JUL 6 1987

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

June 30, 1987

Dr. Kenneth H. Keller
President
202 Morrill Hall
Minneapolis Campus

Dr. Ellen S. Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
N309 Elliott Hall
Minneapolis Campus

Dear President Keller and Professor Berscheid:

I am writing to submit to you the "Final Report of the Implementation Task Force on Undergraduate Education on the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota."

Our Final Report contains the same 16 recommendations as those on the Preliminary Report (February 26, 1987), but differs in the amount of detail describing specific steps necessary to implement the recommendations. Appendix B of the Final Report contains 24 implementation proposals, each of which includes estimated financial resources required for implementation.

Since the completion of the Preliminary Report, several public forums have been held to discuss the content of that report, and I have had the opportunity to talk with several relevant committees on campus. Virtually all of those discussions have supported most of the content of the Preliminary Report. One issue on which opinion is divided concerns the Implementation Task Force's recommendation that several freshman-admitting units continue.

The Final Report, especially the first proposals in Appendix B, contains considerably more discussion of a process for reexamining curricular goals, especially those related to liberal education. Although it is not contained in the Final Report, some work has occurred already in the context of the Implementation Task Force to develop a pilot project in this area.

I am grateful to all of the members of the Implementation Task Force who contributed their time and thoughtful attention this past year to discussing the next steps for improving undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus.

I look forward to the next step: action directed at implementing the proposals in the Final Report.

Sincerely,

John Wallace

John Wallace
Assistant Vice President
for Academic Affairs

JW:ap

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Implementation Task Force on Undergraduate Education was charged by President Keller and the Senate Consultative Committee to meet several objectives: to establish priorities for the recommendations contained in several University reports on undergraduate education; to develop an implementation plan to realize these; and to recommend further actions to achieve the aims and suggestions set forth in each of these documents (listed in Appendix A).

This report, therefore, includes a set of 16 recommendations and 24 associated implementation proposals (Appendix B) to central administration. The report also includes many suggested collegiate and departmental initiatives that constitute appropriate unit responses to the recommendations. To implement them will result in fundamental changes in the quality of teaching and learning on the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota. Many other recommendations, worthy and constructive, were not included among the 16. They are listed in Appendix C, however, so that they may be considered at some future time, or on a smaller scale than contemplated by this group (e.g., to be carried out by a single department or by individual department chairs.)

Because this report is written in an imperative tone, some readers might misinterpret it to mean that the policies and actions recommended do not presently exist at all. Such is not the case. The Task Force chose that tone in order to convey the urgency of its recommendations. In nearly every case, the recommendations already are being implemented in exemplary ways in some units and programs.

### Recommendations

The 16 recommendations fall into three categories that form the structure for the body of the Task Force's report:

**Enhancing Teaching and Learning** (Recommendations 1-4): The Task Force recommends increasing the number of opportunities for active student learning (especially writing) in the curriculum; the improved integration and coherence of learning; and the expansion of honors programs. We recommend, in particular, that the Provost initiate and lead a process which engages the faculty in a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education.

**Supporting the Learning Process** (Recommendations 5-12): The Task Force recommends clearer admissions policies, a common catalog of all courses, and more effective advising. We recommend that greater educational use be made of cocurricular opportunities, and that greater attention be given to maintaining the quality of the physical environment, particularly classrooms and student-related space.

**Monitoring and Influencing the Effectiveness of Undergraduate Education** (Recommendations 13-16): The Task Force recommends that the University

## LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Thomas F. Brothen, Associate Professor, General College

Joanne B. Eicher, Professor and Head, Department of Design, Housing and Apparel

Edward M. Foster, Acting Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Darwin D. Hendel, Research Associate, Academic Affairs

Richard B. Heydinger, Senior Assistant to the President

Russell K. Hobbie, Associate Dean, Institute of Technology

Walter H. Johnson, Professor, Department of Physics

Robert J. Jones, Associate Professor and Corn Physiologist, Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

Gretchen Kreuter, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (staff)

Darrell R. Lewis, Professor, Department of Educational Policy and Administration

Fred E. Lukermann, Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Jeanne T. Lupton, Acting Associate Vice President for Student Affairs

Keith N. McFarland, Dean, College of Home Economics

Timothy D. Pratt, President, Minnesota Student Association

Betty W. Robinett, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Stuart B. Schwartz, Professor, Department of History

Andrew Seitel, Past President, Minnesota Student Association

John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (chair)

admission information of interest to prospective undergraduate students, both freshmen and transfer, in all Twin Cities units; and (c) provide uniform admission cutoff dates for all colleges. For example, we suggest February 1 for priority consideration and April 1 as an absolute deadline for fall admission.

6. Students should be notified within a month after receipt of application whether they have been accepted, rejected, or deferred (placed in a holding category). (Enrollment management may require that applicants be placed in a pool for consideration as a group; thus decisions on some early applications may have to wait until after the absolute deadline.)

7. Newly admitted students currently receive a confusing variety of mailings about orientation and matriculation. Units that prepare such mailings should work together to coordinate and streamline them.

8. The Office of the Provost shall direct the development of a common bulletin for the entire Twin Cities campus. It will be an important advising tool and the first source of information for students, faculty, and advisors. It should not, however, be thought of as a recruiting tool. The many bulletins that now exist should be consolidated and published in a less expensive format, with a size and quality of paper similar to the student-staff directory. The bulletin should contain a catalog of all courses offered as well as all collegiate regulations and curricular requirements.

9. In order to assure that undergraduate advising receives a high priority, the Office of the Provost should: (a) ask colleges to describe the resources they are devoting to advising; (b) ask that colleges increase the number of peer and professional advisors, freeing the faculty for more informal advising relationships with students. Insist that workloads and statements of college expectations should indicate clearly that faculty are expected to enter into these more informal advising relationships; (c) encourage departments to foster informal faculty-student contact; and (d) encourage the colleges to work together to make it easier for students to learn of opportunities in other colleges and, where requirements are met, to transfer between them. Resources should flow to collegiate units that address these goals in their planning.

10. The Office of the Provost, together with the director of the physical plant, should inventory classroom and student study space, conduct a needs assessment, and develop a plan for meeting the needs assessed (e.g., adequate ventilation, acoustics, aesthetics, and lighting.) Some needs are so clearly evident that they need not await the assessment process.

11. The Office of the Provost, in cooperation with planning staff in Physical Plant, should aggressively monitor plans for new construction or major renovation projects. A sign-off should be required before projects are submitted for bidding. This will help to ensure that

collect more information about its undergraduate education to monitor overall performance and to ensure that policies and administrative practices are changed as needed. The Task Force recommends collecting information about teaching and learning, so that good teaching may be encouraged and rewarded, and assistance may be provided for the improvement of ineffective teaching.

What follows here is an abbreviated listing of the 16 recommendations contained in the body of the report and a budget summary showing the estimated funding required to implement the 16 recommendations. No attempt is made to summarize the strategies for implementing the recommendations, since those are described in detail in Appendix B.

1. The Office of the Provost should encourage and consistently review collegiate efforts to fulfill the curricular goals of breadth, depth, coherence, and course availability. Resources should flow to collegiate units that address these goals in their planning. As a first step, the Provost should initiate and lead a process which engages the faculty in a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education.

2. All undergraduates, whatever their areas of specialization or their vocational goals, should hold in common the objective of a liberal education. The Office of the Provost should monitor collegiate attention to liberal education, as it is exemplified in the group distribution requirements. The Office of the Provost should assure that colleges periodically review the group distribution requirements and that new programs include explicit attention to the ways students will be expected to meet them.

3. The Office of the Provost should represent the importance of undergraduate instruction in several ways: (a) by unequivocally stating to collegiate units that the quality of a faculty member's teaching will play a significant role in searches, original appointments, promotion and tenure decisions, and in allocation of merit salary increases; (b) by insisting that colleges and departments provide training programs for teaching assistants that will include both cultural and pedagogical components; and (c) by encouraging and consistently reviewing collegiate and departmental efforts to improve the documentation of teaching quality and effectiveness.

4. Central administrators at the presidential and vice presidential level should reinforce the Provost's efforts by providing frequent public statements of the University's goals in undergraduate instruction. Such statements will help assure that both new instructors and current staff are aware of the University's commitment to an instructional program that takes advantage of the unique resources of a major research university, and of the importance of good teaching.

5. The Office of the Provost should work with appropriate units to do the following: (a) simplify the admissions process (See Appendix D); (b) prepare a single brochure that contains all of the curricular and

adequate attention is given to the needs of students and faculty for informal meeting spaces and for classrooms. This monitoring should be especially sensitive to design elements needed to make academic programs fully accessible to students with disabilities.

12. Greater coordination and linkage should be developed between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in educational areas that reach beyond the classroom, and the Office of the Provost should affirm that faculty participation in out-of-classroom learning is consistent with the educational mission of the University and worthy of its best teaching talents.

13. The Office of the Provost should recommend exactly what information is needed to monitor the effectiveness of undergraduate education, estimate the cost of obtaining it, and determine an appropriate schedule for gathering and disseminating it. Four kinds of information are needed. (See Appendix E for an illustrative list of possible variables of each kind.)

    - Variables that monitor the context, primarily demographic, in which our programs are provided (context variables).

    - Variables that measure the number of students coming into the undergraduate programs and their preparation (input variables).

    - Variables that measure aspects of the effort devoted by the University to the education that undergraduates receive (process variables).

    - Variables that measure aspects of the quality of the education they receive (output variables).

14. The Office of the Provost should establish an administrative structure that is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and reporting the four types of information noted above. The Provost should also monitor the results of changes in the quality of undergraduate education and should provide annual reports to the Campus Assembly and the Board of Regents.

15. An administrative function that would facilitate faculty research on undergraduate education should be established in the Office of the Provost.

16. The Office of the Provost should ask the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to reevaluate the 1974 Senate Policy on the Evaluation of University Teaching and to consider further steps to increase the attention given to appraising instructional quality.

Budget Summary

The following figures summarize the funding necessary to implement the proposals connected with the 16 recommendations. Given the nature of some of the recommendations (e.g., the Provost's Office representing the importance of undergraduate education) no additional financial resources are required to implement them.

| Nmbr. | Content | Source | 1987-88 | 1988-89 | ... 1992-93 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1, 2 | Curricular Goals and Liberal Education | Reallocation and Minnesota Campaign | $ 100,000 | $ 300,000 | --Recurring----- ----------Major Funding- |
| 3 | Provost's Role in Representing Undergraduate Education | None* | | | |
| 4 | Public Statements of Goals | None* | | | |
| 5 | Admissions Process | Reallocation | $ 10,000 | ----------Recurring----- | |
| 6 | Enrollment Management | Reallocation | $ 130,000 | ----------Recurring----- | |
| 7 | Orientation Process | Student Fees and Reallocation | $ 77,000 | ----------Recurring----- | |
| 8 | Common Bulletin | None* | | | |
| 9 | Undergraduate Advising | None* | | | |
| 10 | Inventory of Classroom and Study Space | Reallocation | $ 235,000 | ----------Recurring----- | |
| | | 1987-89 Legislative Request | $ 1.5M | $ 1.5M | |
| 11 | Monitoring New Construction | None* | | | |
| 12 | Out-of-Class Learning | Reallocation | $ 29,200[1] | | |
| 13 | Effectiveness of Undergraduate Education | Reallocation | $ 155,000 | ----------Recurring----- | |
| | | | $ 80,000 | | |
| 14 | Structure for Monitoring Effectiveness | None* | | | |
| 15 | Faculty Research on Undergraduate Education | Reallocation | $ 25,000 | | |
| | | | $ 97,500 | ----------Recurring----- | |
| 16 | Evaluation of Teaching | Reallocation | $ 50,000 | $ 100,000 | --Recurring----- |

* No funding required for implementation.

1 Continuing and increased allocation, depending on success of pilot.

## INTRODUCTION

Undergraduates are the largest constituency served by the University of Minnesota, and they always will be. The Twin Cities campus of the University, at its best, can provide them with a distinctive, high quality education because it can draw from a depth of faculty, facilities, and resources available nowhere else in the state.

The University has several significant missions that can enrich undergraduate teaching and learning. It is a premier institution for graduate education and it includes several professional schools. The University is the land grant institution of the state, committed to equal opportunity and affirmative action, and public service is a clearly recognized obligation. Finally the University is a research institution. Scholarship--the advancement of learning--is a central distinguishing characteristic. For these reasons and for the excellence and variety of the University's offerings, students come to us at all ages and from all parts of the world, helping to create a heterogeneous and cosmopolitan environment.

Because the Twin Cities campus is located in a major metropolitan area that is a center of the arts, government, and business, we can provide our students with opportunities for internships, field learning, and community service. Because it is part of an extensive postsecondary system in Minnesota, it welcomes transfer students and works to facilitate their entry into the University. And because the campus is in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, where 73 percent of the state's underrepresented minority population resides, and because there are faculty and staff at the University who have developed expertise in working with these students, the Twin Cities campus of the University has a particular mission to serve them.

The University's full potential for undergraduate education will be realized when:

- The University community and the people of Minnesota fully accept the principle that undergraduate education of high quality is an essential part of the mission of a great university.
- The people of Minnesota understand that realizing the potential of undergraduate education at the University requires increasing the state's per-student investment in it.
- Top University administrators support undergraduate education by emphasizing its importance, by assisting in clarifying its goals, and by monitoring its effectiveness.
- Faculty are recruited and retained on the basis of promise and achievement in both research and teaching.

- Students, both majority and minority, are recruited who can truly benefit from an environment of research and scholarship, who question and challenge the faculty, and who seek involvement with faculty and other students in activities outside the classroom.

- Staff members in all offices work to make University procedures as simple and efficient as possible.

- Staff members are prepared with the information they need to inform students about the full array of opportunities that the University provides.

The following four major problems interfere with our ability to realize the full potential of undergraduate education:

- **Absence of a sense of community:** The sheer numbers of students, the fact that so many are commuters and that many must work off-campus in order to finance their University education, make it difficult for them to form learning communities or to identify with the institution.

- **Insufficient integration of the curriculum:** Too many courses and too little guidance to help students select among them can lead to fragmented and incoherent degree programs.

- **Insufficient clarity of purpose:** In the absence of clear goal statements we have not been able to assess the outcomes of the educational experience we provide.

- **Uneven attention to teaching:** Although many departments encourage and reward excellent undergraduate instruction, their efforts have not been generalized across the entire Twin Cities campus. We have directed less attention than we should to defining good teaching, evaluating it, and creating incentives and support for its improvement.

We propose a set of 16 recommendations to overcome the problems and, thereby, to realize the promise of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus. To develop our plan, we have drawn on work of other recent University task forces and to some extent on national reports on undergraduate education. Appendix A contains a list of the University reports from which the present recommendations are taken. In addition, two committees whose tasks are related to the concerns of this Task Force have been meeting while we have been doing our work: the Special Committee on Establishing an Undergraduate Research Center on the Twin Cities Campus (Merwin Committee) and the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus (Taborn Committee). Appendix C lists the recommendations of those committees.

The University's experience in implementing the recommendations contained in other reports demonstrates it is possible to improve the quality of undergraduate education in a research university. Changes have occurred during the last three years. More dramatic changes must follow.

There are three sections of our report and major recommendations within each:

**Section I. Enhancing Teaching and Learning:** The Task Force recommends increasing the number of opportunities for active student learning (especially writing) in the curriculum; the improved integration and coherence of learning; and the expansion of honors programs. We recommend increased feedback from students to faculty about teaching and increased support for faculty to improve teaching. Several of our recommendations are intended to facilitate the development of learning communities among students. We recommend, in particular, that the Provost initiate and lead a process which engages the faculty in a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education.

**Section II. Supporting the Learning Process:** The Task Force recommends clearer admissions policies, a common catalog of all courses, and more effective advising. We recommend that greater educational use be made of cocurricular opportunities, and that greater attention be given to maintaining the quality of the physical environment, particularly classrooms and student-related space.

**Section III. Monitoring and Influencing the Effectiveness of Undergraduate Education:** The Task Force recommends that the University collect more information about its undergraduate education to monitor overall performance and to ensure that policies and administrative practices are changed as needed. The Task Force recommends collecting information about teaching and learning, so that good teaching may be encouraged and rewarded, and assistance may be provided for the improvement of ineffective teaching.

Appendix B, "Proposals for Implementing the Recommendations," is a key part of this final report and is the major addition to the Preliminary Report (March 18, 1987). Appendix B repeats the 16 recommendations, but connects them to 24 concrete proposals for implementing our recommendations, with cost estimates and, when feasible, time lines. The Task Force considered including the 24 proposals in the body of the report, but decided to keep the text as similar to the Preliminary Report as possible. For several of the recommendations, and in particular for Recommendations 1 and 2 concerning the overall undergraduate curricula, the proposals in Appendix B contain significant, new statements about the processes to be used in improving undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus.

## SECTION I: ENHANCING TEACHING AND LEARNING

Undergraduate teaching and learning can be significantly improved at the University of Minnesota if we make some changes both in what we teach and in how we teach. We need to ensure that our curricula have clearly-defined learning objectives; we need to assure our faculty that undergraduate teaching has a high priority; and we need to provide improved tools and techniques to enhance teaching and learning.

### Curriculum: Assuring Breadth, Depth, and Coherence

Every undergraduate curriculum should provide depth of study in a major field, breadth in liberal education, and a coherent and integrated program. The courses taught should give students practice in writing, speaking, developing and articulating a thesis, and critically evaluating ideas. Each curriculum should offer opportunities for outside-of-class learning including field experiences, internships, community service, and study abroad. Each should provide coherence and continuity in liberal education, and each should encourage students to integrate their learning into its social context.

Required courses must be offered with enough frequency so that they are available when needed. Wherever possible our undergraduate curricula, supported by high quality advising and related cocurricular activities, should foster a sense of community among our students. To help undergraduates make the best choices among courses, majors, and possible futures, our curriculum should be supported by the ongoing assessment and evaluation of students' aptitudes, skills, and motivation.

We are already moving toward these goals. A system of group distribution and major requirements for baccalaureate degrees exists to guide the achievement of breadth and depth in student learning. Honors programs are in place in most colleges.

To achieve these goals fully, however, will require the allocation and reallocation of resources, which must take place as part of the planning process of Strategy for Focus and as part of the funding for the Minnesota Campaign. Therefore, the Task Force makes specific recommendations to central administration, accompanied by suggestions of the kinds of initiatives that colleges and departments might wish to take to move in these directions.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **The Office of the Provost should encourage and consistently review collegiate efforts to fulfill the curricular goals of breadth, depth, coherence, and course availability. Resources should flow to collegiate units that address these goals in their planning. As a first step, the Provost should initiate and lead a process which**

engages the faculty in a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education.

2. **All undergraduates, whatever their areas of specialization or their vocational goals, should hold in common the objective of a liberal education. The Office of the Provost should monitor collegiate attention to liberal education, as it is exemplified in the group distribution requirements. The Office of the Provost should assure that colleges periodically review the group distribution requirements and that new programs include explicit attention to the ways students will be expected to meet them.**

The initiatives listed below are suggested as ways for units to respond to the recommendations listed above. The Task Force has identified several initiatives that colleges and departments can take to improve undergraduate teaching and learning. These are not arranged by priority. Rather, they are suggestions that have proven successful in some units or which the Task Force thinks could be helpful.

Collegiate Initiatives

- Require that students complete a certain number of courses that demand intensive writing, and ensure that a sufficient number of such courses are available to meet student demand.

- Encourage more opportunities for students to apply their academic learning. Students could be encouraged to integrate carefully planned field learning experiences, laboratory experiences, internships, community service projects, and study abroad into their programs.

- Provide honors colloquia and sections, because honors programs provide a greater challenge for students ready and willing to accept it. Honors curricula also provide an arena for conducting educational experiments which, if successful, could be transferred to other courses.

- Work cooperatively to link noncredit preparation and skill development as closely as possible with the regular curriculum. Developmental courses could be offered, where possible, not as separate courses, but as nondegree credit supplemental sections tied to regular courses.

Departmental Initiatives

- Encourage departments to include more opportunities in their undergraduate course offerings for students to become actively engaged in the learning process.

- Work, both individually and cooperatively, to develop courses and sequences of courses that foster the integration of learning.

Encourage students to see the connections among disciplines and bodies of knowledge, and to understand their major field in its social context. (These goals can be met through greater use of the prerequisite system, through development of courses in different departments that are linked by some shared topics, by shared satellite sections, or by other means that departments may devise.)

- Develop capstone seminars and senior projects that would have among their goals the integration of concepts in the major field, the analysis of a problem in the major field, communication of the results of a study in a form accessible to the nonspecialist, and/or evaluation of the major field in its social context. Colleges should consider requiring every graduate to complete a major seminar.

- Develop courses at the 3000 and 5000 level that meet distribution requirements because students need more continuity in liberal education. Such requirements should not be something to be "gotten out of the way" by taking courses only in the lower division.

In addition to the collegiate and departmental initiatives described above, the Task Force recommends a process for engaging faculty on the Twin Cities campus in a major curriculum revision process. Proposal 1 in Appendix A contains a description of the strategy to be used in that effort. The proposal calls for a process to engage the faculty in the review of the goals, especially those directed at liberal education, for undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus.

Faculty: Assuring High Quality Undergraduate Teaching

Because the University of Minnesota has several missions, its faculty must perform at a high level of achievement in three areas: teaching, research, and service.

Ideally, these areas are mutually reinforcing and supportive. In reality they are sometimes in conflict. The Twin Cities campus can move closer to the ideal and can foster the improvement of undergraduate teaching by creating incentives for faculty to give it higher priority, and by generalizing to all departments the exemplary undergraduate instruction that is already practiced by the best. In time, faculty may feel that a center for research and development in teaching and learning may be desirable to enhance further their knowledge of the most effective undergraduate pedagogy and the technologies that can enhance it.

The Task Force's recommendations are made to central administration and are followed by suggestions of the kinds of initiatives colleges and departments may take to meet them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

3. **The Office of the Provost should represent the importance of undergraduate instruction in several ways:** (a) by unequivocally stating to collegiate units that the quality of a faculty member's teaching

will play a significant role in searches, original appointments, promotion and tenure decisions, and in allocation of merit salary increases; (b) by insisting that colleges and departments provide training programs for teaching assistants that will include both cultural and pedagogical components; and (c) by encouraging and consistently reviewing collegiate and departmental efforts to improve the documentation of teaching quality and effectiveness.

4. **Central administrators at the presidential and vice presidential level should reinforce the Provost's efforts by providing frequent public statements of the University's goals in undergraduate instruction. Such statements will help assure that both new instructors and current staff are aware of the University's commitment to an instructional program that takes advantage of the unique resources of a major research university, and of the importance of good teaching.**

The following initiatives are suggested as ways of responding to the actions noted in the two recommendations listed above:

Collegiate and Departmental Initiatives

- Expand training programs for teaching assistants and hold every department accountable for preparing its TAs adequately for their classroom and advising responsibilities.

- Provide a simple way for students to comment on the quality of teaching and of student support services in addition to the standard course evaluations. It might consist of a readily available response card on which students could indicate satisfaction or dissatisfaction with specific aspects of their learning experience.

- Require careful review of teaching experience or potential before offering an appointment with a teaching responsibility and require well documented evidence of teaching competence for tenure or promotion.

- Designate a certain minimum percent or amount of the merit money allotted each year to be awarded on the basis of outstanding teaching.

- Expand mentoring programs that pair a new faculty member with an experienced colleague. A mentor can help the new person more readily understand departmental expectations and meet the many responsibilities that burden beginning teachers.

## SECTION II: SUPPORTING THE LEARNING PROCESS

High quality teaching and learning require more than effective faculty, rich curricular resources, and well-motivated students. They require, in addition, an array of structures, systems, and services outside the classroom.

Prospective students need easy access to information that will enable them to apply to the University in a timely fashion. They need to know the requirements of each admitting college and the characteristics of each major and degree program. Once admitted, students need an orientation that will acquaint them with the geography of the campus and the resources that are available to them, and will provide an opportunity to expand their interests and circle of acquaintances. A strength of the Twin Cities campus is the diversity of its programs. This strength becomes a weakness if students do not have easy access to information about the offerings of the entire campus. In addition, both students and faculty need classrooms that are clean and pleasant, and campus space that promotes informal discussions among students and faculty. The following recommendations will help to meet these needs and to support the learning process.

### Admission and Orientation

The Implementation Task Force considered carefully whether students would be better served if the University reduced the number of freshman-admitting colleges: at present there are seven on the Twin Cities campus.[1] The Task Force concluded, however, that the present diversity reflects fundamental differences in students' goals and educational experiences, and that consolidation would in some cases make it more difficult to work with students in small groups. Despite the differences that remain, moreover, the University has made considerable progress in simplifying requirements and admissions procedures.

There are some steps, in addition, that will make it easier for students to compare the various colleges, and that will simplify and speed up the admissions process even further. The strategies to be used in carrying out the following recommendations are described in Appendix B.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

5. **The Office of the Provost should work with appropriate units to do the following:** (a) simplify the admissions process. (Appendix D contains a set of suggestions.); (b) prepare a single brochure that contains all of the curricular and admission information of interest to prospective undergraduate students, both freshmen and transfer, in all Twin Cities units; and (c) provide uniform admission cutoff dates for all

---

[1] The seven colleges are: College of Liberal Arts, Institute of Technology, General College, University College, College of Agriculture, College of Home Economics, and College of Forestry.

colleges. For example, we suggest February 1 for priority consideration and April 1 as an absolute deadline for fall admission.

6. **Students should be notified within a month after receipt of application whether they have been accepted, rejected, or deferred (placed in a holding category).** (Enrollment management may require that applicants be placed in a pool for consideration as a group; thus decisions on some early applications may have to wait until after the absolute deadline.)

7. Newly admitted students currently receive a confusing variety of mailings about orientation and matriculation. Units that prepare such mailings should work together to coordinate and streamline them.

Advising and Counseling

Some of the time and effort saved by the anticipated reduction in the number of undergraduate students should be directed to improvement in the quality of undergraduate advising.

Students achieve best when taught in ways that are in keeping with their preferred learning styles, and directed toward long-range academic objectives most compatible with their abilities and goals. Good advising is necessary to accomplish these purposes. Students need well-informed and interested faculty advisers. Advising (e.g., about selection of courses, choice of major, and options within a major) is an essential component of teaching. Students also need the help of peer and professional advisors who keep abreast of the details of University regulations, and may also require the assistance of experts in the University Counseling Center and elsewhere on campus.

Full and updated information on courses, majors, college requirements, and graduation outcomes is essential to a good advising system. Appendix B lists the specific proposals designed to implement the two proposals listed below.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

8. **The Office of the Provost shall direct the development of a common bulletin for the entire Twin Cities campus. It will be an important advising tool and the first source of information for students, faculty, and advisors. It should not, however, be thought of as a recruiting tool. The many bulletins that now exist should be consolidated and published in a less expensive format, with a size and quality of paper similar to the student-staff directory. The bulletin should contain a catalog of all courses offered as well as all collegiate regulations and curricular requirements.**

9. **In order to assure that undergraduate advising receives a high priority, the Office of the Provost should:** (a) ask colleges to describe the resources they are devoting to advising; (b) ask that

colleges increase the number of peer and professional advisors, freeing the faculty for more informal advising relationships with students. Insist that workloads and statements of college expectations should indicate clearly that faculty are expected to enter into these more informal advising relationships; (c) encourage departments to foster informal faculty-student contact; and (d) encourage the colleges to work together to make it easier for students to learn of opportunities in other colleges and, where requirements are met, to transfer between them. This will help students who wish to consider a range of majors during their first two years. Resources should flow to collegiate units that address these goals in their planning.

Physical Environment and Equipment

Undergraduate teaching and learning are most effective when they occur in classrooms and student study spaces that are attractive and flexible enough to be readily adapted to changing objectives, and that are well located, well equipped, and well maintained.

Unfortunately these conditions too seldom prevail on the Twin Cities campus. Many classrooms are poorly designed, poorly appointed, and dirty. General purpose equipment is often absent or in bad repair. Student study space, especially important on a commuter campus, is scarce and overcrowded, and the heavy scheduling of classrooms--as one class leaves the next one enters--makes informal after-class conversations or questions between professor and student almost impossible.

To improve the physical environment will require both a short-range determination to upgrade classroom maintenance, and perhaps withdraw some unsatisfactory rooms from service, and a long-range commitment to rehabilitation and renovation. It will also require that significant attention be given in new construction to providing adequate classroom and student study space.

An overriding consideration is the realization that buildings and their support systems continue to age. The enormity of the implications of this fact can be put into perspective by examining one of the realities that Physical Plant must face. The cost to replace a wearing-out heating plant is estimated at between $80 and $120 million.

The proposals to implement Recommendations 10 and 11 are outlined in Appendix B.

RECOMMENDATIONS

10. **The Office of the Provost, together with the director of Physical Plant, should inventory classroom and student study space, conduct a needs assessment, and develop a plan for meeting the needs assessed (e.g., adequate ventilation, acoustics, aesthetics, and lighting). Some needs are so clearly evident that they need not await the assessment process.**

11. **The Office of the Provost, in cooperation with planning staff in Physical Plant, should aggressively monitor plans for new construction or major renovation projects. A sign-off should be required before projects are submitted for bidding. This will help to ensure that adequate attention is given to the needs of students and faculty for informal meeting spaces and for classrooms. This monitoring should be especially sensitive to design elements needed to make academic programs fully accessible to students with disabilities.**

Cocurriculum

The cocurriculum consists of student organizations and activities that help motivate learning by bringing students together outside of classes in groups in which intellectual activities are the focus. This can happen in dormitories, fraternities and sororities, religious groups, clubs, forums, and discussion groups. When a faculty member can become part of the group, even on a short-term basis, this person has an especially rich teaching opportunity.

There are ample reasons why students find it difficult to participate in cocurricular activities: most undergraduates are commuters; many have off-campus jobs and family responsibilities. Parking is difficult and bus schedules procrustean. However, to the extent it is practical, students should be encouraged to participate in on-campus, noncredit activities. Although the whole University, in the ideal, is a learning community, its values are most likely to be realized in an institution this large in smaller groups, each held together by shared interests.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

12. **Greater coordination and linkage should be developed between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in educational areas that reach beyond the classroom, and the Office of the Provost should affirm that faculty participation in out-of-classroom learning is consistent with the educational mission of the University and worthy of its best teaching talents.**

## SECTION III: MONITORING AND INFLUENCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

The Task Force has set out a number of goals for undergraduate education and a series of recommendations about how to reach them. Once the recommendations are enacted the University will need ways of measuring whether the institution is moving toward its goals, and ways of stimulating movement if it is not.

We recommend two separate mechanisms for these purposes. The first is primarily administrative: to monitor overall performance and to ensure that policies and administrative practices are changed as needed to control enrollments and to improve undergraduate education. The second is directed toward faculty and students: student learning should be defined, assessed, and linked to instructional activities. Good undergraduate teaching should be rewarded, ineffective teaching improved.

The Office of the Provost needs to: (a) gather information to determine whether the Twin Cities campus is moving toward its goals for undergraduate education; (b) distribute that information to those who must act to change performance when necessary, and; (c) design mechanisms intended to make sure that the information is acted on and that the University's performance improves as a result.

### Monitoring the Effectiveness of the System

The recommendations that follow address goals related to improving the quality of undergraduate education and the numerical goals from A Commitment to Focus for reducing enrollments while maintaining access for minorities and disadvantaged students. Appendix B provides greater detail regarding the implementation of the two recommendations stated below.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

13. **The Office of the Provost should recommend exactly what information is needed, estimate the cost of obtaining it, and determine an appropriate schedule for gathering and disseminating it. Four kinds of information are needed. (See Appendix E for an illustrative list of possible variables of each kind.)**

    - Variables that monitor the context, primarily demographic, in which our programs are provided (context variables).
    - Variables that measure the number of students coming into the undergraduate programs and their preparation (input variables).
    - Variables that measure aspects of the effort devoted by the University to the education that undergraduates receive (process variables).

- Variables that measure aspects of the quality of the education they receive (output variables).

14. **The Office of the Provost should establish an administrative structure that is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and reporting the four types of information noted above. The Provost should also monitor the results of changes in the quality of undergraduate education and should provide annual reports to the Campus Assembly and the Board of Regents.**

Collegiate and Departmental Initiatives

Departments might respond to the above recommendations in several ways: (a) by including the relevant information on the quality of undergraduate education in their planning efforts; (b) by developing indicators of quality in their review of particular programs and curricula; and (c) by initiating periodic meetings of curriculum committees and related faculty committees, especially those meetings that address curriculum evaluation and revision.

Enhancing Faculty Efforts on Behalf of Improved Instruction

Most University faculty members attend responsibly and conscientiously to their undergraduate teaching. They do so predominantly because of its intrinsic rewards: they enjoy seeing students develop, they have a commitment to their discipline and believe it is significant to students, to society, and to life. They learn through teaching and from students, and students show appreciation for their efforts.

Conscientious faculty members also spend considerable time in efforts to improve their teaching and to inform themselves about new methods and technologies appropriate to the undergraduate classroom.

To assist them, and to increase the involvement of faculty in generating and testing ideas about improving undergraduate education, the University should direct greater attention and resources to research on student learning. The principle that ought to guide these efforts is that the faculty who are expected to use the results of research on undergraduate education should be involved in defining the questions asked and in conducting the research.

The need for increased attention to research on and evaluation of teaching and learning has been discussed in several reports in the last three years. Currently, the University of Minnesota devotes fewer resources to conducting research on and evaluation of teaching and learning than it has in the recent past. With the dissolution of the Measurement Services Center, the Office of Student Life Studies and Planning, and the Consulting Group on Instructional Design, the University concluded that past mechanisms to facilitate such activities were not effective in reaching institutional goals in this important area of endeavor. The University needs to develop a new approach to facilitate pedagogical research and evaluation of teaching and learning.

Appendix B contains a strategy and associated costs to enhance faculty efforts on behalf of improved instruction. The strategy includes ten specific proposals for increasing faculty activity in research on and evaluation of teaching and learning, and for more closely connecting those activities with instructional improvement. Recommendation 15 has seven associated proposals to address the need to facilitate faculty research on undergraduate education. Although evaluation of teaching (including peer, self, and student evaluation of instruction) is an essential part of research on undergraduate education, it warrants separate attention. Recommendation 16 has three connected proposals that focus specifically on mechanisms to give greater attention to linking evaluation of teaching with instructional improvement.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

15. **An administrative function that would facilitate faculty research on undergraduate education should be established in the Office of the Provost.**

16. **The Office of the Provost should ask the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to reevaluate the 1974 Senate Policy on the Evaluation of University Teaching (See Appendix F for text) and to consider further steps to increase the attention given to appraising instructional quality.**

## APPENDIX A

## PREVIOUS REPORTS ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND SOURCES OF RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

Previous Reports on Undergraduate Education
(listed alphabetically)

Committee on Establishing an Undergraduate Research Center on the Twin Cities Campus (Merwin Committee) 1987

Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (CQUL) 1985.

Committee to Conduct an Orientation Program Review (Orientation) 1983.

Coordinating Committee for Commitment to Focus (CTF Coordinating) 1986.

Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus (Coordinated Lower Division) 1986.

Special Committee on Enriched Advising for Academically Fragile Students (Enriched Advising) 1986.

Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus (Minority Programs) 1987.

Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements (Preparation Requirements) 1986.

Task Force on TA Training and Development (TA Training and Development) 1986.

Task Force on the Student Experience (SETF) 1984.

Sources of the Sixteen Recommendations

Each of the recommendations in this preliminary report was derived from one or more of the previous reports that are listed above. Each of the recommendations is more fully elaborated in the previous reports. To facilitate access to the fuller elaboration, the recommendations are listed here with the reports from which they are derived:

1. Curricular depth, breadth, coherence, and course availability:
   - Coordinated Lower Division
   - CTF Coordinating
   - Preparation Requirements
   - SETF

2. Liberal education and group distribution requirements:

- Coordinated Lower Division
- CTF Coordinating

3. Higher priority to undergraduate instruction:
   - CQUL
   - SETF
   - TA Training and Development

4. Public statements in support of undergraduate instruction:
   - CQUL

5. Simplifying and coordinating the admissions process:
   - Coordinated Lower Division
   - CTF Coordinating
   - SETF

6. Prompt notification of admissions:
   - SETF

7. Coordination of mailings on orientation and matriculation:
   - SETF

8. Development of a common bulletin:
   - SETF

9. Higher priority to undergraduate advising:
   - CQUL
   - Enriched Advising
   - Minority Programs
   - Orientation Committee
   - SETF

10. Needs assessment of classroom and student study space:
    - CQUL
    - SETF

11. Attention to classroom and student space in new construction:
    - SETF

12. Coordination of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs
    - SETF

13. Documentation and assessment of undergraduate teaching and learning:
    - CQUL
    - CTF Coordinating
    - Enriched Advising
    - Minority Programs
    - SETF

14. Administrative structure for monitoring the collection and reporting of data on undergraduate teaching and learning:
    - CTF Coordinating

## APPENDIX B

## PROPOSALS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The Office of the Provost should encourage and consistently review collegiate efforts to fulfill the curricular goals of breadth, depth, coherence, and course availability. Resources should flow to collegiate units that address these goals in their planning.

Recommendation 2: All undergraduates, whatever their areas of specialization or their vocational goals, should hold in common the objective of a liberal education. The Office of the Provost should monitor collegiate attention to liberal education, as it is exemplified in the group distribution requirements. The Office of the Provost should assure that colleges periodically review the group distribution requirements and that new programs include explicit attention to the ways students will be expected to meet them.

Proposal 2.1

The Provost should initiate and lead a process which engages the faculty in a fundamental review and reshaping of liberal education.

Principles to guide the process. We suggest that the design and goals of the process should be guided by the following principles:

- Faculty, in the normal course of their work, are responsible for updating their courses and the curricula of their departments.
- In order for more dramatic change to occur, such as redefinition and restructuring of curricula for liberal education or reassessment of the total curriculum of a college, additional resources must be made available.
- Because large-scale curriculum change requires planning and cooperation across colleges, the Office of the Provost properly has the responsibility to facilitate the process.
- Pilot programs are devices for initiating curricular change.
- The freshman-admitting colleges are important sources of curricular change.

Focus and basic purposes of the process. The focus of the process should be liberal education; its basic purpose should be to reexamine and redefine the meaning of liberal education for the 1990s and to adjust the substance and delivery of liberal education on the Twin Cities campus to fit the new meaning. It should feature the distinctive kind of liberal education that can be provided by the faculty of a research university. This education will emphasize active engagement in modes of inquiry over learning of facts and memorizing of

theories; it will involve students in bringing together modes of inquiry from the various disciplines to form a complex vision of our society--its achievements and its problems--and to evaluate new directions and solutions.

The Task Force is convinced that the Twin Cities campus should increase dramatically the coherence of the liberal education it provides, that it should move to a version of a core curriculum, perhaps a small set of "mini-cores" or tracks suited to the size and character of the Twin Cities campus. Other key elements to be considered in the process are increased writing and seminar experiences in courses meeting liberal education requirements, increased field learning as part of liberal education, increased attention to cultural diversity and to preparation for thoughtful participation in an international economy and society, increased honors opportunities, and increased integration of developmental instruction with the regular curriculum. A newly structured liberal education will make liberal education a component of every stage of an undergraduate's program.

The design of the process. At the first stage of the process, the Assembly Committee for Undergraduate Education and the Council of Undergraduate Deans should work cooperatively to identify basic areas of liberal education (distribution areas) and to give a preliminary philosophy/definition of what undergraduates should learn in each of the areas. At the second stage, faculty committees formed for each area should further define the learning goals of the area and to design curricula to meet the goals. At both stages college policy and curriculum committees should participate fully in the process, through overlapping membership with the central committees and through planning of agendas that ensures a dialogue between central and college committees.

It is worth remarking that because of the new preparation standards and the University's strengthened cooperation with the Community College System and with Minnesota private colleges, this is an excellent time to undertake a fundamental review and reform of the liberal education curriculum. Ways should be found for representatives from the schools, the community colleges, and the private colleges to participate in this process of redefining liberal education.

Allocation. As A Commitment to Focus is implemented, the University will have increased per student resources to provide education of greater intensity and depth to a smaller number of students. With the present proposal, the Task Force is recommending that a significant portion of these enriched resources be devoted to a dramatic improvement of liberal education and that the Twin Cities campus begin at once to plan its new approach to liberal education and to lay out a clear path to take it from the present approach to the new one.

There will be two kinds of costs: (a) planning costs, for workshops, consultants, and faculty released time to generate ideas and design new

curriculum; and (b) program costs, the increased costs of instructional strategies that involve more active learning.

We recommend that resources for conferences and workshops in the Office of Educational Development Programs be committed completely to support the planning in this effort for a period of at least three years. Cost: $100,000 per year.

The program costs, in the long run, will come from the increased per student resources provided by A Commitment to Focus. To ensure a smooth progress of planning and implementation, we recommend a strategy that leverages temporary funding, some of which might be raised from external sources as part of the Minnesota Campaign, against permanent resources that will become available as Commitment to Focus is implemented. In addition, all of the funds in the Twin Cities portion of the Educational Development Grants Program--about $150,000 per year--should be devoted to this curriculum project. As an example of a staged process of this kind, we suggest that allocations of temporary funds be made in three stages--1988-89, 1989-90, and 1990-91--and that at each stage an amount equal to 1 percent of the Twin Cities undergraduate instructional budget be committed for a three-year period. Such a strategy would lead to approximately the following pyramid of temporary funding in departments and colleges:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1988-89 | $1,500,000 |
| 1989-90 | $3,000,000 |
| 1990-91 | $4,500,000 |
| 1991-92 | $3,000,000 |
| 1992-93 | $1,500,000 |

This funding over five years would total $13,500,000.

Recommendation 3: **The Office of the Provost should represent the importance of undergraduate instruction in several ways:** (a) by unequivocally stating to collegiate units that the quality of a faculty member's teaching will play a significant role in searches, original appointment, promotion and tenure decisions, and in allocation of merit salary increases; (b) by insisting that colleges and departments provide training programs for teaching assistants that will include both cultural and pedagogical components; and (c) by encouraging and consistently reviewing collegiate and departmental efforts to improve the documentation of teaching quality and effectiveness.

Recommendation 4: **Central administrators at the presidential and vice presidential level should reinforce the Provost's efforts by providing frequent public statements of the University's goals in undergraduate instruction. Such statements will help assure that both new instructors and current staff are aware of the University's commitment to an instructional program that takes advantage of the unique resources of a major research university, and of the importance of good teaching.**

Recommendation 5: **The Office of the Provost should work with appropriate units to do the following:** (a) simplify the admissions process. (A set of

suggestions is included in Appendix D.); (b) prepare a single brochure that contains all of the curricular and admission information of interest to prospective undergraduate students, both freshmen and transfer, in all Twin Cities units; and (c) provide uniform admission cutoff dates for all colleges. For example, we suggest February 1 for priority consideration and April 1 as an absolute deadline for fall admission.

Proposal 5.1

The present Viewbook should be expanded to include information of special interest to new students. A variation of it should be developed for the transfer student. Its present cost is $40,012. Expansion and variation will require an additional $10,000 of new money.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $10,000

Recommendation 6: **Students should be notified within a month after receipt of application whether they have been accepted, rejected, or deferred (placed in a holding category).** (Enrollment management may require that applicants be placed in a pool for consideration as a group; thus decisions on some early applications may have to wait until after the absolute deadline.)

Proposal 6.1

A new admissions system has been developed with capability of capturing detailed high school course information and other data needed to provide better advising, evaluation, and tracking of requirements. (At this time, each operator can process only four new high school student applications per hour, and three transfer student applications per hour.)

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $131,000

Staff and SEE costs per year, needed to achieve notification of admission status to applicants within four weeks, are:

| | Personnel | | SEE $ | Total $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FTE | $ | | |
| Data Entry Operator | 1 | $ 14,892 | $ 400 | $ 15,292 |
| Senior Office Assistants | 3 | $ 42,588 | $ 1,200 | $ 43,788 |
| Misc. payroll (files) | 1 | $ 15,000 | $ 300 | $ 15,300 |
| Misc. payroll (adm.) | 3 | $ 42,588 | $ 1,200 | $ 43,788 |
| Eight CRT terminals | | | $12,800 | $ 12,800 |
| TOTAL: | | $115,068 | $15,900 | $130,968 |

Recommendation 7: **Newly admitted students currently receive a confusing variety of mailings about orientation and matriculation. Units that prepare such mailings should work together to coordinate and streamline them.**

Review of publications and coordination of their use is essential. A publication review board should be established to develop policy, review the

needs of appropriate clientele, and advise about the material to be included in such publications.

There needs to be acceptance of the principle that orientation is a process and not an event. The orientation program must evolve as a more effective service agent of academic programs. Within the next two academic years, 1987-89, initiatives toward this goal would amount to $77,355 of which student fees would cover about half.

Proposal 7.1

Orientation should be considered an ongoing process, not an event. The following are recommended for initiation and completion during the 1987-88 fiscal year:

| | |
|---|---|
| Minneapolis Campus Information Center | $12,615 |
| St. Paul Campus Information Center | $ 4,500 |
| New Student Peer/Mentor Program | |
| A. Development (one-time expense only) | $12,240 |
| B. Implementation | $15,500 |
| Expanded Welcome Week Program | $12,000 |
| Increased staff support to existing programs: Orientation, registration, graduate student program, parents' program, and University Community Program | $19,300 |
| Expansion of Rendezvous for Booklovers Program and other programs that tie new student experience more directly to academic programming | $ 1,200 |
| Allocation. (Source of funds: fees and reallocation) | $77,315 |

Recommendation 8: **The Office of the Provost shall direct the development of a common bulletin for the entire Twin Cities campus. It will be an important advising tool and the first source of information for students, faculty, and advisors. It should not, however, be thought of as a recruiting tool. The many bulletins that now exist should be consolidated and published in a less expensive format, with a size and quality of paper similar to the student-staff directory. The bulletin should contain a catalog of all courses offered as well as all collegiate regulations and curricular requirements.**

The bulletin should be published annually. If necessary, sections could be revised on the same cycle that is used now, so that only a portion is revised each year.

Proposal 8.1

A common bulletin of phone book size and paper should be prepared and 60,000 copies printed at a cost of $2.50 per copy. In the first year of preparing the bulletin, one FTE staff person will be needed.

Allocation. 1 clerical FTE $25,000
(To be funded from savings of $64,000 over individual bulletins.)

Recommendation 9: **In order to assure that undergraduate advising receives a high priority, the Office of the Provost should:** (a) ask colleges to describe the resources they are devoting to advising; (b) ask that colleges increase the number of peer and professional advisors, freeing the faculty for more informal advising relationships with students. Insist that workloads and statements of college expectations should indicate clearly that faculty are expected to enter into these more informal advising relationships; (c) encourage departments to foster informal faculty-student contact; and (d) encourage the colleges to work together to make it easier for students to learn of opportunities in other colleges and, where requirements are met, to transfer between them. This will help students who wish to consider a range of majors during their first two years. Resources should flow to collegiate units that address these goals in their planning.

Recommendation 10: **The Office of the Provost, together with the director of Physical Plant, should inventory classroom and student study space, conduct a needs assessment, and develop a plan for meeting the needs assessed (e.g., adequate ventilation, acoustics, aesthetics, and lighting). Some needs are so clearly evident that they need not await the assessment process. The following proposals concern the most urgent of them:**

Proposal 10.1

Provide for addition of a professional staff appointment (1 FTE) with classroom experience to do a continuous inventory of classroom facilities. This person would interact with administration, faculty, and the University Physical Planning and Physical Plant offices, and would be responsible for reporting needs, assisting in the development of cost estimates, monitoring projects as they are undertaken, and following the processes through to completion.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $30,000

Proposal 10.2

Maintenance of high-traffic areas: Provide funding for part-time student positions (5 FTEs) to circulate and provide cleanup to high traffic areas (2 FTEs each for the Minneapolis East and West Banks, 1 FTE for the St. Paul Campus).

Allocation . (Source of funds: reallocation) $50,000

Proposal 10.3

Provide support for four part-time students (approximately 1 FTE--classification: Senior Office Assistant for a total of $15,000) to scan classrooms daily before 8:00 a.m. on a rotating basis. These students should be located in the office of the Assistant Director for Student

Support Services. The annual budget for the kinds of minor maintenance and repairs that these students would report should be doubled from its current level of $15,000.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $30,000

Proposal 10.4

Major upgrading of classrooms: There are some 300 general purpose classrooms on the Twin Cities campus; most are used for undergraduate teaching. These rooms are heavily scheduled and take much wear. Improvement needs for classrooms of lower capacity (below 150) tend to be addressed through the annual budget for major upgrading ($75,000 annually). A more realistic figure for major classroom renovation (excluding auditoriums) would be $200,000 annually. There should be a one-time capital outlay of $3,000,000 for the major upgrading of 18 auditorium-studio classrooms

Allocation. $3,000,000

The 1987 Legislature appropriated $2,827,400 for upgrading general purpose classrooms in the 1987-89 biennium.

Proposal 10.5

Increase the annual budget for major upgrading of classrooms from its current level of $75,000 to $200,000. (This figure assumes the allocation of the one-time capital outlay of $3,000,000 for auditoriums.)

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $125,000

Proposal 10.6

Provide a one-time capital expenditure to replace and repair furnishings and equipment in student-related spaces.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $200,000

Recommendation 11: **The Office of the Provost, in cooperation with the planning staff in Physical Plant, should aggressively monitor plans for new construction or major renovation projects. A sign-off should be required before projects are submitted for bidding. This will help to ensure that adequate attention is given to the needs of students and faculty for informal meeting spaces and for classrooms. This monitoring should be especially sensitive to design elements needed to make academic programs fully accessible to students with disabilities.**

Recommendation 12: **Greater coordination and linkage should be developed between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in educational areas that reach beyond the classroom, and the Office of the Provost should affirm that faculty participation in out-of-classroom learning is consistent with the**

educational mission of the University and worthy of its best teaching talents.

Proposal 12.1

A pilot project to demonstrate the possibilities inherent in this recommendation and to foster the development of student communities in the lower division is the New Student Program which will begin on a pilot basis in fall 1987. It will welcome new students to the University of Minnesota, invite them to become active members of the University community, and provide them with special opportunities to pursue their academic interests both inside and outside the classroom.

Eventually 1500 students will be involved from each year's entering class. The first year after the pilot, our goal will be to involve 500 students in 25 groups of 20 students each; in 1989-90, 1000 students in 50 groups; and in 1990-91, 1500 students in 75 groups. The final goal will be to involve approximately one-third of the entering class.

To encourage cohesiveness among classmates and to foster community and identification with the institution, each year's entering class will be assigned a theme by the previous year's student guides. Participating students in 1988-89 might select as a theme "Human Survival" for the class of 1989-90. The theme will then provide an organizing metaphor for each of the student groups and for various campus events and activities (speakers, films, art exhibits, readings in composition courses, etc.) In this way, students and alumni will be encouraged to identify themselves by their entering year theme (for example, the class of 1988, whose theme was "Human Survival.")

To encourage active participation and active learning, group members will be asked to define and complete a group project during the course of their first year together. The culminating event of the year could be a day-long program or fair at which the various projects would be presented to faculty advisers, fellow students, family, and friends.

To ensure faculty involvement and commitment to the project, an advisory committee will work with the program coordinator, staff, and student guides. In addition, a faculty adviser will be assigned to offer guidance to each student group.

To get things underway during 1987-88, we propose to establish three test groups of 15-20 students each. Each group will be led by a volunteer student guide and will represent the diversity of the University population--including a variety of majors and many different ethnic and racial backgrounds. Cooperation with Orientation and the New Students Program Office will be essential in identifying student participants and planning events related to the theme.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $29,200

Staff will include:

- One senior-level administrator (a recent retiree would be appropriate) with broad responsibility for overseeing and coordinating the many activities on campus relating to involving students in the University academic community, with particular attention to managing the new student program and strengthening departmental student organizations:

  (half-time position) $10,000

- One half-time administrative assistant (perhaps a graduate student) whose primary responsibility will be recruiting students to the program and selecting, training, and supervising student guides:

  (one-half of instructor-level floor) $9,948

- One half-time secretary: $8,676

- A volunteer faculty advisory committee, made up of recent winners of the Morse-Amoco Teaching Award. One faculty member will be assigned to each group of students to offer guidance and support.

- A cadre of student volunteers, perhaps graduate students, who will serve as guides and nuclei to the groups of students.

- Evaluation and assessment of pilot project: $500

Recommendation 13: **The Office of the Provost should recommend exactly what information is needed, estimate the cost of obtaining it, and determine an appropriate schedule for gathering and disseminating it. Four kinds of information are needed. (See Appendix E for an illustrative list of possible variables of each kind.)**

- Variables that monitor the context, primarily demographic, in which our programs are provided (context variables).

- Variables that measure the number of students coming into the undergraduate programs and their preparation (input variables).

- Variables that measure aspects of the effort devoted by the University to the education that undergraduates receive (process variables).

- Variables that measure aspects of the quality of the education they receive (output variables).

Proposal 13.1

The following should be done, beginning in 1988: a quadrennial survey of all graduates should be taken and a biennial sample of students: ($75,000 annually); data on high school preparation of NHS and NAS, required for the new preparation standards, should be collected ($80,000 annually); enrollment statistics and retention information should be programmed ($80,000, one-time).

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) (Annual) $155,000
(One-time) $ 80,000

Recommendation 14: **The Office of the Provost should establish an administrative structure that is responsible for collecting, analyzing and reporting the four types of information noted above. The Provost should also monitor the results of changes in the quality of undergraduate education and should provide annual reports to the Campus Assembly and the Board of Regents.**

Recommendation 15: **An administrative function that would facilitate faculty research on undergraduate education should be established in the Office of the Provost.**

Goals of the proposals. The following seven proposals form a coherent "package" of actions designed to achieve four goals: (a) increasing the momentum for faculty attention to research on teaching and learning; (b) creating mechanisms to involve faculty in research on teaching and learning; (c) connecting research and evaluation with planning and administrative decision-making; and (d) increasing the attention given to evaluating educational development activities.

Proposal 15.1

Although there is considerable interest on the part of faculty, the University needs an outside perspective in helping focus our attention and in developing increased momentum to conduct the necessary studies.

Bring an expert on current issues and strategies in assessing learning in higher education to campus for one quarter: (a) to contribute to ongoing discussions concerning issues we face as we change the composition of our undergraduate student population; and (b) to conduct a research seminar for interested graduate students and faculty.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $25,000

Proposal 15.2

Given that the thrust of this set of proposals is on involving faculty in research and educational activities, there must be a way for the results of those efforts to be shared with other faculty.

Conduct an annual conference that focuses on faculty research on teaching and learning. In the first year, give the conference a theme that centers

on the research issues identified from the above process. In the second and subsequent years, feature the findings from the projects funded through the process described below. Publish the conference papers for distribution to interested faculty and staff.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $7,500

Proposal 15.3

Some ongoing responsibility for coordinating these efforts must be assigned to one individual.

Reassign a professional staff member (quarter-time) in Academic Affairs to be responsible for coordinating activities, including planning the conference, obtaining and distributing to faculty copies of relevant research conducted elsewhere, and providing staff support to facilitate the funding of faculty proposals described below.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $15,000

Proposal 15.4

Topical literature reviews and evaluations can provide the foundation for a rational approach to informing the University's decisions regarding educational policies and practices. Focused reviews lend themselves to the summertime part of a faculty member's annual activity cycle, or, perhaps as part of a sabbatical leave.

Expand the Faculty Summer Research Program to include summer salary support especially designated for faculty who wish to review and evaluate a body of literature pertinent to an issue of educational policy or practice at the University of Minnesota. Announcement of the acceptability of such summer projects might include a list of specific topics which appropriate administrative officers, committees, or staff feel need to be examined. Each focused review would require approximately $5,000 in salary monies.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $25,000

Proposal 15.5:

Original data-gathering and analysis projects can be most effectively fostered by making the funds necessary to support them available to faculty through a program modeled on the Request for Proposals (RFP) approach used by various governmental agencies to stimulate research on topics of concern.

Initiate a Research and Evaluation Program that funds faculty to conduct research on and evaluation of teaching and learning. A reasonably thoroughgoing, year-long research project in this area would cost, on average, about $10,000. Fund five such endeavors annually.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $50,000

Proposal 15.6:

In the recent decades, the University of Minnesota has made several attempts to create organizational structures for conducting research on teaching and learning, but has failed to connect these offices with committees and groups charged with implementing change in undergraduate education. If the two efforts described above are to contribute to improving undergraduate education, they must address, in a timely fashion, the questions that are being asked by collegiate administrators.

Connect the programs described above to the Undergraduate Dean's Council by having a subcommittee of the group, in consultation with a panel of local faculty and staff members with special expertise in this area, oversee the programs. This panel of faculty and staff is necessary to be consistent with the principle guiding these efforts: that faculty who are expected to use the results of research should be involved in defining the questions asked. The subcommittee should be made up primarily, but not exclusively, of the deans of the freshman-admitting colleges. This subgroup of deans is suggested because their concern with undergraduate issues extends across the full four years and includes many of the most important issues, such as freshman admissions policies, remedial and advanced placement, initial adjustment to college life, the acquisition of academic values and intellectual habits, curriculum and career planning, policies that affect transfer students, ways to increase student retention, etc. The chair of this subcommittee should change among these deans every two years, with the support staff being provided by the coordinator of research and evaluation.

Allocation. (No additional costs)

Proposal 15.7: Although proposals for funding of instructional improvement projects require that the faculty member address the issue of evaluation, relatively little time and few financial resources are devoted to critical evaluation of the projects, especially those projects that have clear implications for improving instruction elsewhere in the University.

Request that the Educational Development Committee explore the nature and scope of evaluation and research activities that should occur in conjunction with educational development activities.

Allocation. (Additional costs cannot be projected at this time)

Recommendation 16: **The Office of the Provost should ask the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to reevaluate the 1974 Senate Policy on the Evaluation of University Teaching (See Appendix F for text)** and to consider further steps to increase the attention given to appraising instructional quality.

Proposal 16.1:

There was strong sentiment in the Task Force to evaluate all courses, to routinely include student course evaluations in the assessment of educational quality, and to use the results in more effective ways to enhance faculty vitality.

Request that SCEP place the "Evaluation of University Teaching" as an agenda item for fall quarter 1987.

Allocation. (Additional costs cannot be projected at this time)

Proposal 16.2:

When the Measurement Services Center was "disestablished" in 1982, processing of student evaluation of instruction ratings was assumed by the Technical Division of University Counseling Services (UCS). That part of UCS has been renamed the Office of Measurement Services and their professional staff are available to help departments, colleges, and faculty use new technologies in designing student evaluation systems.

Ensure that SCEP works closely with the Office of Measurement Services in its consideration of further steps to increasing the attention given to evaluating teaching.

Allocation. (Additional costs cannot be projected at this time)

Proposal 16.3:

The Implementation Task Force endorses the need for programs to help faculty become more effective teachers. Although several services are already available to faculty, one-on-one consultation with faculty on an individual's teaching methods and styles is not available. Probable uses for such a choice would be faculty and teaching assistants, either those who seek assistance voluntarily or those who are referred by department heads.

Hire an expert consultant on teaching in higher education to coordinate one-on-one consultation with faculty. To the extent possible, connect these consultation services with faculty noted for their teaching expertise, including the encouragement of team-teaching opportunities. The focus of consultation activities would be to analyze teaching performance (e.g., presentation skills, interpersonal skills, and course design) using peer observation, student evaluation of instruction, evaluation of course materials, and videotaping.

Allocation. (Source of funds: reallocation) $50,000-$100,000

## APPENDIX C

## OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus

-Recommendations-

**Recommendation 1:** The Committee recommends that the University provide resources to expand its current minority student recruitment efforts and implement a comprehensive, coordinated undergraduate recruitment program to identify and recruit minority students.

**Recommendation 2:** The Committee recommends that the University establish annual goals for the successful recruitment and admission of high-potential minority high school seniors.

**Recommendation 3:** The Committee recommends that the University expand, support, and effectively coordinate its early "reach-out" programs in those Minnesota elementary and secondary schools that serve a significant number of minority students.

**Recommendation 4:** The Committee recommends that the University provide funds to increase and improve the financial aid package for minority undergraduate students.

**Recommendation 5:** The Committee recommends that the University develop indices of academic potential that take into account the educational backgrounds and experiences of nontraditional students from minority populations. This is necessary in order to establish appropriate admissions criteria for these populations.

**Recommendation 6:** The Committee recommends that the University establish a centralized, coordinating mechanism for minority student programs in order to facilitate development of more uniform reporting methods, accountability, allocation of resources, fiscal planning, and to reduce possible redundancy of effort.

**Recommendation 7:** The Committee recommends that the University promote and reward creative efforts that increase the direct involvement of faculty members in addressing the academic needs of minority students.

**Recommendation 8:** The Committee recommends that the University develop creative funding strategies to support and insure the continuity and expansion of special programs that have demonstrated their effectiveness in facilitating the retention and graduation of minority students.

**Recommendation 9:** The Committee recommends that the University develop creative financial assistance programs to facilitate the continuous enrollment of upper division minority students.

**Recommendation 10:** The Committee recommends that the University develop and implement a program of staff development and graduate education for minority program personnel.

**Recommendation 11:** The Committee recommends that the University encourage academic and student support personnel, as part of their professional development, to enroll in courses and programs that upgrade their awareness, understanding, and communication skills with minority students.

**Recommendation 12:** The Committee recommends that the University strengthen the current Office of Equal Opportunity in Graduate Studies by placing responsibility for the program in the office of an associate dean whose duties will entail primary responsibility for exercising leadership with academic units to develop and implement creative initiatives for recruitment, retention, and graduation of minority graduate students.

**Recommendation 13:** The Committee recommends that the University establish annual goals for the successful recruitment of minority graduate students in all disciplines with special focus on those disciplines where minority students have been historically underrepresented.

**Recommendation 14:** The Committee recommends that the University provide funds to increase and improve the financial awards for minority graduate and professional students.

**Recommendation 15:** The Committee recommends that the University allocate resources to develop a comprehensive, centralized, computerized data system to facilitate monitoring the progress of minority students from initial contact (e.g., participants in special summer programs and applicants for admission) through graduation and follow-up after graduation.

**Recommendation 16:** The Committee recommends that the University develop mechanisms to support research concerning minority students in higher education with a special emphasis on the State of Minnesota.

**Recommendation 17:** The Committee recommends that the University establish a structured, highly visible, and aggressive program for minority faculty recruitment, which is coordinated and monitored centrally.

**Recommendation 18:** The Committee recommends that collegiate units establish short- and long-range goals for the successful recruitment of tenure-track minority faculty. These efforts should be reviewed annually at the highest level of academic administration.

**Recommendation 19:** The Committee recommends that the University encourage academic units to create initiatives that enhance the careers of minority faculty in their progress within their disciplines, relationships with their departmental colleagues, and their productivity in areas appropriate to their level of career development. Adaptations should be developed to facilitate the efforts of the coordinate campuses in attracting and retaining minority faculty.

**Recommendation 20:** The Committee recommends that the University take measures to provide adequate and physically attractive spaces that are commensurate with the programmatic needs of minority student programs.

**Recommendation 21:** The Committee recommends that the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs assume principal responsibility for the leadership, coordination, and provision of adequate resources for minority student academic programs and minority faculty recruitment/retention. A new position should be established in that office and a significant part of the responsibility of this position will be to provide leadership and coordinate minority programs.

**Recommendation 22:** The Committee recommends that the Board of Regents require an annual review of the University's progress in implementing the recommendations contained in this report.

## Report of the Special Committee to Study the Feasibility of a Centralized University Research Center on Undergraduate Education

-Recommendations-

**Recommendation 1:** The Director of the Center must report to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**Recommendation 2:** A Governing Board charged with setting policy and guiding the program of the Center should be established.

**Recommendation 3:** While the professional staff of the Center can be relatively small (2-4), it must be capable of providing expert assistance to those interested in conducting research on undergraduate education.

**Recommendation 4:** Specialized expertise such as that of bibliographers, statisticians, design experts and editors from across the University must be accessible as needed by those faculty doing research on undergraduate education.

**Recommendation 5:** The Center must function as a communication "hub," securing and disseminating information regarding research, research interests and research resources related to undergraduate education.

**Recommendation 6:** Funds designated for support of undergraduate research must not be comingled with those designated for educational development.

## APPENDIX D

## PROPOSED ADMISSIONS INDICES AND SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE ADMISSIONS PROCESS

To place our recommendations in perspective, note that the number of freshmen admitted to each college in fall quarter 1985 was:

| | |
|---|---|
| College of Liberal Arts | 2720 |
| Institute of Technology | 937 |
| General College | 896 |
| College of Home Economics | 68 |
| College of Agriculture | 65 |
| College of Forestry | 22 |

We make the following recommendations. If implemented, they will make it considerably easier for students to understand what the admission requirements are, to decide where to apply, and to receive an admission decision in a timely manner.

1. The following colleges on the Twin Cities campus should admit freshmen: College of Agriculture, College of Forestry, College of Home Economics, College of Liberal Arts, Institute of Technology, renamed General College.

2. The faculties of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics should examine the desirability of becoming upper division professional colleges.

3. There should be uniform admission dates for all colleges. For example, we suggest for fall quarter the dates be February 1 for priority consideration and an April 1 absolute deadline.

4. The University should make a public commitment to notify students whether they have been accepted or rejected no later than one month after the absolute deadline. If a positive decision can be made earlier, the student should be notified at once.

5. In order to make it easier for students to ascertain their chances for admission to the various colleges, all colleges should use the same indices for admission. One should be based on the PSAT, the other on the ACT. We recommend that the PAR = HSR + PSAT VERBAL + PSAT MATH be used. {The SAR, which is the HSR + (SAT VERBAL + SAT MATH)/10 is equivalent to the PAR.} The ACT index should be the AAR = HSR + 2*ACTCOMPOSITE.

6. Each college may adopt other criteria in addition to the indices for evaluating applications. For example, a college may require the student to have certain high school courses or to write an admission essay or to provide letters of recommendation. A college may also publish an explanation of the kind of student which it can best serve.

7. Each college should develop PAR cutoff values which will guarantee admission provided that its other admissions criteria are met. The numbers should be at least as high as the following for students applying for fall quarter 1988. Changes in these values in subsequent years should be recommended by the college faculty and approved by the Office of the Provost.

| College | PAR or SAR | AAR |
|---|---|---|
| Agriculture | 150 | 100 |
| Forestry | 150 | 100 |
| Home Economics | 150 | 100 |
| Institute of Technology | 190 | 140 |
| Liberal Arts | 150 | 100 |
| Renamed General College | (no level for guaranteed admission) | |

A college may use higher values if necessary for enrollment management.

8. Each college should develop and public state values, for each index, above which it will consider applications for freshman admission. Students with index values between this number and the one described above will be reviewed individually and admitted as space is available. We recommend the following values:

| College | PAR or SAR | AAR |
|---|---|---|
| Agriculture | 130 | 80 |
| Forestry | 130 | 80 |
| Home Economics | 130 | 80 |
| Institute of Technology | 150 | 100 |
| Liberal Arts | 130 | 80 |
| Renamed General College | (no level for guaranteed admission) | |

9. A single document should be sent to all applicants which states the admissions requirements of each freshman-admitting college.

10. A student who is admitted to one college but who does not meet the requirements for admission to another college may not apply for transfer until the grades for at least two quarters are available. A college may require more experience before considering the application.

The following recommendation, if adopted, should improve the student experience:

11. If there are more than 100 freshmen admitted to the college each year, students should be advised in smaller groups. These groups may take the form of curricular "tracks." Where courses from other colleges are used in the curriculum, faculty from the other colleges should be consulted during the development of the curriculum.

## APPENDIX E

## PROPOSED VARIABLES TO MONITOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

I. The context for undergraduate education (Context variables)
   - A. Demographic statistics
     1. High school graduates
        - a. Percent minority
     2. Number and percent enrolling in higher education, in Minnesota and nationally
        - a. New high school graduates versus others
        - b. Percent minority

II. Proposals to monitor students coming in to the program (Input variables)
   - A. Statistical monitoring by college
     1. Total admitted
        - a. Sex
        - b. Minority status
        - c. Resident/nonresident/foreign
     2. Qualifications
        - a. Test scores, class rank
        - b. Percent who meet preparation standards
        - c. Shortfalls from preparation standards
        - d. Number of advanced placements (total students and total subjects)

III. Proposals to monitor the process (Process variables)
   - A. Statistical monitoring by college
     1. Student mix
        - a. Lower division
        - b. Upper division
        - c. Adult special
        - d. Professional
        - e. Graduate
        - f. Totals for undergraduates reported by:
          - i. Minority status
          - ii. Instate/Outstate/Foreign
          - iii. Transfers
          - iv. Age
          - v. Sex
     2. Number on probation
   - B. Department performance
     1. Course surveys
        - a. Recommend to SCEP: student survey of every course every term
          - i. Faculty member does not collect surveys
          - ii. Departmental or central tabulation
          - iii. Departmental/college administrators have access to survey results
          - iv. Each faculty member is provided data that compares performance with that of relevant peers

2. Course closure data
3. Department checklist on attention to undergraduate education

C. Student experiences (to be taken from registration records, not from course records)
1. Distribution of class sizes faced by lower division students
2. Distribution of faculty (TAs versus regular faculty versus others) faced by lower division students
3. Percent of contact hours taught by nonnative English-speaking TAs (if feasible)
4. Number of students who obtain all their first choices in registration
a. Classified by lower division/upper division, if possible
5. CEE registration by day school students

IV. Proposals to monitor output (Output variables)

A. Statistical monitoring (by college)
1. Retention rates for freshmen (those who complete 90 credits?)
2. Graduation rates
a. for freshman entrants
b. for transfers
3. GRE scores of departing seniors
4. Placement statistics?

B. Monitoring student experiences
1. Student exit interviews
a. Satisfaction with quality of overall education
b. Satisfaction with major
c. Liberal education: What broadened your horizons?
2. Current student surveys
a. Satisfaction with registration/student records
b. Satisfaction with advising
c. Satisfaction with instruction
d. Satisfaction with physical facilities
e. Experience with cocurriculum (extracurricular activities transcript as alternative)

C. Monitoring competency
1. Staged process: start with CLA writing portfolio
2. Develop further competency tests based on principles to be endorsed by SCEP

## APPENDIX F

### 1974 SENATE POLICY ON TEACHING EVALUATION
as adopted by the University Senate, May 30, 1974

The University of Minnesota has a threefold mission for its faculty--teaching, scholarly and/or creative achievement, and service. Teaching is probably the most important of these missions. This policy statement is concerned with the evaluation of teaching. It has been prepared in the belief that evaluation contributes to teaching excellence and that excellent teaching should be appropriately rewarded.

Evaluation--or periodic, systematic appraisal of instruction--is imperative to the vitality of the University's teaching mission. Its force and effect can be twofold; both are equally important.

> Systematic evaluation can identify and acknowledge those instructional programs and practices which best demonstrate and exemplify the philosophy and mandate of excellence. In other words, it provides an opportunity for outstanding teaching to be identified and suitably rewarded at a number of administrative or decision-making levels.
>
> Equally significant is the potential of such a program for illuminating, with a keen diagnostic eye, those instructional situations where both instructor and students can benefit from the assistance and consultation of appropriate specialists. This can include, but not be limited to, the support services available through the Measurement Services Center, the Consulting Group on Instructional Design and other University resources.

Within a still wider framework, evaluation of teaching can be viewed as requiring an "open" system of communication, information and cooperation among students, members of the faculty and the administration.

> Teaching is an enormously broad and complex enterprise which takes many forms, occurs in many settings, has many different aspects, and interacts with many other activities of faculty. Criteria applied to judgment of the quality of didactic exposition cannot be applied to small group seminars. Teachers who value affective goals as highly as cognitive goals will use techniques different from those who see their roles as deliverers of information and ideas. Evaluation of teaching should not be done using a single set of criteria for all kinds of teaching, a single means of evaluation, or a single source of information.
>
> Information used in evaluation of teaching must come from a variety of sources in a variety of ways. Sources can include the instructor, colleagues, students and administrative supervisors, past and present. Ways to obtain information may be formal or informal and include conversation, written narratives, rating scales, analysis of audio and videotapes, and classroom

interaction analysis instruments. The kind of evaluation information and way in which it is obtained depend upon the purposes for which it is obtained.

A number of different purposes for evaluating teaching exist. Chief among these are the improvement of teaching, the making of personnel decisions, and the advisement of students in course selection. Confusion about the purpose for any particular evaluation activity presents problems. If the purpose is to obtain evidence for the improvement of instruction, does the evaluation attempt to identify strengths and weaknesses in the various aspects of teaching, or does it merely rate the instructor in some way? If the purpose is to gather evidence for making a promotion, tenure or salary decision, has agreement been reached between administrator and instructor as to the performance expected? Has the instructor's assignment been clarified with respect to the mission of the unit involved? If the purpose is to help students better select courses, have all those things students must know about a course and instructor been identified? Instructors really resent being rated when the purposes are not clear and the means seem unrelated to the purposes. Problems also arise when evidence is obtained for more than one purpose at the same time, or when information for one purpose is used for another.

Responsible and sensitive evaluation is tied closely to the provision of mechanisms for strengthening discovered weaknesses in instructional practice, faculty assignments, curriculum or other factors related to the instructional climate. It is also tied to an objective and effective system for rewarding identified excellence in teaching. It must also include safeguards for the rights of those being evaluated and those making the evaluation.

For the purpose of the policy, "faculty" refers to those full-time and part-time employees on the University with regular or nonregular appointments who engage in classroom instruction as part of their assigned responsibilities, including individuals who hold appointments as Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor and graduate students who hold appointments as Teaching Associate and Teaching Assistant.

Rationale: It is unclear whether the policy in its present form refers to Teaching Associates and Teaching Assistants as well as to faculty with regular appointments. Because much instruction at the University is done by Teaching Associates and Teaching Assistants, and because these nonregular members of the faculty deserve the same considerations and safeguards with respect to the evaluation of their teaching as do regular faculty, it seems desirable to include them explicitly in the policy.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** All faculty should evaluate at least one of their courses annually. Over a period of time, these evaluations should involve all types and levels of courses taught. Colleges and other units should develop a

plan for compulsory evaluation of all undergraduate courses beginning with the academic year 1975-76.

Comment: Faculty can benefit by invited observations by colleagues and supervisors, by student opinions obtained formally or informally, by the use of technology, such as audio and video tapes, and by measures of student achievement--among others. In most cases, a combination of approaches is desirable.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** Evaluation of teaching should include some form of student opinion of the teaching effectiveness of the instructor. Other sources might include teaching colleagues, professional peers, and the individual instructor.

Comment: No single source of information or single evaluation is sufficient for support of personnel decisions in particular. Student reactions must be one component of teaching evaluation. How student reaction is to be obtained should be a departmental decision. Student evaluations should not be the sole source of information but there are compelling reasons why student evaluation is valuable.

1. The student is in a unique position to evaluate instruction day by day.
2. The student has a backdrop of experience in other courses to use as a frame of reference.
3. The student is in contact with the entire educational process: as it affects examinations, preparation for class, bibliography, counseling, and the instructional aids used.
4. Students have a right to be heard.
5. The opinions of students should be solicited as an expression of faculty confidence in them and faculty respect for their judgments.

It is also apparent that some aspects of teaching are better evaluated by colleagues. The scholarship underlying teaching and the objectives of instruction can be judged by persons with the expert background possessed by departmental colleagues.

The individual instructor can be a valuable source of information. If the institutional attitude shows a caring for students and indicates that good teaching is valued, instructors likely will seek to:

1. secure measures of student growth in their command of the content of the course;
2. secure measures of value and attitude change in students;
3. secure feedback from students about goals, processes, etc.;
4. critically analyze their own techniques in search for more effective procedures.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** Since evaluation should be in terms of recognized goals, academic units should implement the Council of Liberal Education

recommendation regarding faculty performance agreements.[1] These should be written agreements that clearly state the criteria upon which faculty will be judged at the end of the stated term of the agreement. The criteria should be developed in line with those employed by all decision-making bodies having review functions with regard to faculty.

Comment: These faculty performance agreements are intended to preclude misunderstandings about what a faculty member is to be evaluated upon. They should be placed in the personnel file. Academic units should take individual differences in training and experience in teaching into account when establishing standards of expected performance. These expectations should be mutually agreed upon and clearly stated in the agreement. It is important that the criteria used by basic academic units be checked against those that might be employed by other decision making bodies such as promotion and tenure committees or salary committees. A faculty member should not be placed in the position of working faithfully to meet the criteria in a departmental performance agreement only to find a collegiate group using a different set of criteria to make a personnel decision.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** The results of evaluation for personnel decision-making should be treated as confidential information to be shared by the faculty member and the decision-making bodies. Release of this information to others should be at the discretion of the faculty member.

Comment: Release to the public of the results of evaluation, particularly that which is not well designed or is technically poor, can add unbearably to anxiety produced by evaluation itself. This is especially true when gathering data for instructional improvement and for rating personnel for administrative purposes is done at the same time.

**RECOMMENDATION 5:** The faculty reward system used at all levels in the University should be so designed to ensure that excellence in teaching contributes significantly to decisions concerning promotion and to salary

---

[1] "...Collegiate and departmental units develop faculty performance criteria consistent with their academic missions and establish evaluative procedures that measure performance effectiveness. Faculty assignments should reflect he individual's special talents and commitments as they relate to the missions of the academic unit. Departments of other appropriate units are expected to work out agreements with individuals concerning their University commitments, especially their teaching/advising assignments for each academic year.... Individuals will be responsible for fulfilling the conditions of their agreements while departments will be expected to provide information as to how they deal with their missions and goals and establish assignments. Documentary evidence of performance effectiveness consistent with these agreements will be required in support of recommendations for merit increases, promotions, and the granting of tenure. Such evidence will be used as a basis for judgments regarding these personnel decisions." "Perspectives and Recommendations Concerning the Improvement of Liberal Education," All University Council on Liberal Education Report to the Senate, Part II, Recommendation 1, 1973.

increases. Documentary evidence of instructional effectiveness should be used in support of decisions. However, attention should be paid to studies which indicate that high student evaluation scores may well be negatively correlated with student learning as well as to studies which indicate a positive correlation between such variables.

Comment: The kind and amount of documentation should reflect the emphasis on instruction described in the instructor's performance agreement. The kind of information gathered should be based upon the kind of instruction evaluated. No single rating scale is suitable for the complex variety of classroom practices, goals for instruction, facilities available, and class sizes found in a University of this size. The way in which evidence is gathered and the kind gathered will depend upon the purposes and the use to be made of it.

**RECOMMENDATION 6:** Primary responsibility for improvement of teaching should be with the individual faculty member and with the basic academic units. The University, however, should act to increase its resources and expertise for helping both the individual faculty member and the academic units to strengthen weaknesses identified by evaluation of teaching or to improve instructional practices in general.

Comment: Such resources as are now available in the University are widely scattered, relatively unknown, few in number, and not organized into a viable system. These resources need to be expanded and made part of consistent and regular programs for improvement of instruction. These programs should be visible, confidential, and readily available to faculty.

Evaluation of teaching may highlight inadequacy of resources within the University. Thus, the evaluation process may necessitate the expansion of instructional resources as well as the improvement of effort by individual faculty members.