

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Friday, February 4, 1994
2:00 - 4:00
Room 626 Campus Club**

Present: Kenneth Heller (chair), Anita Cholewa, Thomas Clayton, Robert Johnson, Manuel Kaplan, Michael Pawlicki, William Van Essendelft, Darren Walhof, Gayle Graham Yates

Regrets: Craig Bursch, James Cotter, Megan Gunnar, Carla Phillips

Absent: Sue Donaldson, Darwin Hendel

Guests: Vice President Eugene Allen

Others: none

[In these minutes: Advancement of University College planning]

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Heller convened the meeting at 2:15 and began by reporting that one member of the Morse-Alumni nominating committee had resigned after initially agreeing to serve. Professor Graham-Yates reported that the committee had already scheduled its first meeting. Noting that the number of committee members is not fixed, after some deliberation SCEP agreed that if Professor Graham-Yates could identify a logical replacement, she was empowered to ask the individual to serve. If she could not, the nominating committee would have one less member.

2. Discussion of University College

Professor Heller next asked Committee members to introduce themselves, for the benefit of Vice President Allen, and then invited Dr. Allen to begin the discussion. He noted that SCEP members had raised a number of questions at its last meeting and said he would attempt to answer them. First, however, he said he wished to provide some perspectives that did not appear in the report.

First, the effort to develop University College (hereinafter UC) began late in the summer; as he reflects on where people began in their thinking, he said there has been a significant evolution. There are some concerns and issues that they were dealing with earlier that are no longer issues or that have been sorted out. Second, the working group has since met with many groups and individuals and also had significant external participation as a result of the statewide discussions of U2000. Third, while many who worked on UC were not sure what it meant at the outset, he said he believed he could speak for the working group in saying that they have become increasingly excited about the possibilities and the

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

concepts. Finally, the working group views this as a four-stage process: first, the President's vision; second, the evolving concepts (about to be concluded); third, the detailed planning phase; and fourth, implementation.

What has changed since the working group began? First, they are quite certain that the name "University College" is not the right one, although they do not yet have a substitute to propose. But UC, in the context of the concepts and vision that will be recommended, creates too much the perception that it will be a real college. What the report recommends is not a real college; it is a way to provide service to students and assistance to colleges in delivering programs. One of the first steps they envision for the more detailed planning is a decision about the name.

A second change has to do with graduation rates. When he first began working on this project, he was very concerned about graduation rates and the impact UC might have on them. Graduation rates are no longer an issue with respect to UC. In working with Management Planning on this issue, Dr. Allen said that reporting graduation rates come down to how the cohort is defined; whether there is UC and regular programs, or one or two registration systems, is not the way to address the issue.

Another question raised at many UC hearings was "why are we so concerned about graduation rates?" Many people are returning to the classroom as a result of career changes or furthering their education. The group was told that the University should not be too concerned about trying to "fix" the graduation rate. It goes without saying, Dr. Allen told the Committee, that there are things that can be done to improve the graduation rate, but this is an issue that goes well beyond UC planning.

A third change is redefining terms. The definition of the student target populations for UC will have to be redone. Terms like "part-time students" and "working adults" and "lifelong learners" have all been used. But it is also the case that there are a significant number of "traditional" day school students who are enrolled in CEE. No one of the labels defines the current student population of CEE or what is envisioned for UC. The best way to approach this in the report is to acknowledge this diversity and simply speak of the student body.

Data have been produced that support this proposition and Dr. Allen noted two numbers from CEE. First, in Fall, 1993, 12.4% of the day school headcount was enrolled in CEE courses to bring their load up to full-time--so looking at their day school records, students would not have appeared to be enrolled full-time. But for 12.4%, when CEE courses were added, they WERE full-time. That was about 4660 students on the Twin Cities campus. The second datum was that only 18% of students admitted to one of the 26 degree programs offered in CEE took ONLY CEE courses. One simple way to interpret that is that they were the students admitted to degree programs through CEE, but the answer may be more complex. These numbers help share the concern that has been raised about how the UC student population is defined and discussed. No single adjective can easily define current CEE or future UC students.

The fourth point he wanted to make, Dr. Allen said, is that the data in the draft report were only a fraction of the data they collected. They spent the good part of two months gathering data from both inside the University as well as to the Higher Education Coordinating Board. They reviewed the data and are gathering additional information they believe is needed.

One other point Dr. Allen made is that originally the vision for UC was that it would be on the

Twin Cities campus. That is not the vision now. Following only limited discussions with other campuses, it was the sense of the working group that the UC concept be system-wide. If it is not, as CEE is folded into UC, there would be disconnected CEE remnants on the coordinate campuses.

What has also been made clear, through the U2000 discussions, are issues related to student services:

- registration: with the large number of students registered in both CEE and day school, there are many who must go through two registration systems. One decision that will be made--Provost Infante has asked Vice President Hughes and Dean Miller to begin working on it--is a move to a single registration system. Dr. Allen said he was fairly certain the University would have a single registration system in the near future--the discussions made it clear that the current system is one of the most user-unfriendly parts of the University.
- access to the library: many students in CEE courses want to use the library on weekend mornings, times when certain services are not available.
- access to the bookstore is a similar problem.
- advising: very positive comments have been made about CEE advising, but the University must be sure that what is positive is not lost and that as change occurs advising is strengthened, not weakened.
- issues related to the availability of food service and parking.
- consolidation of evening and weekend courses into a fewer number of buildings, rather than being so scattered. This touches on energy costs and safety.

The final point, Dr. Allen said, that is perhaps not well-depicted in the report, is a very important concept they are working with: Instead of thinking of today or next year, people must think about where the University will be in five or six years. Right now, students register in two systems and there are two categories of students, CEE and day school; the concept they are working with is that all are the University's students. We should think of all students as OUR students--rather than dividing them into two groups, "yours" and "ours."

As a result, what is being proposed is uniting some of the activities of the University (e.g., registration). In moving in this direction, the colleges will have more responsibility--which means, for example, that they should benefit from the tuition income from the students currently in CEE. About 25 - 30% of CEE instruction is already inloaded, in various units; there are departments that have been inloaded for years. The college that is most advanced in this respect is Education, but there are also individual departments that have inloaded their teaching for a long time in a way that fits with what is being envisioned. As changes occur, it must be recalled that no adjunct faculty are approved by CEE--they are approved by the colleges. The distribution of faculty who teach in CEE (regular, adjunct, and TAs) is also known; the main difference between CEE and day school is a switch in the percentage of adjunct faculty and TAs. In the day school, regular faculty teach about 51% of the courses and about 45% in CEE. In day school, about 34% of courses are taught by TAs; in CEE, about 32% are taught by

adjunct faculty.

If fully implemented in the future, there would be no need for a name such as University College, because all students would be more the responsibility of colleges. There would continue to be a need for an office or program that does a number of things, such as being certain advising is handled appropriately for this group of students or constantly evaluating what is needed in the way of degrees and courses. (With regard to the latter, what became clear in the U2000 discussions is that there are a lot of people out there who are not looking for another degree, they're looking for a package of courses that help them go through a career change.)

Moreover, as technology improves and distance education become increasingly important, the University needs an office responsible for coordinating these activities. (The University of Maryland, for example, has a program of courses that are offered around the world, including to military bases.) The University must consider its strengths and decide what it can offer to the state and world through technology. The competition will do so; if the University does not, it will not only be out of the market, it will also not have the presence in the world that it needs. The University needs to do some sorting out of where the opportunities lie and what it should be doing; this office can help do so.

These conclude his introductory remarks, Vice President Allen said, and invited questions from Committee members.

When he said that graduation rates were no longer an issue, did that mean for all of U2000 planning or for the University College working group? The latter, Dr. Allen said. Speaking for himself, he said, he believes there are things the University can do to improve its graduation rate. Is there, he was then asked, an understanding that some people attend the University who do not intend to graduate? (Such as older adults who take classes because they want to.) Dr. Allen said there is; the majority of CEE students are NOT there because they are pursuing a degree.

This touches upon another point, Dr. Allen said, that must be dealt with in the detailed planning for UC. In his judgment, there is little to talk about in terms of students admitted to degree programs--there will only be one standard for admission. But the point is that access to the University should not be closed off for the large number of people who want to take a course or courses for a variety of reasons. The question is, what happens to students who register in CEE--as do some in the day school--and become non-performers? Does the University have mechanisms to deal with them? The colleges have probationary standards; if a student does not deal with the problem, "you're out." The same kind of issue needs to be considered for non-degree students. CEE Dean Hal Miller apparently believes this should not be a big problem. But it does need to be addressed, Dr. Allen concluded.

UC will be system-wide--but the registration system on the Twin Cities campus would be integrated. What are the implications of integrated registration on the Twin Cities for the coordinate campuses? An important question, Dr. Allen said. If the systems are not compatible, "we will end up with a mess." Registration is not just a Twin Cities issue; it will have to be considered system-wide.

CEE has had difficulty finding classrooms for evening courses, it was said, so the idea of consolidating courses may not be possible. The issue has been raised by Facilities Management, Dr. Allen said, but perhaps it will not work.

What else may happen, Dr. Allen said, is that as technology improves, some of those who now come to campus will not need to do so. Even within the Twin Cities, the classroom may be collective, not physical. One Committee member noted that St. Thomas is offering classes at the Mall of America, and in some ways St. Thomas may be the University's chief competitor in the Twin Cities. While the University offers some courses around the metropolitan area, most are on the campus; does this plan suggest that will be changed?

Dr. Allen said his personal reaction is that he could not imagine the University would NOT begin to move out into the community. Considerations of the economics of such offerings, and the location of students, may suggest otherwise. If the University has a highly-specialized course oriented to employees at two or three locations, however, there may be a better place to reach them than on the campus. There are proposals to establish off-campus centers in the ring suburbs, one Committee member reported, and Masters degrees are being offered through CEE by interactive TV in Little Canada, Stillwater, and Spring Lake Park.

One Committee member asked for a definition of the term "inload." Dr. Allen explained that overload means the instructor who teaches the class, if a member of the regular faculty, is paid extra for the teaching. If it is inloaded, the department responsible for the course provides it but the resources (55% of the tuition) come back to the department, not the individual (the rest of the revenue goes to CEE and the administration). It's a touchy issue, observed another Committee member--one faculty member may teach at night as part of employment; another may do it on an overload basis and get paid extra. "Inloading" means a faculty member does it as part of receiving a salary; overload means extra pay. What has also come along during these discussions is the workload guidelines, which may be helpful with this issue, Dr. Allen commented.

It sounds like this involves re-integrating parts of CEE back into the "day school," so the vision of UC is that part of CEE is put back into what we call the day school--and that UC would perhaps take on other functions. Dr. Allen said they see more responsibility being put on the colleges, along with potentially more benefits to them. Colleges may decide, with the resources available to them, to adjust the time when they are teaching a course. They may decide whether both an evening and morning course is needed, or not. Both the colleges and departments will have a larger role in making the decision.

So, one Committee member clarified, departments may offer a wider range of courses, perhaps on a rotating schedule, in the early evening or late afternoon in order to achieve an economy of scale, and in order to offer smaller courses that are rarely offered to students who work. Dr. Allen concurred. CEE at present offers access to 26 degrees; of the other University degrees, which ones do we need to offer to meet the needs that exist? In some cases, there may only be a few courses missing from the CEE offerings--but they may be key ones for a degree program.

This new vision of UC, then, focuses not on "who" but rather "when." Initially, UC was a question of "who"--part-time versus full-time students; now it appears to be focused on when--evenings, weekends, and remote sites--in order to provide more access to the students, whoever they are. Dr. Allen said that was correct. It must be also recognized that there are a lot of part-time students in the day school. At this campus of the University, because of its location in the Twin Cities, not every student works during the day--some work at night. This campus has a mixture, and that has engendered the

difficulty in trying to attach a label to current CEE students. Some are part-time, some are working adults, some are life-long learners, and some are traditional students. The University must stop trying to find one label--the proposition that we should quit saying "who" and inquire instead "when" they need our services is apt.

There remains a small amount of uncertainty on the "who" question, said one Committee member. Most of the people about whom Dr. Allen has spoken are local--they already live here. There has, however, been discussion about attracting more out-of-state and international students to the University (which already characterizes many of the graduate and professional students, unlike most of the undergraduates). Is that a problem?

Dr. Allen said this could be very exciting. One concern that has been raised is how to bring more of an international character to undergraduate programs. That may be one advantage to distance education. Higher education is moving to an orientation that is less site-oriented and more to one of locating its students and trying to reach them. This is an opportunity that the University should not miss, in terms of what the technology can bring to the classrooms. In some classes there may be more of a mixing of the "adult learner" and the "traditional" college student. The mix may work in some classes and not at all in others. Faculty have doubtless had different experiences in this respect; his own was that the mixing was very positive.

The Committee's conversations, it was said, originally were directed to the concept of UC as the "city university," in contrast with the research university. The "who" question revolved around the part-time student, the student whose orientation to study was practical rather than research, and so on. The working group did not see UC that way, Dr. Allen responded, and it is necessary to be careful in thinking about students. Many of the CEE students are more oriented to, and can benefit from, the research university than can some in day school. That is in part due to the perspective the CEE student brings to the course--they may have the experiences and now want the enrichment that a research university can offer.

Dr. Allen affirmed, in response to a question, that the partnership programs are still a part of UC. Two have been approved; a third one is being discussed (one that draws on IT and a technical college). In the total context of UC, this would be only a small fraction of the total number of students. Asked about new such partnerships, Dr. Allen said the University needs to "keep its ears open" to where it has the possibility. One question, though, is when these programs are "experimental" and when are they no longer so? When does the University call them regular or cut them off?

Discussion then turned to the questions raised at the last SCEP meeting (and set out in the minutes of that meeting).

1. "What provisions will be made to ensure that quality of instruction and performance standards in UC will be the same as those in day school?"

That is a collegiate and departmental issue, Dr. Allen said. The ramifications, said one Committee member, are that if they are regular day school faculty, things are done in certain way--by selecting the faculty, one assumes the quality is good. If the faculty are adjunct, they are more loosely connected to the department and there is less daily interaction and, therefore, knowledge about quality.

The department and the college are responsible for signing off on appointment of adjunct faculty, Dr. Allen responded. In turn, when they take it seriously, they must deal with these issues with adjunct faculty. What do you expect to be done? Who will you ask to do it? Some units do that well; others do not do as well as they should.

Is the assumption that this plan will not address this issue at all? His answer was a short one, said one Committee member--that the responsibility lies with departments and colleges and is not an issue for UC. Or will there be other changes that matter more, such as a far more integral connection between CEE and the other college? The latter, Dr. Allen said; this is not primarily CEE's business nor issue--it should already be a collegiate issue.

Might there be more people in the adjunct category if this University-wide program is adopted? Will there not be a greater need in five or six years for adjunct faculty? That could be true in some departments, Dr. Allen said; some may evolve to the point where they see adjunct faculty very differently. They may see that adjunct faculty need to be more closely connected to the department. The issue should not be shunted to the side; guidelines are needed, things need to be done right, and it would not be surprising if, across the University, things could not be done better than they are now.

To characterize it in an extreme way, right now CEE might be thought of by the department as "it's not our students, it's not our budget, it's not our organization, and they just ask us to sign off if this person is OK to teach." The departments say "well, you know, the person has a Ph.D., why care?" There is no connection--if it were my students, or my budget, it would be different. When he talks of more unity, does he see those factors pulled together? Dr. Allen said he sees more responsibility and more rewards tied to them.

One Committee member observed that this Committee passed a policy last year on faculty evaluation without mentioning one word adjunct faculty--yet such faculty are used extensively both in evening and day courses. What steps should the University take to assure that they are good teachers? It seems likely CEE would stand behind measures to assure they are. By and large, it was said, most departments with which CEE works do care about instruction, but anything that can be done to ensure quality should be considered. It might be helpful to obtain suggestions about quality; this would be a prime one. The same assessment should be made of TAs; this Committee could look at University-wide guidelines on quality of instruction by adjunct faculty and TAs. Dr. Allen agreed.

2. "What incentives will be offered to faculty to ensure that senior faculty participate in University College?"

Senior faculty were probably singled out in the question, Dr. Allen surmised, because their salaries are higher and because junior faculty need the money. He said that first, the data demonstrate that faculty who teach in CEE are very satisfied with their experiences. Second, some of the teaching will continue to be on an inloaded and overload basis; the proportion may change, but it will remain a combination of the two. Third, not all people function by the same biological rhythms and some enjoy teaching in the evening. There are a variety of reasons why people teach in CEE. The data show that 20% of the full professors teach in CEE, which is a higher percent than in the assistant and associate professor rank. At present, there seems not to be a problem with respect to senior faculty.

The term "senior faculty" was used, said one Committee member, because one member of the Board of Regents used it; it was a reflection of a concern about whether or not the most highly qualified and best of the faculty would be teaching in the evening. Dr. Allen said that he knew of some of the "biggest name" faculty who have taught in CEE for many years.

A related issue is the use of emeritus faculty, said another Committee member. It seems that when people retire, the University forgets them--yet these are the people who have significant expertise. The problem is across the University, but would there be any effort made in UC to entice these people into teaching?

The point is important, Dr. Allen said, and he has seen no data on how much use is made of emeritus faculty. Generally, he said, they would like to be more involved with many things at the University than they are asked to be, and the point is well taken. He asked that the Committee consider meeting with the leaders of the retired faculty group to learn what they would like to continue to contribute to the University? He, in turn, said he would try to obtain information about the extent to which they do continue to teach. CEE uses retired faculty, it was said, although to what extent was not known--nor is it known if all are aware that they can teach.

3. "Will there be coercive elements of that participation [by senior faculty]?"

His view, Dr. Allen said, is that the University cannot be coercive; that is not what it is about. But at some level, pointed out a Committee member, a department has a list of courses to teach, and there are teaching assignments in day school. If the efforts become more unified, will the UC courses just become part of a department's set of teaching assignments? So that there is a responsibility on the department heads to fill the slots with a reasonable mix of different types of people? The answer is "yes," Dr. Allen said. That is why it is important that the responsibility rest with the department and college. And as a result, there must be rewards that flow to them.

4. "To what extent has thought been given to the new models for budgeting, such as Responsibility Centered Management?"

Dr. Allen said that there has been a lot of discussion about RCM; there are also concerns about it. One of them is how one deals with RCM when the University wants to encourage intercollegiate and inter-departmental kinds of programs? That is a big issue. On the other side, however, it is the CONCEPT of RCM that is being talked about when it is said that the responsibility and the rewards that must be at the college level. RCM need not be an "all or none" proposition, Dr. Allen said; the question is to what extent. He said he would be very troubled if the University were to move completely to RCM without full consideration of the "potential downsides."

5. "With the emphasis on the delivery mechanism, and the consumer defining what is to be delivered, how will increased University educational standards be incorporated into UC?"

One thing heard in the U2000 discussions, from many kinds of people, is that the University needs to raise its expectations of its students, Dr. Allen recalled. When told that, one does not sense it conflicts

with the beliefs of many inside the University as well. Those views seem to coincide. Expectations should then be raised for ALL students--rather than thinking about them being divided into two pools.

What faculty who teach in CEE have said about why they enjoy doing so is because frequently the expectations of CEE students are higher than those of students in the day school, Dr. Allen related. It is easy to say where expectations are higher and lower but it often isn't quite as clear cut as we may lead ourselves to believe, Dr. Allen observed. The question is how to increase University standards. Once the decision is made, those will then be the standards. CEE student attitude will be key in some things the University might do in active learning and other classroom activities because of their experiences.

Part of the concern, Dr. Allen was told, is the market-driven philosophy that some would say underlies UC. If the idea is to increase enrollment, to increase revenue, the concern is that would the competition with other institutions allow the same entry standards be retained. How? One hears that in the research university 80% of students will be in the top 25% of their high school class. That is a quantifiable standard for people coming out of high school. But for people who are NOT just coming out of high school, what is the equivalent standard?

This is a valid question that needs to be dealt with in the detailed planning, Dr. Allen said. What the University does with "adult special" students, or students not admitted to degree programs will have to be reviewed. Perhaps probationary standards for ALL students will have to be reviewed. High school graduation rank is less important and valid ten years after the fact--but that situation must be dealt with because it is the status of an increasing number of students. Data indicate that the average student graduating today will go through 5 - 7 career changes. When people go through a career change, they frequently need educational programs. The University must deal with this issue, but right now it doesn't have an answer.

Part of the question harks back to the city college analogy, with possible open enrollment. On paper that can look good, because with high exit standards some will pass and some will not. But the reality is that instructors cannot stand the pain; history has shown that graduation standards are driven down by the sheer weight of under-prepared students.

It is for that reason that the University is encouraging Metropolitan State to grow--because the University does not want extra numbers, and it may not want as many as it has now. But it has a specific role to play--and the University should NOT become the City University of New York.

6. "Do students admitted under UC guidelines receive a research university degree?"

Students admitted to degree programs are admitted under one standard, set by the college and the department. There are currently 26 such programs (in CEE); there should probably be more degrees, but that is yet to be determined. There are not two standards, Dr. Allen repeated; there are not different standards for students taking courses at one time of day versus those taking courses at another time. The University CANNOT have dual standards for degrees.

The question arose about the responsibility charts in the report, reported one Committee member. Suggestions have been made that will improve the report, Dr. Allen said. The point was to illustrate the process from the time of recruitment, enrollment, registration, taking classes, and to the time of

graduation--and who is responsible for these efforts. The question arose about the partnership programs. Dr. Allen said he had comments but wanted the Committee's views. These are experimental programs, he reminded the Committee, and the decision must be made when that status is to end. When the time comes to confer the degree, there may be situations where it is conferred by the college. But when they are experimental, it seemed appropriate to suggest they should graduate within UC. In terms of setting standards, he emphasized again that this is not a regular college--they must be set with the University's partner institution and the collegiate unit working with it on the program. UC has no faculty; it coordinates the effort and evaluates where the University may need to have such degrees.

The model of the two degrees, it was said, appears to be similar to that of the old University College, where each degree program will have a faculty committee to oversee it--and that faculty committee will report to a faculty assembly that will be composed of faculty members representing a number of colleges. There is concern, it was said by another Committee member, that this all go through the regular academic structure of the University instead of special committees. That may be fine for an experimental program, but eventually people will be uncomfortable unless a degree had approval by a college. If it were an IT degree, in partnership, then IT should have to approve it--and have to take the responsibility for ensuring that it is a valid University degree. The worry in part is that the University will become a trade school.

The key word is "if," it was pointed out. Neither of the existing degrees are in a college--they did not want them. Even so, it was rejoined, the responsibility for setting the standards should somehow be connected with the regular academic structure to be sure that the standards are the same. That should also be true for the existing University College, it was said.

The selection of the applicants is also a concern, Dr. Allen was told. One must adjust to the quality of the people who come into the program--one cannot design a program unless one takes account of the students who are in it. Those standards also need to be connected to the regular University structure so that the appropriate standards are applied.

7. One question had to do with distance education and distance advising.

Dr. Allen said he had not given this a great deal of thought. One thing he would do is see what is being done--does the University have experience here?

Interactive television has been used for advising as well as classrooms, it was noted, as has the telephone and the Internet; the latter will become more accessible over time. The Committee view, it was said, was that many people had had positive experiences in this regard.

Dr. Allen then inquired of the Committee's view on the report--does it appear to have made progress? What, he asked, is the feeling of Committee members? Conceptually, where should the University be heading?

One Committee member observed that this is very different from what was originally proposed--and this is much more attractive. This plan really addresses the problems and is a much better means of improving the University.

Will it solve one of the problems that U2000 was addressing, that of getting the graduation rate up? By putting everyone together, saying it is all one student body. . . . University College will not solve that problem, Dr. Allen declared, but said he is also certain UC will not make it worse, either. Graduation rates have to be addressed in ways the University deems fit--but beyond the discussions surrounding University College. He said he was concerned, earlier, that if the University moved ahead with UC and a single registration system, the rates would get worse. Based on conversations with Dave Berg, however, he said he is confident that will not happen. That does not mean that anything that has been done to improve the rates, however.

It would seem that one could make graduation rates look much better if there were groupings of students, and if those who were full-time and those who are not were defined. That is true, Dr. Allen said. But there are other issues to deal with as well.

It is not just the numbers, added another Committee. There was a feeling that some students would benefit more by a research-oriented undergraduate environment than would others. Earlier in the discussions, there was a feeling one should identify those two classes of students and put different labels on them so that at least when faculty were teaching, they would know to whom they were teaching. The present mix of students in the day school appears not well matched to a research-oriented university. Now UC no longer addresses that issue--so the problem still exists. Dr. Allen said he did not believe those students differentiated themselves by day and evening, by part-time versus full-time status, or by traditional versus adult learners.

The focus of the report is more limited than what was being perceived earlier in the year, said another Committee member, and it is to be applauded because it now addresses a number of specific and practical issues that need fixing. It is disappointing to see issues of curriculum and instruction, and of the relationship between research and teaching, left out. Some were hopeful, in the beginning, that the report would address what many see continues to be a problem, that of having at least two populations of students who need to be served differently. The way to serve them is to respond to those needs. Those are curricular and research and teaching issues that Dr. Allen appears to be saying will not be addressed in this report. What was helpful in thinking about the first ideas of UC was that there would be a research university with undergraduates and graduate and professional students whose orientation was to research, plus another population of students who are provided a general education plus something specific for their work--which might not be directly connected with the research university work. Those were two honorable tracks for people the University teaches--but sometimes poorly, in the same classroom. It would have been desirable to identify how to serve both those groups better, not just one of them (the UC students, who appear more and more to be part-time day students plus CEE students). That set of questions is not addressed at all. Dr. Allen has said that is the business of the departments and colleges; one was hopeful that it would be the University's business to decide how to do the two jobs. There are different groups, with different backgrounds and goals, that makes it difficult to teach them both in one class.

Dr. Allen said he understood the problem quite well. The issue that ends up being confronted is that with a large number of commuter students, it is difficult to segregate students in a cost-effective way in terms of when they come to class. To do so, some classes would have to be divided--some of that may be done anyway, in some departments. They may teach the same class but with a slightly different focus. The degree focus may not be the same. But for many, it will be difficult to separate them, especially at a

time when the University is concerned about tuition costs and faculty salaries and the need for efficiencies. But he said he would welcome ideas to deal with the problem.

Dr. Allen also said he did not want to leave the impression that curriculum would not be dealt with; it will be, he said, in the detailed planning phase and beyond.

What might be helpful, Dr. Allen added, would be to have a focus group in the next phase of planning, drawing on departments that have been involved with significant numbers of students in both CEE and day school, and see if any of them have identified ways to respond to the concern about the different kinds of students.

From the point of view of CEE, it was said, the single registration system is primarily an advantage for students who are registering in both CEE and the day school. At the same time, the CEE registration system is seen as much more user-friendly and responsive to students than the day school registration system. Any integration of the systems should retain those aspects. It is to be hoped that the University has not spent as much time as it has talking about user-friendliness, Dr. Allen observed, and then do something that makes it LESS user-friendly. He said he agreed, the CEE registration is much more user-friendly than the one in the day school--it is at least a model to look at. Everyone on the Committee, it was said, hopes the University will move into the modern age in registration. This was a serious issue in many of the U2000 discussions, Dr. Allen reported, and MUST be corrected.

As the University moves toward integration of programs, it must be recalled that CEE has typically served a large number of non-degree-seeking students, it was said. Colleges and departments tend to be much more degree oriented in the coursework they offer. An inloading experiment in one department put the decision about the courses to be offered in the hands of the department; the enrollments in the evening courses dropped by about 300% in the course of the experiment. There were a number of variables beyond the University's control, but a number demonstrated that the department was thinking primarily of degree-seeking students rather than being responsive to the needs of non-traditional students. As integration occurs, this must be kept in mind, especially if keeping enrollment levels up is important.

A creative system of advising will also be needed so that UC students have a sense that there is someone who is interested in their work. The sample may have been biased, Dr. Allen allowed, but between the U2000 discussions and student comments, there have been positive reactions to CEE advising.

One question raised at the previous meeting was about defining students. Will a degree-seeking student be defined on the University's application form? If students in the higher ranks of their graduating class are to be selected for the research university, will those who don't make it to the research university automatically shunted to the UC application form even if they define themselves as degree-seeking? If they are to be mixed with part-time but degree-seeking, or with non-degree-seeking students, and given evening and weekend classes, is it realistic to keep standards as high as day school in terms of outcomes? Will degree-seeking students taking evening and weekend classes, who are highly motivated, be in classes with a heterogeneous group of students where the instructor must compromise in order to keep the pass rate at an appropriate level?

That is a very difficult question, said another Committee member. One way to seek answers might

be to have a focus group discussion with faculty who teach the CEE students--ask them to what extent this is problem in the classroom, or to what extent it is a BIGGER concern in the evening than in the day classes. Part of the question--as the University raises its standards--is that there will be fewer of the traditional day students. Those students will have been replaced by better-qualified students. But will those students who will not then be qualified to enter the research university come back, through UC, and again be in the classrooms?

That is why, Dr. Allen said, he mentioned the need to consider probationary status for CEE students and to consider overall student classroom performance issues as a criterion for remaining enrolled in the day school. Dean Miller does not see this as a big problem, Dr. Allen reported--and his own experience was that CEE students were very demanding.

Another problem is funding. Departments will be responsible for UC teaching but will not be completely reimbursed for the inloaded instruction. If everything is to be unified, and departments will be responsible for assigning instructors for courses and for their quality, they must also be responsible for their budgets--because at the end of the day, it is the finances that tell where responsibility lies.

Dr. Allen said that if there were one registration system instead of two, there may be opportunity for more money to go back to the department than is currently the case with CEE. The University may also find--not for all, to be sure--that some efficiencies can be accomplished in terms of when courses are offered. At present there may be courses offered twice a day that are under-enrolled and which could be consolidated. It is difficult to answer some of these questions but it is important to think about them.

In thinking about the budget, it was pointed out, it is to some units' advantage to have two courses that are under-enrolled. Dr. Allen agreed. Right now 55% of the income from CEE courses goes to the department; the other 45% goes to CEE to support its programs and to the administration for University needs, and there is pressure in some cases NOT to combine courses. That is, the administration and CEE would rather have an identified CEE course and an identified day course--because both derive income from the CEE course by means of a 45% "tax" on the course. It isn't clear why departments inload under these arrangements. Perhaps it is their desire to ensure the integrity of the course structure.

It is true, it was responded, that some departments inloaded in a peculiar way--in a way that costs them money. Most departments that inload receive money that they otherwise never would have had but using under-worked faculty. Another objective of keeping CEE courses separate from day school courses is to give the faculty members an overload salary.

Dr. Allen said he checked on a couple of departments that have inloaded courses; it is his understanding that some of the money they receive is used to support TAs and RAs. Others choose to put it into a faculty line.

In any event, it was said, the budget must be considered or the entire unification scheme will founder. Dr. Allen concurred.

There have been discussions in the past about students who are unprepared, requiring more University resources than students who are better prepared. It would be undesirable to characterize the day students as the ones who are better prepared and the part-time/non-traditional/adult learner as

"poorer" intellectually. Dr. Allen exclaimed that that was NOT the vision of the working group. It has been said elsewhere that the issue of lower standards has nothing to do with whether or not a student is non-traditional. They do not accept the proposition that the quality of students is defined by when they come to class. That is confirmed by faculty comments that some of their most interesting teaching is in CEE classes. The comments about under-prepared students in CEE are usually made, it was added, by faculty who do not teach in CEE; it is an assumption not based on experience.

Some of the comments from faculty are from those who have not been connected with CEE or with adult special students who may come back because they need extra classes to qualify for a better job. One Committee member remarked, "I really object to the connections that some people make [between] 'poorer' students and those kinds of students." Dr. Allen expressed appreciation for the comment and said the working group agreed completely.

In the latest plan there would essentially be no special University College classes (with the possible exception of the partnership programs)--a chemistry class would be a chemistry class and responsibility for its standards would rest with the chemistry department--whether offered at 9:00 or on Saturday. Dr. Allen agreed.

Dr. Allen has not talked about summers, it was observed. Dr. Allen said he believed that the demand for the University's services is becoming more 12-month, more 7-day, and more of a longer day. The University needs to determine what it is going to do about that. There has not been a lot of discussion of Summer Session. Who will integrate it, Dr. Allen was asked--UC? Right now CEE and Summer Session are effectively independent, although Summer Session is a part of CEE. This needs to be put back on the agenda, Dr. Allen concluded.

Professor Heller thanked Dr. Allen for joining the Committee; Dr. Allen expressed appreciation for the meeting and invited additional comments on the report. Professor Heller then adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota