MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

of the

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Madison, Wisconsin

Held 1820 Van Hise Hall
Thursday, December 6, 2001
10:30 a.m.

\- President Smith presiding -

PRESENT: Regents Axtell, Boyle, Burmaster, DeSimone, Gottschalk, Gracz, Jones, Klauser, Krutsch, Marcovich, Mohs, Olivieri, Randall, Schneiders and Smith

ABSENT: Regents Brandes and Barry

\- - -

PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION TO ASSEMBLY SPEAKER SCOTT JENSEN

Regent President Smith welcomed Assembly Speaker Scott Jensen, who had been invited to the meeting in recognition of the key role that he played in supporting the UW's economic stimulus package, capital budget, and increased management accountability initiatives.

The economic stimulus package, Regent Smith noted, will mean that by the end of the biennium there will be 2,500 additional students enrolled in high-tech, high-demand fields, such as: Engineering at UW-Fox Valley; computer information systems at UW-Eau Claire, River Falls, Platteville, and La Crosse; geographic information systems at UW-Stevens Point, graphic communications at UW-Whitewater; transportation logistics at UW-Superior; and biotechnology at UW-Madison.

The capital budget will enable the UW to: Extend the useful life of many aging buildings; refit and redesign existing space to meet student needs; build laboratory infrastructure to sustain biotechnology research leadership; and sustain an ability to spin off about 13 new technology transfer-based businesses each year.

Regent Smith pointed out that Speaker Jensen has consistently acted on his belief that investment in human capital is essential to growing Wisconsin's knowledge economy. He also supported the Board of Regents' initiatives to attract and retain high quality leadership, faculty, and staff, and supported allowing the UW to hire, within budgetary constraints, new faculty and staff needed to respond to market demand for courses. The Board supported the Speaker's plan to increase availability of financial aid to needy students through a tax credit to businesses that pay for their employees' education.

Speaker Jensen also was thanked for the insights that he shared at the Economic Summit. He identified the need for a broad public consensus for growth by Republicans and Democrats, leaders in the private sector and the public sector, and in the state media.

In conclusion, Regent Smith expressed appreciation to Speaker Jensen for being personally accessible during budget deliberations, completing the budget in a timely fashion, and demanding an open process for conducting caucus business.

Presenting Resolution 8416, which had been adopted by the Board in September, Regent Mohs expressed gratitude to Speaker Jensen for his leadership and support of the university.

University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents
Resolution of Appreciation to the Governor and Legislature

Resolution 8416: WHEREAS, the Governor and leaders in the Senate and Assembly actively participated in last year's highly successful Wisconsin Economic Summit -- an event that provided an impetus for government, business leaders and higher education to address challenging issues in the subsequent biennial budget session; and

WHEREAS, the Governor and legislative leaders recognize and appreciate the UW System's value as an economic force in Wisconsin, and together made a concerted effort -- despite severe fiscal constraints -- to support the university's core budget initiatives related to growing the state's economy; and

WHEREAS, the Governor, speaking at the UW Day celebration in March, introduced an extensive and farsighted capital budget -- a building program including the 10-year BioStar effort) that will benefit the UW System and Wisconsin for decades to come; and

WHEREAS, by pursuing a vision in difficult times -- with leadership and confidence -- the Governor and the Legislature produced a budget that will lead to increased earnings for Wisconsin citizens and make important new investments in Wisconsin's high-growth future, a future in which the UW System will play a central role; and

WHEREAS, the final budget outcome included $77.5 million in new GPR funding, with strong support for the statewide Economic Stimulus Package, the Madison Initiative and the Milwaukee Idea, as well as significant improvements in management flexibility for the lowest-administrative-cost university system in the country; and

WHEREAS, final action on the biennial budget was accomplished before Labor Day, enabling the UW System to begin the fall semester with a greater degree of confidence concerning the availability of resources;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the UW System Board of Regents expresses appreciation and gratitude to Governor Scott McCallum, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Chvala, Assembly Speaker Scott Jensen, and members of the Wisconsin State Legislature for all they have done to enhance the mission and future of the UW System; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, on behalf of students, faculty, staff, administrators, and the entire university community throughout Wisconsin, the Board commits the UW System to use what we have been given for the benefit of the state and the world -- now and for years to come.

Speaker Jensen thanked the Board for its commendation and commented that these accomplishments were made possible by the cooperation of Assembly colleagues. He also thanked the Board for another successful Economic Summit. At that event, he had called for rebuilding the bipartisan public consensus in Wisconsin for growth in jobs and the economy which had resulted in 14 years of prosperity. It is crucial, he emphasized, to recognize the need for constant investment in the state's future. Noting that it had not always been easy to convince the Legislature to provide more resources and flexibility to the UW, he asked that the UW make the authority and resources granted in the budget the best investment the Legislature has ever made on behalf of the people of Wisconsin.

\- - -

RESOURCES: PROS AND CONS OF COHORT TUITION

Presenter: Richard Porreca, Senior Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, University of Colorado-Boulder

Introducing the presentation, Regent President Smith noted that this month the Board will review tuition options as part of its priority on building the resource base. The concept of cohort tuition, he explained, has the benefit of increasing predictability of college costs for students and parents. Disadvantages include potential difficulty in generating sufficient revenue to meet costs, especially if there are cuts in state GPR, and administrative challenges in terms of assigning transfer students and others to cohorts. Later in the meeting, President Lyall would present other tuition options in more detail.

Regent Smith welcomed Richard Porreca, Senior Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer for the University of Colorado at Boulder. Over the past several years, his work has focused on multi-year budget development, integrated resource management, performance assessment reporting, and revenue enhancement strategies. In 1996, he initiated a cohort tuition program at UC-Boulder, which was brought forward to the Colorado Legislature in 1999.

Beginning his presentation, Mr. Porreca explained that cohort tuition is a program that defines a fixed tuition rate for a cohort of students that stays the same for a period of time or a certain number of credit hours. The period of time or number of credit hours typically is sufficient to complete a degree under normal full-time conditions.

With respect to advantages of cohort tuition, he identified the following:

1) It helps parents and students plan for the cost of higher education.
2) It enhances predictability of tuition revenues.
3) It provides a financial incentive for timely graduation.
4) It can be used to provide financial incentives for targeted groups, such as transfer students or others that the institution wants to encourage to enroll in certain programs.
5) It provides a good marketing tool, particularly to nonresident students for whom costs are higher and the fluctuation in costs can be much greater.
6) It has the potential for revenue enhancement.

If it is decided to implement a cohort tuition program, the most important decisions are establishing the fixed rate and time/credit limits. Mr. Porreca suggested the following steps in these considerations:

1) Predict likely tuition rates and/or tuition revenue needs over a multi-year period without cohort tuition.
2) Determine revenue goals (neutral or enhanced).
3) Identify administrative costs and system changes.
4) Establish appropriate reserve levels based on expected rate of inflation and allowing for variance from predicted persistence rates.

Subsequent cohort rates would be set based on economic conditions and revenue goals.

As matters to consider in setting up a cohort tuition program, Mr. Porreca listed the following:

1) Whether the program is to be voluntary or mandatory. He did not recommend a voluntary program because it would be difficult to administer and could make students unhappy when comparing their tuition to others in the same class who may have more favorable rates.
2) Student eligibility and whether to include residents, nonresidents, graduates, undergraduates, full-time students, or part-time students. Another consideration is whether to start with a subset as a pilot program and then add others.
3) Whether course fees that are charged in addition to tuition should be eliminated in a cohort tuition program. He recommended rolling these fees into the tuition so that the price would remain fixed as promised by the program.
4) Assessment of inflation risk and tolerance, as well as mitigation to offset the risk, often by building a reserve and adjusting the rate increase for incoming students.
5) Ability of administrative systems to support a cohort tuition program.
6) Recognition that tuition rates will grow faster than normal during start up.
7) Recognition that tuition price may look comparatively high and produce "sticker shock" in the some prospective students, even though the tuition will stay the same for four years.

Turning to the Colorado experience, Mr. Porreca described some of the conditions that led the state to consider this program. First, there was a 1994 change in the state constitution called the Taxpayer Bill of Rights that limited the amount of state expenditure growth. This implicitly restricted the rate of tuition increase. Since then, the rate of tuition growth has been kept below the rate of inflation to balance other areas of expenditure growth (K-12 education and prisons) that were above the rate of inflation.

Second, 60% of UC-Boulder's operating budget comes from tuition - - among the highest rates in the country for public institutions. Seventy percent of that tuition comes from nonresident students, making the campus highly dependent on customers who could chose to go their home state institutions or elsewhere if they became dissatisfied. A third circumstance was creation in the mid 1990s of a pre-paid tuition plan, the benefits of which would not be felt for about 16 years when individual accounts would accumulate enough funds to send students to college. This led to the suggestion of cohort tuition as something that could be done right away to help people plan for the cost of education.

The next steps were to conduct financial modeling and business systems review to determine feasibility of implementing cohort tuition, and conducting parent/student focus groups to assess interest and support.

Specifics of the Colorado plan included:

1) A premium would be added to the legislative-approved tuition rate for the first six cohorts.
2) Tuition would remain fixed for a student for four years (or 135 credit hours in 5 years). The credit limit was set high enough to allow for programs like engineering and to allow students to study abroad and participate in internships.
3) Students who exceed the limit would be charged at the same rate as the cohort behind him or her in the fourth year, which would amount to a tuition increase plus a premium. While there was a financial disincentive to exceed time and credit limits, it is not so severe that students could not afford to finish their education.
4) Transfer students would pay the prior year freshman rate – fixed for three years (or 135 credit hours in four years). This was aimed at marketing to community college students and encouraging them to complete a four-year degree.
5) Undergraduate students enrolled in joint bachelor/master 5-year programs would get their rate extended one year.
6) Nonresidents converting to residency would pay the freshman rate in effect for that year. This rate would be on the high end for a resident student, but a significant discount from the nonresident rate.

Although the Colorado plan was approved by the legislature for implementation in 1999-2000, it was line-item vetoed by the governor because of concern about the long-term potential to exceed TABOR spending limits. A different arrangement is being pursued, involving a compact with the state to increase tuition by a set rate over a period of time. Guaranteed tuition may be used as an implementation tool for that plan. For example, a $1,200 increase could be implemented by $300 increases in each of four years, with a guarantee to each class that tuition would not increase again for a set period of time.

In conclusion, Mr. Porreca commented that the value of cohort tuition is dependent on institutional needs, risk tolerance and environmental conditions, and should be considered in the context of other options and institutional goals. In the right situation, he indicated, it can be an appealing and creative tuition reform.

In discussion following the presentation, Regent President Smith inquired as to the university's relationship with the state before introduction of the plan, during consideration of it, and currently.

In response, Mr. Porreca noted that with the TABOR amendment, the Board lost much of the control it once had over tuition rates. The cohort tuition proposal was a means to gain more control over tuition increases in a way that would be beneficial to students and helped to stimulate communication between the board and legislature that previously had been lacking. Following approval by the legislature and veto by the Governor, the conversation was joined by the Governor and his staff to consider how this program could be structured in a more beneficial way. This has resulted in a new proposal for a tuition increase to be phased in over four years.

Regent Smith asked if the proposal would have come forward without the TABOR amendment, to which Mr. Porreca replied in the affirmative, noting that the first impetus was the pre-paid tuition plan and the effort to find a more immediate way to help families plan for college. However, he felt the follow-through would have been less vigorous without the TABOR amendment since the plan did have the disadvantage of limiting tuition flexibility.

Asked by Regent President Smith if there is a major system that utilizes cohort tuition at this time, Mr. Porreca replied that the University of Minnesota has a pilot program, in which participation is voluntary. He did not believe any major institution uses this plan on a mandatory, across-the-board basis. The chief concern is about the risk of high inflation, persisting for a number of years.

Regent Marcovich inquired about how a cohort tuition plan could enhance revenue. Mr. Porreca replied that a profit would be realized if inflation rates remained stable, while tuition rates were set to ensure against rising inflation. If inflation did rise during those years, the reserve would be used to buy out the inflation increase.

Regent Krutsch observed that the plan allowed inclusion of other institutional goals, such as encouraging degree completion in four years. If degree completion were speeded up, there would also be the advantage of providing access to more students without need for additional taxpayer dollars. Mr. Porreca indicated that, in high-priced institutions, there may be a greater relationship between price and time to degree. He wondered, however, if a penalty consisting of a 5% to 10% increase on lower tuition would deter changes of major or counter a perceived need by students to work more hours to put themselves through school. However, he did believe that students would respond to an incentive to use summer school or inter-sessions to avoid fifth or sixth year price increases. Another option, he added, would be to combine cohort tuition with a guaranteed graduation program, although fewer than one percent of students take advantage of the guaranteed program that is in place in Colorado.

Regent Krutsch asked what caused Colorado's governor to become interested in the program after initially vetoing it. In reply, Mr. Porreca indicated that one reason was interest in creating more differentiation between the Boulder campus and other institutions in the system. The governor agreed to support increased tuition in return for the university's agreement to make the Boulder campus more selective and move students into other state institutions.

Regent Burmaster asked how financial aid planning relates to cohort tuition. In reply, Mr. Porreca explained that the university's financial aid office made estimates of federal and state support and locked in university funds over a four-year period. Students were provided with total cost and total aid packages over that time span. The disadvantage to doing this, he commented,, is that the "sticker shock" of seeing the total cost figure could deter students from enrolling. On the other hand, students that do enroll are more likely to stay because they have seen the figures and will not be surprised by future costs.

In response to a question by Regent DeSimone, Mr. Porreca referred to a 1994 paper on how to calculate tuition rates on the basis of persistence and graduation rates. Students who transfer before completing their program would lose financially by not benefiting from the discount offered by the fixed tuition rate during the program's latter years. He was not aware of institutions that granted rebates in those circumstances.

Regent Mohs observed that the advantage of a cohort tuition program is leveling of costs over the course of the program and preventing large and unexpected tuition increases that could make it impossible for some students to continue. In Wisconsin, he noted, there have not been increases of the magnitude that would generate a call for the stability of cohort tuition. He thought it unappealing to give up flexibility without a compelling reason to do so.

Mr. Porreca noted that he and his colleagues had used focus groups and family visits to assess views about the program and were surprised by the lack of negative reaction. The goal in Colorado had been both to help students and to generate additional revenues. If revenue generation would result in reduction of tax support, he said, that would argue against consideration of such a plan.

In response to a question by Regent Jones, Mr. Porreca indicated that about 40% of students at UC-Boulder receive financial aid. Regent Jones asked if there was linkage of the higher tuition rate to financial aid. Replying in the negative, Mr. Porreca indicated that, while the first year price may be high, the total cost of education for the student is not intended to be higher than it would be in a traditional plan. Therefore, he did not think an increase in financial aid would be needed unless the tuition were set at an artificially high level.

In response to a question by Regent President Smith, Mr. Porreca indicated that about 32% of the student body at UC-Boulder are nonresidents. The Colorado legislature had authorized a pilot program that began with resident students. This allowed a large number of students to take advantage of the planning benefits offered by the program, without the university risking a major share of tuition revenue, 70% of which comes from nonresident students. These students would have been added to the plan in the second year.

Regent Krutsch observed that the success of a cohort tuition program could be enhanced if there were incentives built into it, so that a department could keep additional funds from the program in return for reducing time and credits-to-degree by such means as summer school or inter-session programs.

Regent Klauser commented that he felt uncomfortable with the concept of freshmen subsidizing seniors, since seniors were closest to graduation and earning a living. He also expected that there would be difficulty in accurately predicting GPR appropriations four years in advance, thereby risking a deficit.

Expressing agreement with Regent Klauser, Mr. Porreca noted that inflation is unlikely to increase dramatically in one year, but level of state support may be less predictable, especially in a recession. If state support were sharply reduced and reserves were not adequate, it might be necessary to unfairly burden one or more incoming cohorts.

Regent Smith asked if the plan intended to differentiate UC-Boulder from other campuses. Although that was not the goal under the original plan, Mr. Porreca said the plan currently under consideration does intend to differentiate the Boulder campus by price. In that regard, he noted that tuitions at community colleges and research universities in Colorado are not very different, and that there is support for increasing tuition at the research institutions, beginning with Boulder.

In response to a question by Regent Schneiders, Mr. Porreca indicated that the plan, although never implemented, still is an attractive way to potentially enhance revenue, while providing a benefit to students. To date, however, it has not been used on a large scale at a major university.

In response to a question by Chancellor Miller, Mr. Porreca indicated that he would not recommend a cohort tuition program at a campus that had a large population of part-time students.

\- - -

QUALITY: THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

Introducing the presentation, Regent President smith referred to the Board's three top priority issues for the current year: (1) Growing the state's economy; 2) building the UW's resource base; and 3) enhancing the quality of the student experience. In that regard, there is nothing more central to the university enterprise than the quality of teaching and learning.

He introduced Bill Cerbin, Professor of Psychology and Assistant to the Provost, UW-La Crosse; and Lisa Kornetsky, Director of the UW System Office of Professional and Instructional Development and a Professor of Theater Arts at UW-Parkside.

Professor Cerbin began the presentation by pointing out a common dichotomy between teaching, viewed as the faculty role to provide information, and learning, viewed as the student role to absorb information. An alternative view, he explained, is that the goal of teaching is to advance students' understanding. More than simply accumulating information, students should grasp the subject matter to the extent that they can use knowledge in new circumstances to solve problems, make decision and develop new ideas.

Research over the past 30 years has shown that understanding is not an automatic consequence of teaching and that attaining deep understanding is not simply a matter of paying attention in class and studying hard. While students may be able to talk and write about ideas they have studied, that does not necessarily mean that they can use new knowledge effectively and think with newly learned ideas to solve problems in new contexts.

Professor Cerbin considered teaching for understanding to be a fundamental problem in higher education, with a significant gap between the professed goal of promoting deep understanding of important knowledge and an outcome that is often superficial, fragmented understanding. The information transfer model of teaching, he commented, disregards student understanding, leaving that job to the students. Teaching for understanding begins with questions about what students should understand and what aspects of the subject are difficult to understand. Teaching then is designed to take these factors into account in trying to help students develop knowledge.

Dr. Cerbin provided the following two examples of teaching designed for student understanding. A professor of chemistry at the University of Notre Dame, concerned about a high student failure rate in introductory chemistry, redesigned the course from a lecture and lab format and turned it into one that emphasizes interactive learning by infusing group activities into the lab and discussion sections, as well as the lecture section itself. As a result, 50% more "at risk" students are majoring in science than in previous years. A second example is a history professor at Barnard College who teaches classic texts by having students re-enact critical historical events. Students prepare for weeks, reading original texts and taking their roles seriously. As one student noted, "This class tricks you into learning so much". Although the class still is undergoing independent evaluation to determine its effects on the quality of learning, Dr. Cerbin predicted that students in this course will be shown to develop a deeper understanding of philosophical ideas and issues and have the ability to connect these ideas to contemporary life.

In both cases, Professor Cerbin noted, faculty were motivated by concern not only about what students learn, but their depth of understanding, and redesigned their courses with student understanding as a primary goal.

Pointing out that this approach to teaching still is very much the exception, he explained that, while faculty care about student learning, most do not have insight into how their students learn or why they fail to learn. While faculty know their fields of expertise extremely well, they have not been prepared to teach for understanding.

This situation will not change, he emphasized, unless student learning becomes an object of serious study among faculty. If faculty engage in the scholarship of teaching, their work would extend beyond their own classrooms and would be made public so that others could critique and build upon it.

An ideal situation would consist of collective enterprises in which groups of instructors would address common student learning dilemmas. For example, he explained, thousands of students encounter difficulties in introductory courses each year. Yet, disciplines have not developed exemplary ways to foster students' understanding of important disciplinary knowledge in those classes, leaving thousands of instructors each year on their own.

In conclusion, Dr. Cerbin suggested treating introductory courses as student learning laboratories. Collectively, instructors would investigate their students' learning and gradually develop more effective ways to teach. Those courses also could be places where new faculty learn how to teach by learning from and contributing to well-tested ideas about teaching and learning.

In her portion of the presentation, Dr. Lisa Kornetsky described what is being done by the System Office of Professional and Instructional Development (OPID) to advance the practice of teaching, with a primary emphasis on student learning. This includes developing examples of best practices that faculty can share and upon which they can be built.

Like traditional research, she noted, teaching can create new knowledge for others to debate and develop in order to advance the discipline.

Higher education, she pointed out, has seen a paradigm shift from teaching to learning; from transmitting information to focusing on student understanding. Like any other practice, teaching needs to be understood as a field that is continually evolving, with new ways of teaching different disciplines and of teaching different constituent groups with varying needs. The shift from teaching to learning is connected to the assessment movement, to the impact of technology on teaching and learning, to changing student and faculty demographics, and to ways in which higher education is preparing future faculty.

Another paradigm shift, Dr. Kornetsky continued, is from the individual faculty member, left to his/her own resources in learning to teach, to the development of a community of teacher-scholars who are expanding the profession of teaching through scholarly inquiry, focused on what makes teaching most effective.

These shifts together comprise a movement called the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. One of the characteristics of this movement is to make teaching scholarship public and available for peer review and dissemination for others to build upon. Just as in traditional disciplinary research, there is a culture of collecting and testing evidence. This sharing and testing will continue to advance the practice of teaching and the quality of the student experience. Implicit in this way of teaching is assessment, not only of what the student knows, but of how the student learns.

Describing the work of the Office of Professional and Instructional Development, Dr. Kornetscky noted that it administers a variety of programs to advance quality teaching and regularly convenes a council of representatives from all UW institutions. The office is in a leadership position to foster ideas and share resources and best practices across campuses and disciplines. Faculty from all institutions are brought together for workshops, discussions, seminars and conferences. By sharing examples of what works, they collaborate in continuing development of a culture of teaching and learning.

Noting that OPID is almost 25 years old, Dr. Kornetsky explained that, while the office has always worked to improve teaching and learning, it has changed in recent years as part of the national dialog on these subjects. Areas of greatest impact include:

1) Faculty College – OPID’s flagship program conducted each June: A three-day conference of intensive seminars gives 100 UW faculty and staff an opportunity to explore the challenges of undergraduate teaching.

2) The Wisconsin Teaching Fellows Program – designed for outstanding teachers at the outset of their academic careers - allows faculty and instructional academic staff the opportunity to devote part of an academic year to intensive inquiry into teaching and learning.

3) The Wisconsin Teaching Scholars Program – developed last year: Outstanding faculty and instructional academic staff with over ten years of teaching experience engage in a year-long project focusing on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. This program gives participants an opportunity at mid-career to improve their own teaching and their students’ learning through redesign of a course or program. Benefits to institutions include identification of a cadre of quality teachers who model the scholarship of teaching and learning, share their knowledge and expertise, serve as consultants to colleagues, and become leaders in their institutions.

4) Grant Programs: In conjunction with the Office of Academic Affairs, OPID annually funds a wide range of teaching proposals through the Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Grants.

5) Student Learning Conference: At least one conference is sponsored each year by OPID, the next one being titled *Teaching for Understanding with Technology*.

In conclusion, Dr. Kornetsky said that all of these programs work hard to promote excellence in teaching and learning. They also seek to develop collaboration and partnerships among institutions around the state and to nurture a sense of belonging to a community that is deeply committed to teaching and learning.

Regent Krutsch asked if support for the scholarship of teaching and learning is being institutionalized to the department level by making it a valid criterion for tenure consideration and for granting of sabbaticals.

President Lyall remarked that Regent Krutsch's question is especially important for two reasons. First, there is a significant wave of new faculty who need to focus on the importance of student learning, as well as effective teaching, early in their careers. Second, she felt the profession will change its practice and culture only through faculty teaching other faculty about this subject. OPID's work encourages this kind of reflection on the scholarship of teaching and learning, and every campus now has a teaching academy that provides a focus for these kinds of efforts.

Regent Burmaster pointed out that, in addition to peer-to-peer learning, the interactive process between students and teachers leads to reciprocity of learning that is critical to achieving depth of understanding.

Regent Gottschalk asked if there are broad incentives in place to encourage faculty to focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning.

President Lyall replied that, in addition to OPID programs, there is increasing attention to this field in awarding sabbaticals. She felt the subject needs to be promoted on a number of different fronts.

Chancellor Wells added that growing acceptance of the scholarship of teaching and learning as a scholarly activity is helpful in promoting its acceptance in tenure and promotion considerations. However, more incentives need to be put in place. Chancellor Keating concurred, adding that excellent teachers often are so involved in the practice of teaching that they do not take time to inform others about what they are doing. Another area that needs attention is preparation of graduate students for teaching at the college level.

Upon completion of discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Judith A. Temby