

## MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

of the

## BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

UW-Milwaukee  
Held in the Union, Wisconsin Room  
Thursday June 5, 2003  
10:00 a.m.

- President Gottschalk presiding -

PRESENT: Regents Amato, Axtell, Bradley, Burmaster, Connolly-Keesler,  
Gottschalk, Gracz, Marcovich, Mohs, Olivieri, Richlen, Randall,  
Rosenzweig, Salas, Smith and Walsh

ABSENT: Regent Davis

- - -

### **WELCOME REGENT EILEEN CONNOLLY-KEESLER**

Regent President Gottschalk welcomed Regent Eileen Connolly-Keesler, who was appointed to the board by Governor Doyle to succeed Regent Emeritus Pat Boyle. She is executive director of the Oshkosh Area Community Foundation and holds a bachelor's degree from UW-Green Bay and a master's degree from UW-Oshkosh.

- - -

### **BUDGET UPDATE**

Noting that the budget process has been long and difficult for all concerned, Regent President Gottschalk remarked that the chancellors were given a challenging and thankless task in determining how each institution would handle its budget cuts within a set of four guiding principles: Cut administration first; merge or eliminate majors or programs with small enrollments; support a move-to-the-midpoint policy for tuition; and as a last resort, adjust enrollment targets to reflect decreased staffing, if necessary.

Each institution, he explained, engaged its faculty, staff, students and community members in open forums to determine, from the ground up, how to manage its cuts, as opposed to detailed, top-down directives from the regents or system administration. While some might disagree with specific results, all voices were heard; and any concerns with ongoing impacts can be reconsidered in the board's upcoming exercise on re-thinking the UW System.

Turning to legislative actions, President Gottschalk indicated that the Joint Finance Committee approved the Governor's proposed budget with some modifications. A provision, that would allow the UW to spread the proposed position cuts over two years, rather than taking them all in the first year, is especially beneficial for the UW Colleges, which could have been significantly harmed by the original proposal. He also was pleased with the bipartisan vote and the fact that the committee did not seek to override campus-based decisions by micro-managing the UW's cut.

While a \$250 million cut could not be called a victory, he believed that it could have been worse and that Engage Wisconsin was a successful endeavor. The process used in determining specific cuts was the right one, and that message had been conveyed convincingly to lawmakers.

He expressed great appreciation to the chancellors, provosts, faculty, staff and students for coming to grips with the budget problems and to the university communities, alumni groups, foundations and other organizations, community leaders, editors, parents, regents emeritus and other friends of the university for the supporting visits, phone calls, letters and emails that made a difference with lawmakers.

At the system level, he thanked Vice President Linda Weimer, who did fine work in coordinating Engage Wisconsin, and her colleagues in University Relations, Margaret Lewis and David Miller who worked tirelessly, informing legislators and correcting misconceptions as they deliberated on specific budget issues.

Finally, he expressed gratitude to regent colleagues who took the time to make contacts and spread good words about the university.

With respect to the future, Regent Marcovich, President Lyall, and he had begun to give form and substance to the re-thinking study; and drafts of a case statement and structural outlines will be shared with regents and chancellors.

- - -

## **THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING: THE NATIONAL AND STATE SCENES**

In opening remarks, President Lyall noted that the UW System and UW-Milwaukee have a national leadership role in the scholarship of teaching and learning. She introduced Pat Hutchings, Vice President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which has been leading the way nationally on this issue. The foundation is a major national and international center for research and policy studies

about teaching, with a mission to address the most difficult problems, including how to achieve lasting student learning and how to assess the impact of teaching on students.

Dr. Hutchings oversees all foundation programs and provides guidance to research initiatives. She joined the Carnegie Foundation in 1998, after serving as a senior staff member at the American Association for Higher Education. She has written widely on teaching, course portfolios, peer collaboration and the review of teaching. She holds a doctorate in English from the University of Iowa and was chair of the English Department at Alverno College before joining AAHE.

Dr. Hutchings began by stating that American higher education cannot afford not to learn from the innovative approaches that many faculty are trying with their students; instead, these innovations need to be used to improve student learning in the future. That, she said, is the promise of the scholarship of teaching and learning. The UW System has been involved in it for a number of years and is now in a position of national leadership.

As an example of the meaning of this work, she read a case study, titled "The Larrys", which was about the dilemma of how best to teach students who, like Larry, are bright and hard working, but do not have the necessary background to succeed in a key gateway course, like introductory chemistry. The faculty member in this case had been trying new approaches, such as collaborative work, lab reports and online tutorials; but generating evidence of their effectiveness would require a major commitment of time and effort. She knew that other faculty viewed such classes as filters to weed out students not suited for advanced work and would view her efforts as a waste of time. Further, she knew that she needed to spend her time with her research team in the laboratory and that she needed to publish to ensure tenure. She thought it odd that research should be collaborative and team-based, while teaching felt so solitary.

Dr. Hutchings asked regents to work in pairs for several minutes to consider what needs and opportunities the scenario highlights, what it makes one hope for, and what a happy ending would look like. Upon conclusion of those discussions, she asked for comments from the board members.

While he agreed that collaborative learning could be helpful to some students, Regent Mohs pointed out that it also could allow a student to get through a course without really learning the material on the strength of another student's work. Therefore, he was somewhat skeptical about considering that type of learning a solution to the problem.

Concurring with the importance of Regent Mohs' point, Dr. Hutchings said it underlines the need for scholarly work to gather evidence on what strategies work best to improve learning.

Regent Walsh commented that, if a bright, hard-working student cannot succeed in getting through a gateway course, it indicates that different ways of measuring performance and success may be needed.

Dr. Hutchings agreed, explaining that the scholarship of teaching and learning is concerned not only with teaching techniques, but also with what is meant by success and how that can be measured.

Regent Salas observed that teaching need not be a solitary endeavor and can benefit from collaboration, as much as learning can. Just as effective research often is done in a team setting, he noted, effective teaching and learning can result from working together collaboratively. He added, however, that most classrooms are not structured to accommodate collaborative student work.

Dr. Hutchings indicated that one aim of the scholarship of teaching and learning is to create the kinds of communities that alleviate the isolation of teachers.

In response to the question of what a happy ending would look like, Regent Burmaster thought one answer would be for institutions to reward and recognize faculty who balance research and teaching and to build communities of teaching and learning. The goal, she added, should not be to filter people out, but to help learners to find success.

With respect to reward systems, Dr. Hutchings felt that part of the answer is for faculty to produce solid evidence of student learning in ways that can be rewarded through the institutional decision-making context.

Regent Marcovich cautioned that some collaborative learning or teaching groups might tend to sink to the lowest level of the participants, which could impede complete learning. In addition, he was concerned about the possible loss of star teachers who prefer to teach by themselves, rather than in collaboration with others.

Dr. Hutchings indicated that one question revolves around what is meant by collaboration in teaching – whether it means team-teaching together in the classroom, collaborative design of curricula, or co-assessment of students.

Regent Olivieri inquired about the role of the Board of Regents in the area of teaching and learning and what the board could do to help faculty who want to improve student learning, perhaps in such areas as rewards, tenure criteria, and sabbatical policy.

Regent Smith commented on the importance of keeping the focus on “the Larrys”, with recognition that students learn differently from one another.

Turning to an example of the kind of results that have been obtained in the scholarship of teaching and learning, Dr. Hutchings referred to the case of Professor Dennis Jacobs, of the University of Notre Dame Chemistry Department, who last year was named Carnegie Professor of the Year from the research university sector for his work in this area. The problem he faced was that too high a proportion of competent students were performing poorly and leaving scientific fields or even leaving the institution.

In response, he introduced a number of instructional innovations in experimental sections, including an emphasis on key concepts and small group work on questions too challenging for an individual student.

In order to quantify outcomes, he tracked grades, retention and achievement in subsequent science courses for 4,000 students over several years. He also conducted focus groups in order to hear from individual students about the experience and analyzed

videotapes of small group work in order to determine what actually happened in the groups.

The results were: 1) the quality of student performance increased dramatically; 2) the retention rate of at-risk students rose 55%; 3) at-risk students were twice as likely as before to get an A; and 4) the same results were obtained when other instructors taught the course using Professor Jacobs' design, showing that the improvements did not simply result from Dr. Jacob's individual teaching skill.

In response to a question by Regent Olivieri, Dr. Hutchings indicated that the content of the course and the tests were the same; only the learning strategies changed.

Similar changes were adopted by faculty in engineering and physics at Notre Dame. Tracking of students was done through the university's Office of Institutional Research. Notre Dame has involved other campuses in this work, and Professor Jacobs has moved on to do further work on service learning and other dimensions of teaching and learning chemistry.

In a nutshell, Dr. Hutchings said, the scholarship of teaching and learning consists of :

- Faculty seeking better classroom strategies;
- Documenting effectiveness;
- Sharing results with colleagues; and
- Changing the way business is done.

It requires an ethic of continuous improvement and serves as an antidote to teaching by the seat of the pants. Today, she explained, there are places where budding faculty are inducted into the work of teaching, not just research, in their field – something that traditionally has not been done as much as it should be. Finally, it entails faculty bringing their knowledge, skills and values as scholars to their work as teachers. In doing so, it takes advantage of the ways that they have been taught to behave by tapping into scholarship.

Dr. Hutchings then quoted as follows from an article by Randy Bass, a faculty member in American Studies at Georgetown University: "One telling measure of how differently teaching is regarded from traditional scholarship or research within the academy is what a difference it makes to have a 'problem' in one versus the other. In scholarship and research, having a 'problem' is at the heart of the investigative process...But in one's teaching, a 'problem' is something you don't want to have. And if you have one you probably want to fix it. Asking a colleague about a problem in his or her research is an invitation; asking about a problem in one's teaching would probably seem like an accusation. Changing the status of the problem in teaching from terminal remediation to ongoing investigation is precisely what the movement for a scholarship of teaching is all about."

Turning to context and rationale for the scholarship of teaching and learning, Dr. Hutchings pointed out that today many more students are going on to college than was the case in the past. In a sense, going to college has become a requirement for life in the middle class and no longer seems optional to many students. More and more of these students are nontraditional or come from underrepresented groups, and they come with varying levels of preparation. This creates challenges and shows up in graduation rates that are at issue nationally, although the UW's rates are higher than the national average. Faculty are finding that what used to work in the classroom no longer works as well. The scholarship of teaching and learning provides a means to address these challenges.

Several decades of research, Dr. Hutchings indicated, have provided new insights into how learning happens. Noting that one of the most important variables in whether learning occurs is what the student already knows, she remarked that an agenda for the scholarship of teaching and learning involves examining the learning that students bring to their college classes. Another finding is that students are more likely to learn in powerful and lasting ways if they are told what they are expected to learn and can connect those goals with their goals for themselves. Finally, it is clear that education takes place not only in the classroom, but across the university. In that regard student success entails partnerships between classroom activities and out of class learning, such as experiential learning, service learning, and international internships.

With regard to new approaches to learning, Dr. Hutchings indicated that many faculty are trying new strategies that involve technology. Another approach involves active learning, such as use of collaborative groups and out-of-class learning.

Turning to the matter of accountability, Dr. Hutchings explained that the university needs to be accountable to a diverse circle of stakeholders who have different perspectives on its work. Evidence about the quantity and quality of student learning and success, she pointed out, is an essential part of these accountability measures, and the scholarship of teaching and learning is a means of producing that kind of evidence.

With regard to the beginning of the national movement toward the scholarship of teaching and learning, Dr. Hutchings referred to a report released in 1990 by the Carnegie Foundation called *Scholarship Reconsidered: New Priorities for the Professoriate* by Ernest Boyer, who at the time was president of the Carnegie Foundation. In that report he argued that higher education needs a broader conception of scholarship and that the enterprise of scholarship has been hijacked by research narrowly defined. To fulfill the many missions of higher education, he promoted a broader conception of scholarship, including integrative work, applied work, connection with the community, and the work of teaching. It was this report that coined the phrase, "the scholarship of teaching".

Since that time, many institutions, including the UW System, have re-examined their reward systems to align them more closely with a broader conception of scholarship. In a national survey done in 1994 by the Carnegie Foundation, 60% of institutions reported that teaching counted more in the reward system than it had five years previously. Along the way, many campuses also undertook fundamental reforms of undergraduate education, looking at new approaches in the classroom, new curricular designs, and reinvigorated general education.

Dr. Hutchings then described the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), with which she and colleagues had been working for the past six years. The academy has programming at three levels – with individual scholars, with scholarly and professional societies, and with campuses.

In the scholar's program, individual faculty apply to do research focused on their students' learning. Participants are selected through a national competitive process, with 114 faculty having gone through the program to date and another 26 about to begin. These faculty, Dr. Hutchings said, produce powerful examples that others can build on and often become agents of change on their own campuses.

Professional and scholarly societies in the program have included the American Chemical Society, the American Historical Association, the American Sociological Association and allied health fields. These organizations advise faculty on what matters in their professions and collaborate with faculty on teaching and learning and on new standards for judging a student's work.

The CASTL campus program, which is designed to help institutions find ways to support the scholarship of teaching and learning, is coordinated by both the Carnegie Foundation and the American Association for Higher Education. In the first five years of the program, about 200 campuses made a public commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Activities have included new professional development programs and new publications. Many are finding ways to involve students and offices of institutional research.

In March the foundation announced 12 campus cluster leadership sites which will become focal points for advancing the movement. The UW System is one of those sites.

In conclusion, Dr. Hutchings predicted that, over the next five years, faculty will increasingly use their talents as scholars to improve student learning, campuses will develop programs and rewards to support faculty in this work, and graduate programs will turn out new faculty who are better prepared to bring students to higher levels of learning. When all of these things happen, the educational needs of states and society will be more broadly met.

The next portion of the presentation was made by Tony Ciccone, Professor of French and Director of the Center for Instructional and Professional Development (CIPD) at UW-Milwaukee, and by Lisa Kornetsky, Director of the Office of Professional and Instructional Development (OPID) and a senior academic planner for UW System Administration.

Dr. Ciccone began his remarks by indicating that the UW System leadership site focuses on supporting the work of individuals and institutions across the system in advancing the practice of teaching through scholarly inquiry into student learning.

Turning to UW-Milwaukee's initiatives, he said that the campus-wide discussion on the scholarship of teaching and learning, initiated by Chancellor Zimpher in February 1999, led to the creation of a Center Scholars Program designed to create models of

scholarly inquiry into student learning for UWM's faculty. The success of this work led to national presentations and recognition for achievement from the American Association for Higher Education. That recognition resulted in grants to connect UWM expertise with UW System priorities, as well as initiatives to connect the scholarship of teaching and learning to student success at UWM -- especially to the work of the Black and Gold Commission on the student experience -- and in efforts to connect the scholarship of teaching and learning to assessment.

Dr. Kornetsky explained the Office of Professional Instructional Development has been involved in the scholarship of teaching and learning since 1998, working to develop a sustained initiative across the entire UW System. Bringing to this initiative more than 25 years of faculty development centered on teaching and learning, the office has developed several programs that focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning, including the Wisconsin Teaching Fellows Program and the Wisconsin Teaching Scholars Program, giving faculty and instructional staff across the system the opportunity to do this work and model it for others. The initiative has been expanded through numerous conferences and presentations, including the 2000 Student Learning Conference at which 11 Carnegie scholars from across the country presented to over 150 UW faculty and staff.

Dr. Ciccone noted that in 2001 OPID and CIPD joined forces, combining campus expertise with the tradition of system-wide faculty development in which OPID is a national leader. A collaboration was developed with faculty from several campuses to support individual faculty and campuses, while creating connections between and among campuses.

As of July 1<sup>st</sup>, Dr. Kornetsky indicated, the leadership site will be open for business on the UW-Milwaukee campus under the direction of Professor Renee Meyers, a former UWM center scholar and a former OPID representative who has been involved in this initiative from the beginning. The leadership site is a joint UW System/UW-Milwaukee initiative to advance the practice of teaching through scholarly inquiry into student learning. The site will have an advisory board with membership from each UW institution. In the best tradition of the UW System, all institutions will benefit and contribute to the collaborative work of the leadership site.

After three years, the intention is to measure success through meeting the following goals: 1) Development of a well-established leadership site that is known and accessed across the UW System; 2) scholarship of teaching and learning initiatives at each campus that have demonstrated outcomes on student learning and faculty development; 3) collaboration between and among campuses with similar strategic objectives; 4) individuals at each campus with expertise in the "doing" of the scholarship of teaching and learning who can take a leadership role; 5) training tools that are available to system faculty/staff and those outside the system for clearly defining what this work is; 6) core membership in the cluster from members of other Wisconsin institutions and faculty development centers beyond the state; 7) national recognition for Wisconsin for leadership in the scholarship of teaching and learning; 8) external funding to support the Leadership Site and some of its activities; and 9) linkages between the scholarship of teaching and learning initiative and larger system priorities, such as retention, advising,



curriculum infusion, student access, teacher preparation, and assessment of student learning.

In closing remarks, Dr. Kornetsky noted that the scholarship of teaching and learning is at the heart of the university's mission and that the work of faculty in this area merits support and recognition. The scholarship of teaching and learning, she said, connects directly to ongoing attempts by the Board of Regents to define quality and student success.

In discussion following the presentation, Regent Bradley asked how this initiative connects to UW-Milwaukee's efforts to aid the Milwaukee Public Schools. In reply, Dr. Ciccone indicated that several Centers Scholars projects have focused on learning by students who are preparing to be teachers. This work will benefit future K-12 education. Dr. Hutchings added that there are efforts at the national level to help higher education learn from K-12 education and vice versa. Making these connections, she remarked, is an important challenge.

Regent Bradley asked if the Carnegie Foundation is working to address concerns by members of Congress about the need to have measurements in higher education to justify tuition increases.

In reply, Dr. Hutchings stated that higher education needs to seize the accountability agenda and that one of the arguments for the scholarship of teaching and learning is that it puts the onus on educators to provide evidence about effectiveness in student learning and success.

Regent Smith remarked that the initiative is an exciting, in-depth effort. He asked what effect it would have on learning for "the Larrys" that would be different from their experience today.

Dr. Hutchings replied that they will have more positive views of learning and will be more likely to become life-long learners. Focus groups conducted by Professor Jacobs found that his students developed a more positive attitude toward the study of science than students with similar backgrounds who were not in the experimental sections. Dr. Ciccone added that the Larrys will also find that faculty care about their success and will support them. Dr. Kornetsky said the hope is that the Larrys will not only learn the material, but learn it more deeply and be able to retain it.

Regent Mohs referred to Dr. Hutchings statement that students are not coming to the university with the knowledge their professors expect and asked if there is a change in the students that prevents them from knowing what they should know and whether such distractions as access to unlimited cable channels and computer games causes students to fall behind.

In reply, Dr. Hutchings indicated that, while modern media and technology make some difference, the challenge for educators is to figure out how to make use of them in advancing learning.

Regent Rosenzweig expressed the hope that the scholarship could be designed to track Larry's success in the future, which also is a concern of lawmakers at the federal and state levels.

Dr. Hutchings indicated that this is an important challenge and one that initially will be met at the local level through programs such as Dr. Ciccone's. The hope is that this information can be aggregated so as to be meaningful in addressing larger questions.

Regent Axtell commented that it is much more difficult today than in the past to hold the attention of young people who are used to constantly changing images on television and in the movies. He asked how teachers can cope with this kind of situation.

Dr. Ciccone replied that many faculty now understand that the 50-minute lecture is not the best way to get students to learn. Strategies include the interrupted lecture, in which the teacher talks for 10 minutes and then poses a question on which students work individually or in pairs. This allows the teacher to find out how students are understanding the material and then move on accordingly. Another technique is to end the lecture by asking each student to write down one thing that still is not clear and then to start the next class by answering those questions. With regard to use of technology, he indicated that many faculty use video in class and also incorporate students' internet skills into their teaching.

Dr. Hutchings added that asking students what they do not understand or what they consider the most important point from a class has the benefit not only of obtaining information, but also of making students more thoughtful and self-conscious about their learning.

Regent Mohs asked if these comments meant that students really are different than they were 25 or 30 years ago.

Dr. Ciccone replied that, from his perspective as a teacher with 28 years of experience, he did not believe that there is much difference in the way students pay attention in class. What has been discovered is that attention span wanes after about 15 minutes, as does ability to recall what has been said. However, there is no base-line information from many years ago with which to compare findings. While he and other faculty believe that students get more out of the class when it is broken into segments, the scholarship of teaching and learning can gather the evidence that will prove whether or not that is the case.

Regent Olivieri observed that, for many years, faculty did not really care whether or not Larry succeeded; in fact, the filtering process was viewed in some fields as a good strategy. Noting that in recent years Larry's success has become a more important issue, he asked where resistance is found and what arguments are made against making Larry more central to thinking about the mission of higher education.

He inquired about policy implications and suggested that measurements of success should be concrete and fitted to the board's accountability goals. He also suggested that the foundation fund studies to find out what happens to Larry.

Dr. Kornetsky indicated that, at this time, policy actions were not being recommended. The intention is to start with projects that will gather the kind of evidence that may later lead to changes in the reward structure and the ways in which faculty work. Noting the longstanding tradition of faculty privacy in the classroom, she remarked that what is being sought is a major culture shift into a communal way of thinking about teaching and learning.

Dr. Hutchings added that what is needed is an expectation of professional development of faculty in the area of teaching and learning that is made possible by investments that provide the necessary infrastructure and resources.

The discussion concluded and the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

---

Judith A. Temby, Secretary

