1985 with fleshing out the Commitment to Focus recommendations that deal with the lower division, has studied the CQUL Committee recommendations and endorsed all of them in its interim report.

The Special Committee notes, however, that the CQUL Committee repeatedly noted, that unless the University's system of rewards recognizes the importance of undergraduate teaching, even the most thoughtful recommendations will go unfulfilled.

Please let me know if you have questions about any of this. I will be happy to send you a copy of my fuller report after January 15.

GK:alp

c: John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Roger B. Page, Associate to the Dean, College of Liberal Arts

UNIVERSITY CHAIR FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

BACKGROUND:

The Page Committee Report on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning, which was presented to the Council of Undergraduate Deans in August 1985, recommended that there be established a University Chair for Undergraduate Studies which would be shared by three people. The committee made its recommendation after studying several similar models at other universities, including the President's Chair at the University of California/Berkeley.

What follows is a proposal to make the Committee's recommendation operational and specific.

PURPOSE OF THE CHAIR:

To encourage projects in undergraduate teaching and learning by faculty who have a proven record of scholarship and teaching competence. To increase the number of occasions on which issues in undergraduate education are publicly addressed. To expand the opportunities for discussion of quality undergraduate education within committees and units of the University.

ELIGIBILITY:

All tenured faculty members on any campus of the University may become candidates by submitting proposals.

FORMAT AND CONTENT OF APPLICATIONS:

Each application should include documentation of the candidate's teaching competence.

Each application must include a proposal for the project that the applicant tends to carry out during the three years that successful applicants will hold the chair. The proposal shall center on specific ways of effecting enduring improvement, especially at the lower division level, and shall have potential applicability beyond the applicant's home department or college.

SELECTION PROCEDURE:

Proposals will be submitted to the Office of the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education which will provide staff assistance.

Applicants will be reviewed by a committee of faculty, students, and administrators appointed by the Council of Undergraduate Deans.

Final selections will be made by the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon recommendation by the Committee.

One appointment per year will be made until there are three overlapping appointments on a continuing basis.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE POSITION:

Each holder of this chair shall be expected to offer at least one lecture per year based on the project in undergraduate education that he/she is conducting.

Each holder will meet at least once a quarter with the Vice President for Academic Affairs to discuss topics of mutual concern. Some time during each year each holder will be invited to address SCEP on "Current Needs in Undergraduate Education at the University of Minnesota."

Each will be available for consultation with deans and with college and departmental curriculum committees, and with the legislature.

REWARDS OF THE POSITION:

Appointment will be for a three-year term. The chair's endowment will pay one quarter's salary per year, which may be used in the summer if the recipient prefers, and \$10,000-15,000 per year support for the project.

Selection of University Professors will be widely publicized both within and outside the University.

GK:alp
12/30/85

How To Add Evidence of Good Teaching
To a Faculty Member's Curriculum Vitae: A Guide*

INTRODUCTION: In order to evaluate faculty members for promotion and tenure, documentation of their teaching competence must be provided. The new Tenure Regulations that became effective on July 1, 1985, ask that each academic unit have a document that articulates "with reasonable specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate . . . candidates . . .".

It is usually assumed that it is easier to evaluate research than to assess teaching achievement. One reason for this view is that the methods and format of presentation have been well developed with respect to scholarly activities, while in teaching evaluation neither format nor criteria have been agreed upon. The guide that follows is to provide a format and to describe some criteria, so that a faculty member's teaching competence can be well presented.

PURPOSE: To put together a dossier summarizing a faculty member's major teaching accomplishments and strengths. The dossier is to a faculty member's teaching what reports of publications and research are to scholarship. It is intended to provide selected short descriptions that will accurately convey the scope and quality of the faculty member's teaching. It will ordinarily be no more than three to five pages long.

ROLE OF THE FACULTY MEMBER IN THE PREPARATION AND USE OF THE DOSSIER: The faculty member is the editor and takes responsibility for deciding what to include and exclude. When speaking to the quality of teaching the faculty member has the responsibility for specifying the criteria by which judgments should be made.

HOW TO PUT TOGETHER A TEACHING DOSSIER:

1. Summarize the expectations that may exist between the faculty member and his/her chair or dean concerning teaching responsibilities and criteria for success. Such expectations may include understandings about the numbers and types of courses to be taught, how students are to be evaluated, and the nature of student progress expected.
2. Select, from the list of possible items in the appendix that follows, the items that are most applicable to the individual faculty member's teaching, and prepare a statement about accomplishments in each area.
3. The faculty member should keep on file full copies of all items referred to in the dossier. These would include such things as examination outlines, original replies to course evaluation questionnaires, letters from students and department chair, and samples of student work. These materials are not part of the dossier, but backup in case primary evidence is required. A sentence in the dossier should indicate that such materials are available upon request.

* This proposal is based upon the Guide to the Teaching Dossier, Its Preparation and Use, prepared by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee of the Canadian Association of University Teachers.

APPENDIX: LIST OF POSSIBLE ITEMS FOR A TEACHING DOSSIER

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES RELATED TO TEACHING:

1. Participating in seminars, workshops and professional meetings intended to improve teaching.
2. Participating in course or curriculum development.
3. Pursuing a line of interactive research that contributes directly to teaching.
4. Preparing a textbook or other instructional materials.
5. Editing of or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one's subject.
6. Reviewing new teaching materials for possible application.
7. Maintaining a record of the changes resulting from self-evaluation.

MATERIAL ON CURRENT AND RECENT TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES AND PRACTICES:

1. List of course titles and numbers, credits, and enrollments, with brief elaboration.
2. Syllabi and other materials prepared for students.
3. Non-print materials (films, video, etc.) used in teaching and how they were used.
4. Active learning strategies used.
5. Student advising activities, both graduate and undergraduate, and estimate of advising workload.
6. Participation in co-curricular opportunities for majors.
7. Service on collegiate, campus, and all-University committees dealing with aspects of teaching.

INFORMATION FROM OTHERS

STUDENTS

1. Course and teaching evaluation questionnaire data.
2. Honors received from students that relate to excellence in teaching and advising.

3. Unstructured (and possibly unsolicited) written evaluation by students, including written comments on exams and letters received after the course has been completed.

COLLEAGUES

1. Statements from peers who have observed teaching either as independent observers or who teach other sections of the same course.
2. Written comments from those who teach courses having the instructor's course as a prerequisite.
3. Statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
4. Honors or recognition, such as distinguished teacher award.

OUTCOMES OF GOOD TEACHING

1. Scores of students on faculty-made or standardized tests, preferably before and after.
2. Student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
3. Student placement data for both undergraduates and graduate students, including type of initial post-baccalaureate employment.
4. Publications by students on course-related work.
5. Records of students who select and succeed in advanced courses of study in the field.

OTHER SOURCES

1. Statements from administrators from one's own institution or from other institutions.
2. Reports from employers of students or from community supervisors of student interns.
3. Invitation to contribute to the teaching literature.
4. Other kinds of invitations based on one's reputation as a teacher (e.g., public media, interview for a book on exemplary teaching).

PROPOSAL: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT PILOT PROJECT

Providing faculty with appropriately equipped, well-maintained classrooms is an essential service that the University must perform. Nevertheless, recent reports on the quality of student life and student learning prominently mention the deficiencies of University classrooms. For example, the Page Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning noted:

The Committee was quite surprised at the extent of the criticism of classrooms--inappropriate size, poor design, poor appointments, noisy, depressing ambience, and simply dirty. General purpose equipment was reported as often not provided, many times in poor repair, or requiring personal delivery by the instructor. . . .

These are major problems which require long-range planning and resource allocation if they are to be solved.

Some of the problems, however, are simple. The purpose of this pilot project is to identify some of the simple ones and, through a process of continuous monitoring and scrutiny, solve them.

The pilot project will be undertaken in Folwell Hall, one of the most heavily used buildings on the Twin Cities campus. Both day school and night classes use the 23 classrooms there.

Two undergraduate students shall be employed to assess daily the condition of the 23 classrooms in Folwell. They will be provided with the following information:

1. The capacity of each room.
2. The scheduled daily use of each room: courses and number of students in each.
3. Special needs for equipment, etc., that each user may have requested. (It shall not be the responsibility of the monitors to provide this equipment, but only to keep track of whether or not it is being provided as requested.)

The two monitors will look for the following in each classroom at the beginning of each class day:

1. Is the assigned number of chairs really there? A lectern?
2. Do the lights work? Are some flickering or dead?
3. Do the window shades work?

Proposal: Classroom Environment Improvement Pilot Project
Page 2

Deficiencies that are noted by the student monitors are to be taken care of as follows:

1. Furniture needs: Elizabeth Grundner's office
2. Audio-visual and electrical needs: _____
3. Other: _____

The student monitors are also to keep a record of what deficiencies are found, and how long it takes to get them corrected.

BUDGET: Two students for ten hours weekly at \$6.76 per hour (Senior Office Assistant), winter quarter:

TOTAL: \$1352.00

Half of this budget shall be provided by Student Affairs, half by Academic Affairs.

GK:alp
12/30/85



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for
Academic Affairs and Provost
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 625-0051

May 29, 1986

TO: John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Gretchen Kreuter, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Progress Report: Implementation of Recommendations of the Page Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (CQUL)

Gretchen Kreuter

As you know, the Page committee, in its report, made 32 recommendations designed to increase the number of faculty, departments, and students who give high priority to quality undergraduate teaching and learning.

Since October 1985, it has been my assignment to spend 50% of my time on developing strategies for the implementation of those recommendations. In my memorandum of November 12, I described four areas to which I had by that time given particular attention. In my report of January 16, 1986, I reported on the status of all the recommendations on which any specific action had been taken and on preliminary plans for, or next questions about, all the rest. The present summary is a further update.

As I indicated in my earlier report, and as the report of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus reaffirms, the CQUL report has particular urgency in the light of the "Commitment to Focus." "Commitment to Focus" and the task forces it has launched makes certain implied promises to the state. One of them has to do with admissions standards and says, in effect, if prospective students will prepare more rigorously for a baccalaureate education at the University, the University will provide them with an even higher quality undergraduate experience than it has in the past.

I believe that the Page report constitutes an effective guide to keeping that promise because its recommendations, when implemented, will affect all undergraduate students, not just those who are in honors programs or are in the top 5% of their class.

That said, let me tell you where we are now:

I. INCREASING THE NUMBER OF FACULTY WHO GIVE HIGHER PRIORITY TO QUALITY UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING/LEARNING.

A. EXTRINSIC FORMAL REWARDS

RECOMMENDATION 1. "Offer no appointment with a teaching responsibility without careful review of teaching experience or potential, and tenure or promote no one for whom there is not well documented evidence of teaching competence."

Implementation: This is listed as the committee's first recommendation because of its central importance and because concern about the evaluation of instruction and the documentation of teaching were central to the charge that the Council of Undergraduate Deans gave the committee. (See charge memorandum, Wallace to Committee, December 7, 1984.)

An important concern of the Page committee, however, has been that the new guidelines for tenure and promotion do not include the specificity of language about documenting teaching that was in the Koffler-Ibele memorandum. In the committee's report, therefore, it suggested alternatives, such as the "Canadian Dossier on Teaching." With the assistance of other members of your staff, and after consultation with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the University College Assembly, I have adapted the Dossier to a form that is suitable for the University of Minnesota.

This model deserves to be widely disseminated and widely discussed. It is an appropriate guide for the improvement of instruction. The Office of Educational Development Programs intends to use the document in some spring meetings it is planning.

In the near future I will convene the Directors of Undergraduate Studies to discuss this document and other recommendations of the Page Committee (see below).

RECOMMENDATION 2. Designate a certain minimum percent or amount of the merit money allotted each year for award on the basis of outstanding teaching.

Implementation: Implementation of this recommendation requires discussion and decision among the appropriate vice presidents. This recommendation is specifically endorsed in the report of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus.

RECOMMENDATION 3. Establish collegiate undergraduate teaching awards and fund them at a higher level than at present.

Implementation: The vice president needs to ask those colleges that do not have such awards--most do--to establish them.

RECOMMENDATION 4. Establish a University Chair for Undergraduate Studies.

Implementation: Patterned after a similar chair established at the University of California at Berkeley, the University Chair would be awarded, for a three-year period, on a competitive basis, to a faculty member whose proposal was deemed most likely to effect enduring improvement in undergraduate education, especially at the lower division level.

The proposal has been discussed in the Council of Undergraduate Deans, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and the University College Assembly.

The proposal will be submitted for foundation support in June.

RECOMMENDATION 5. Recognize the validity of educational development and instructional improvement as a basis for sabbaticals, single quarter leaves, etc; and establish Faculty Summer Instruction Grants analogous to the Graduate School's Faculty Summer Research Grants.

Implementation: Some of this is occurring already, and I am discussing the proposed Faculty Summer Instruction Grants with the Office of Educational Development Programs.

This recommendation is specifically endorsed by the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus.

B. INTRINSIC REWARDS

RECOMMENDATION 6. Increase the frequency of public testimony, by the President, other central officers and the deans, on the value and significance of quality undergraduate teaching.

Implementation: University Relations can assist significantly on this proposal. I am setting up a small committee that will address this issue. Frequent reminders of this recommendation should have the desired effect. Such public testimony is particularly desirable to counter the widespread impression that "Commitment to Focus" is primarily directed at improving the University of Minnesota as a graduate research institution.

RECOMMENDATION 7. Encourage University Relations and other offices to seek more aggressively opportunities for appropriate publicity for teaching activities of the faculty.

Implementation: The committee mentioned above will do this. University Relations needs to indicate also to college editors that the University is seeking to publicize the teaching activities of its faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 8. Develop more activities within the University in which teaching is the focus.

Implementation: OEDP is developing activities of this sort and hopes to expand this area of its mission. It has recently completed a series of four Faculty Forums on teaching. Current efforts are hindered by the fact that there is only \$12,000 for workshops and conferences in the OEDP budget. There needs to be activities within all the colleges in which teaching is the focus. Conversations with collegiate deans and with departmental directors of undergraduate studies is necessary to encourage expansion of such activities.

RECOMMENDATION 9. Support international, inter-institutional, and interdepartmental teaching opportunities and exchanges, and encourage outreach teaching for atypical students and through atypical teaching/learning systems.

Implementation: A grant proposal is being developed to provide faculty exchanges between the University and private colleges in the area. It will be submitted in June 1986.

The OEDP has developed a proposal for a Visiting Faculty Program to provide stimulation to individuals and to programs through opportunities for faculty in one college or campus to teach in another for a quarter.

RECOMMENDATION 10. Increase the proportion of undergraduate students who are motivated to seek quality learning and adequately prepared to attempt it.

Implementation: The merit scholarship program (\$1000 to each entering freshman student who was in the top 5% of his/her high school class); the Recruitment Project, and the proposed Residential College all contribute to realizing the goals of this recommendation.

In a larger sense, however, this recommendation suggests the interdependence of teaching and learning. More highly motivated students will help to raise the motivation of faculty to give higher priority to undergraduate teaching. The recommendations of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements, when implemented, will help in this regard.

C. BARRIERS AND IMPEDIMENTS, SERVICES AND FACILITIES

RECOMMENDATION 11. Improve the overall quality and general maintenance of the classrooms of the University.

Implementation: To address this need to improve the overall quality of classrooms, a major legislative proposal is being prepared. (The last legislative appropriation for classroom improvement was in 1972.) I have discussed the forthcoming proposal with the appropriate administrators and with the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation.

With respect to general maintenance, efforts to monitor the condition of some heavily-used classrooms and correct minor deficiencies is underway on a pilot basis. Early reports are that the project is highly successful. This is, however, a tiny beginning at meeting a very large need.

RECOMMENDATION 12. Provide improved support for instructional supplies and equipment and for clerical/administrative assistance available for instruction; designate specific budget lines for these purposes.

Implementation: This needs to be discussed by the appropriate vice presidents.

RECOMMENDATION 13. Increase the number of teaching assistantships so that very large classes . . . can become better teaching/learning opportunities for both faculty members and students.

Implementation: This needs to be discussed by the appropriate vice presidents. It must not be forgotten, however, that increasing the number of teaching assistants is of little value in improving teaching and learning unless the preparation of those teaching assistants is sound. A program of TA training and development is needed, and a proposal has been developed this spring by OEDP.

At my request, a proposal for a three-year TA English program has been developed by Jan Smith and Mark Landa of ESL.

This recommendation has been especially endorsed by the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus.

RECOMMENDATION 14. Develop a coordinated University program of better supported services and assistance for improving instruction.

Implementation: The OEDP presently serves this function. Its resources are extremely limited, however, and not sufficient to perform the functions envisioned in this recommendation.

II. INCREASING THE NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS THAT GIVE HIGHER PRIORITY TO QUALITY UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING/LEARNING.

The charge letter to the Committee (Wallace to Committee, December 7, 1984) specifically asked that the committee make recommendations about "How to bring departments into the category of those that give substantial attention and high priority to the undergraduate enterprise."

A. FINANCIAL REWARDS AND SANCTIONS

RECOMMENDATION 15. Upon occasion, make non-recurring awards of \$15,000 to \$25,000 to five to seven departments judged to be offering undergraduate instruction of outstanding quality, to be used at the department's discretion for undergraduate teaching.

Implementation: This recommendation has been discussed with some of the undergraduate deans and it has been specifically endorsed in the report of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus. Before we seek resources for funding such awards, criteria needs to be developed for evaluating departmental attention to undergraduate education. I have prepared a draft, "Criteria: Departmental Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Education," which I am circulating for comments and suggestions.

A next step will be to develop a peer nomination process: to identify ten or so departments that meet the requirements of an initial screening, and then invite them to submit further information in support of their candidacy for a departmental award.

Meritorious Department Awards were made once before, in Spring 1984, based primarily on national research ranking. I have gathered information on that procedure in order to inform our consideration of this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 16. Use the level of departmental attention to undergraduate instruction as an important consideration in responding to any requests that departments make.

Implementation: As above, the first step here is to develop measures of departmental attention to undergraduate education.

RECOMMENDATION 17. Establish a Fund for Improving Departments' Instruction (FIDI) to receive competitive submissions for broad, department-wide instructional improvement projects.

Implementation: Such a fund does not exist. OEDP guidelines make it possible for departments qua departments to apply for educational

development awards, but that has not been an emphasis, and no such applications have come forward. Modifying EDP guidelines might be a sensible way to test out this recommendation before seeking the larger funding that it obviously intends.

B. PROCEDURES, ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

RECOMMENDATION 18. Develop a set of departmental data that bear on undergraduate education and include full attention to the undergraduate mission of units in the University's formal, recurring departmental reviews.

Implementation: Joint Undergraduate Education--Graduate School protocols have been developed which suggest basic procedures to be followed when a program under review offers both undergraduate instruction and graduate programs. These need to be assessed and discussed. We also need to learn to what extent they are currently in use.

This is not a sufficient response to the recommendation, but it is a beginning.

This recommendation has been especially endorsed by the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus.

RECOMMENDATION 19. Encourage every college to have a faculty-student committee whose charge include overview of instruction and to include attention to instruction in the portfolio of some administrative officer of the college.

Implementation: What needs to be done first is to find out which colleges now have such a committee and which colleges assign attention to instruction to one of their administrative officers.

The Vice President should request that colleges follow this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 20. Encourage every department with a significant undergraduate mission to have a faculty-student committee whose charge includes instruction as a primary focus and to designate a Director of Undergraduate Studies.

Implementation: The Vice President should request that departments follow this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 21. Include specific attention to the member's teaching activities in the annual departmental review of each faculty member that determines salary for the next year, following a set of departmental procedures that outline how instructional contributions are to be appraised.

Implementation: The draft proposal, "How to Add Evidence of Good Teaching to a Faculty Member's Curriculum Vitae: A Guide" speaks to this recommendation: it suggests what competencies faculty members should possess and how documentation should be collected. The departmental responses to Associate Vice President Betty Robinett's memo of December 20, 1985, requesting a description of promotion and tenure processes should be reviewed to make sure that every unit attends adequately to teaching. If the responses are adequate for promotion, they can be used for determining merit assignment also.

RECOMMENDATION 22. Encourage departments to give faculty members differential assignments among the several faculty obligations, especially as this might be appropriate at different times in a career.

Implementation: Discussion of this alternative might be initiated by the faculty-student committees suggested above or by the director of undergraduate studies in each department. The proposal needs to be kept before the appropriate department authority by whom departmental assignments and faculty members expectations are established.

C. INCREASING THE PROBABILITY OF "HISTORICAL ACCIDENTS."

RECOMMENDATION 23. Evaluate seriously and critically the values of prospective heads/chairs concerning undergraduate teaching, as part of the review process leading to possible appointment.

Implementation: The vice president and collegiate deans can initiate discussion of this recommendation and, by doing so, indicate their confidence in the ability of departmental leadership to affect in important ways the value attached to undergraduate instruction.

RECOMMENDATION 24. Make dedication and contributions to undergraduate instruction a significant factor in appraising a colleague who presents a retention challenge.

Implementation: The vice president can initiate discussion of this recommendation.

D. BARRIERS AND IMPEDIMENTS, SERVICES AND FACILITIES.

RECOMMENDATION 25. Give to every department a priority assignment claim to some classrooms and assign as many classrooms as possible in this way to some department.

Implementation: I have consulted with Elizabeth Grundner and Sam Lewis about this recommendation, and both believe that the interests of faculty and students are better served when departments do NOT have a priority claim or responsibility for maintaining specific classrooms. However, I am initiating a small pilot project in the School of Management that would give SOM priority for about twenty classrooms.

If classroom were maintained and renovated on a reliable schedule this issue would be moot. The information necessary to do so is available. As yet, the resources are not.

RECOMMENDATION 26. Determine acceptable faculty-student ratios needed for departments to accomplish their mission.

Implementation: A study of existing faculty-student ratios needs to be made. Much of the necessary information is available through the AAUDE data of the University.

This recommendation has been particularly endorsed in the report of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus.

III. INCREASING THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS WHO GIVE HIGHER PRIORITY TO QUALITY UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING/LEARNING

RECOMMENDATION 27. Describe clearly, through official documents, statements by University and college officers, meetings, and individual interviews, the characteristics of the students we especially seek to serve.

Implementation: "Commitment to Focus" and the discussion it has engendered both inside and outside of the University are accomplishing this as this time. The final outcomes should be institutionalized in University documents.

RECOMMENDATION 28. Offer merit scholarships, financial aid, employment opportunities, and other awards and recognitions that are competitive with those of other institutions.

Implementation: The activities of the Recruitment Project are directed toward these ends.

RECOMMENDATION 29. Utilize more extensively "learning communities" and "active learning" as significant models for motivating students to achieve quality learning.

Implementation: The proposed Residential College is one effort to develop a learning community. Collegiate honors programs, which are being strengthened, are others.

RECOMMENDATION 30. Set high expectations for student performance.

Implementation: The report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements makes recommendations which, if adopted, set higher standards, in terms of course preparation, than the University has required in recent years. The Special Committee expects that better prepared students will make it possible for University courses to be taught at a higher level.

RECOMMENDATION 31. Encourage and support good academic advising services.

Implementation: The Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements and the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus both recognize that their recommendations entail increased academic advising services and additional University resources.

A University-wide program for Academic Advising Awards, analogous to Distinguished Teaching Awards, has been initiated for 1986-87: it will provide three awards of \$1000 each for meritorious advising.

RECOMMENDATION 32. Offer quality undergraduate teaching.

Implementation: Like Recommendation 10 above, this one is intended to suggest the interdependence of teaching and learning and was included in the Committee report as a succinct summary statement rather than as a specific action recommendation.

GK:alp

- c: W. Andrew Collins, Chair, Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements
William H. Hanson, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy and Chair, Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus
V. Rama Murthy, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Roger B. Page, Associate to the Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Betty W. Robinett, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Deon D. Stuthman, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee