

## MINUTES

### EDUCATION COMMITTEE, BOARD OF REGENTS Wisconsin Room, Union, UW-Milwaukee Milwaukee, Wisconsin

June 5, 2003

Regent Mohs convened the meeting of the Education Committee at 1:30 p.m. Regents Mohs, Axtell, Burmaster, Connolly-Keesler, Richlen and Smith were present.

a. Approval of the minutes of the May 8, 2003, meeting of the Education Committee.

It was moved by Regent Smith, seconded by Regent Axtell, that the minutes of the May 8, 2003, meeting of the Education Committee be approved.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

b. Discussion of All-Regent Session on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Dr. Pat Hutchings, Vice President for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and Lisa Kornetsky, Director of the UW System Office of Professional and Instructional Development, were present to respond to follow-up questions from the morning presentation on the scholarship of teaching and learning. In response to a question from Regent Smith, Senior Vice President Marrett noted that while a variety of scholarship of teaching and learning initiatives are underway at the institutions, there remains a good deal of resistance to some of the work because it requires a cultural shift in terms of how traditional faculty roles and rewards are determined. Regent Burmaster added that professional development programs are urgently needed to make the most of the will among faculty to improve their teaching. Ms. Kornetsky described some specific examples of the institution-based work that is taking place, and that serves to link the scholarship of teaching and learning to other institutions, both within the UW System and nationally.

c. Report of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

1. Report from the Black and Gold Commission

Senior Vice President Marrett introduced Chancellor Zimpher, who then introduced a group of student members from the Black and Gold Commission. Composed of an equal number of students, faculty and staff, the Commission was formed about 20 months ago to develop recommendations on how to provide the best quality educational experience for UW-M students. The work of the Commission resulted in a report with a set of recommendations that are now being implemented. Over 130 students are engaged in this implementation process. The Education Committee heard examples of both college-wide and institution-wide activities. For example, students are working to enhance student input into teaching in the Schools of Business, Nursing, and Architecture and Urban Planning. Students have also worked to develop a Student Success Center that will be both located on campus, and will exist virtually as an online student information and advising website. The Black and Gold Commission has made a lasting impact on UW-M, creating active roles for leadership and involvement by students throughout the institution. As one student put it, the work of the Commission “turned a simple report, into a way of thinking about investing in students.”

2. Report of Education Committee Works and Accomplishments

Senior Vice President Marrett then turned to a brief review of the Education Committee's works and accomplishments for the year, which she hoped would allow the Committee to begin the process of setting its future directions. She reminded the Committee of two promises she had made a year ago: the first being a proposed partnership between the Office of the Senior Vice President and the Board of Regents, in particular the Education Committee; and the second being a close study of quality, both its meaning and its measure. She reminded the Committee of the work done together this year in the areas of program planning and review, the integration of technology into teaching and learning, and efforts to infuse multicultural teaching and learning into the curriculum. She also recognized the work of her colleagues in the Office of Academic Affairs, including individuals from the Institute for Race and Ethnicity and the Multicultural Center for Educational Excellence, who were present at the meeting, as well as the others who work diligently behind the scenes to advance quality systemwide. She emphasized that as a public institution, the UW System's responsibility is to meet the needs of all its citizens and to provide education as a public good.

### 3. Quality Indicators

Senior Vice President Marrett recalled for the Committee the question posed a year ago: How does the UW System know it is a quality system? She then turned the podium over to a presentation by Associate Vice Presidents Ron Singer and Frank Goldberg, and Academic Planner Dr. Christine Flynn-Saulnier. The presentation expanded on several key points: 1) Quality is multifaceted and textured; 2) Quality is in the eye of the beholder; and 3) Quality processes are important to stakeholders.

Associate Vice President Ron Singer reviewed for the Committee the quality matrix he and Associate Vice President Goldberg presented to the Board last October, in which the complexity of defining quality was linked to the different stakeholders who hold the university accountable in different ways, and who have different ideas about what quality is. He discussed the various levels at which quality must be evaluated: the program level, the institutional level, and the System level. He emphasized that in the short term, the UW System must be sure not to sacrifice quality in a period of diminishing resources; access must be protected but not at the expense of quality. In the long term, the goal remains to develop more effective means by which to assess quality.

Dr. Flynn-Saulnier next presented the preliminary findings of data compiled from numerous focus groups she convened this past year from around the state. She offered several caveats to her work, namely that the findings are not representative and should not be generalized, but come from individuals or clusters of participants. In other words, hers was never intended to be a large scale study that included samples of a size necessary in order to generalize the views of the people in the sample to the population as a whole. The focus groups convened by Dr. Flynn-Saulnier included Student Ambassadors; Faculty Representatives, Academic Staff Representatives, Provosts, alumni/alumnae, prospective students and their families; and community groups. Her data collection was gleaned from a total of 116 focus group participants, as well as some additional email and in-person conversations with Regents, Chancellors, and others.

Focus group participants identified certain areas of quality as having the highest priority, among them: Mission, Access, Faculty, Teaching, Climate, and Diversity. While both stakeholders internal to the academy and those external to it identified the same priority areas, they ranked them somewhat differently. Many of the items identified as quality indicators are already monitored by the UW System each year in its Accountability Report. Moreover, several of the factors identified as aspects of quality are addressed via major UW initiatives like the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

initiative, Plan 2008, and the Advising Task Force. Dr. Flynn-Saulnier listed several recommendations for improving quality that emerged from the focus group data, including:

- Hone institution-specific missions;
- Improve the balance of faculty contribution among teaching, research and service;
- Make more dramatic inroads towards increasing diversity;
- Provide supportive environments in and out of the classroom;
- Attend to class size in relation to quality instruction.

She also reported that the data, while still undergoing analysis, is already being used in a variety of ways, e.g.: to clarify stakeholder thinking about the liberal arts; to shape requests for external funding to improve campus climate; to provide mission-related data to the institutions; and to assist in the planning of Phase II of Plan 2008. She concluded by reiterating that: different constituents identify and prioritize different quality indicators; some aspects of quality must be measured at the institutional level and some at the system level; the UW System has initiatives in place to address some priorities identified by the focus group participants; however, new approaches are needed to continue to improve quality.

Associate Vice President Goldberg discussed the implications of the focus group analysis for the year-long examination of quality. He pointed to three conclusions from the discussion:

1. Because quality is not a simple concept, it is difficult to measure and cannot be fully captured by numerical scores.
2. Different stakeholders approach the issue of quality in different ways – what may be quality from one person’s perspective, may not be quality from someone else’s perspective.
3. Although the ultimate measures of quality are measures of outcomes, when asked what a quality education is, most respondents focused on the quality of inputs and processes.

Dr. Goldberg indicated that earlier this year, several Board members suggested that it would be useful to develop a small set of indicators to measure quality and track changes in quality over time. He pointed out that restricted budgets most immediately impact the quality of inputs and processes. It is only after a period of time that outcomes begin to suffer. Therefore, if the UW System is committed to preserving quality outcomes, it is prudent to monitor the immediate impact of budget reductions on inputs and processes. Once outcomes begin to deteriorate, it may be too late to make the policy adjustments needed to reverse the decline. Therefore, it is useful to develop a set of leading indicators – indicators that can signal in advance potential threats to the quality of outcomes.

Dr Goldberg proposed the following leading indicators: Student-Faculty Contact; Support Services for Students; Campus Environment; and Access. He also identified for each of these indicators a subset of input measures that are reducible to quantifiable terms, and that are necessary to achieving and preserving quality. For example, in the area of student-faculty contact, measures such as student-faculty ratio, average class size, and the percentage of student contact hours taught by faculty would be used. He clarified that these are not direct measures of quality, but are measures of the input necessary for quality outcomes which would serve as early indicators of areas requiring attention before quality suffers.

Associate Vice President Goldberg concluded by recommending that these measures be tied to the strategic objectives set by the UW System and the Board of Regents in the planning exercise that will begin over the summer.

The discussion centered on questions about the extent to which the UW System already measures those areas—in terms of input, process, and outcomes—identified by the three presenters. Questions

and dialogue also focused on the extent to which quality measures should be institution-specific, and about whether institutional missions differentiate enough from each other. Senior Vice President Marrett reiterated that it would be nearly impossible to find one metric that would meet the definitions of quality among various stakeholders, and that the value of Dr. Flynn-Saulnier's focus groups lies precisely in the opportunity for different stakeholder voices to be documented and analyzed. Regents Mohs and Smith agreed on the importance of looking at quality institution by institution.

#### 4. Implementation of the Excess Credit Policy

Senior Vice President Marrett concluded her report with an update on the implementation of the Excess Credit Policy, which the Board approved in December, 2002, in response to a mandate from Governor McCallum. At the Board's request, Senior Vice President Marrett convened a working group to hammer out carefully and deliberately a viable means of implementing this policy systemwide. The working group labored to balance flexibility in the administration of the policy so as not to adversely impact students, with the need to ensure that the policy would have the desired effect of changing behavior and reducing the number of credits that students accumulate while completing a degree. The agreed-upon guidelines will be distributed soon for implementation in Fall 2004. There is an expectation, among all those involved in developing and reviewing the policy, that it will impact a minimal number of students.

##### d. Report on Remedial Education

Senior Vice President Marrett and Associate Vice President Goldberg helped contextualize for the Committee the Report on Remedial Education. Senior Vice President Marrett reviewed the series of events leading up to this report, which included the development in the late 1980s of several Board policies which determined the way remedial education is handled in the UW System. Initially, the Board required a report on the status of remediation in the UW System on an annual basis. After several years, however, the Board was satisfied that the remedial policies were accomplishing their purpose and modified the reporting requirement so that the report would be produced every three years.

In fact, the news continues to be good, as Associate Vice President Goldberg informed the Committee: a relatively small number of students admitted to the UW require additional coursework in English and Math to get them up to the standard that is necessary for college-level work. This relatively small number can be attributed to the quality of K-12 education in Wisconsin. For new freshman in the UW System, only 6 %--which is half the national average for 4-year institutions—enroll in remedial English courses. Likewise, the percentage of freshman enrolling in remedial math courses is below that of peers across the country. Since 1990-91, when the Board first mandated reporting on students requiring remediation, the percentage of students requiring English remediation fell from 10.2 % to 7.4% in 2001-02. There has been a similar decrease in the same time period for students requiring math remediation. Moreover, there have been relatively stable and high second-year retention rates for students who enrolled in and completed required Math and/or English remediation. The conclusion is that the remediation seems to work for those few students who enter the UW System needing it.

##### e. Report on Promotions, Tenure Designations, and Related Academic Approval Items

Every June, the UW System compiles data on tenure designations and new tenured appointments made at each of the institutions for approval by the Board. Regent Mohs suggested, and the Committee concurred, that the Education Committee should take up a more nuanced discussion next year of faculty roles and rewards, including presentations on what tenure really means and how it is

awarded, on faculty governance, and other issues that will elucidate what it means to be a faculty member in the UW System in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Regent Axtell asked how faculty members are notified of the Board's approval of their tenure, noting that it is such a significant milestone in their careers. He asked whether it might be possible to add some language to the letters sent out by Chancellors to their newly tenured faculty, signaling that the Regents approve and congratulate them on their records of achievement and commitment to teaching, research and service. Senior Vice President Marrett and several Chancellors and Provosts lauded the idea and assured him that this would be possible.

I.1.e.: It was moved by Regent Smith, seconded by Regent Axtell, that, upon the recommendation of the respective Chancellors and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the 2003-04 tenure designations and new tenured appointments be approved.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

f. PK-16 Partnerships and Initiatives

Regent Burmaster delivered a report on the PK-16 partnerships and initiatives that are in operation throughout the state of Wisconsin, linking UW institutions to local school districts, and the technical and private colleges. During the past year, Regent Burmaster initiated a series of regional discussions with PK-16 partners. She logged many hundreds of miles around the state, as she drove from region to region, hosted by Chancellors and Provosts, to discuss existing and future collaborative efforts among the public and private institutions of higher education, PK-12 school districts, business, labor and government. There is a lot of work going on in such areas as PI-34 (the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative to educate, recruit, retain and professionally develop teachers), alternative teacher certification programs, and closing the achievement gap. Regent Burmaster enthusiastically shared some of the specific activities underway at each of the institutions in collaboration with primary and secondary educators in their regions. She also recognized the leadership role of her colleagues on the Wisconsin PK-16 Leadership Council in helping to forge a common vision for collaboration and the effective use of resources.

Regent Burmaster was joined by Dr. Francine Tompkins, Director of PK-16 Initiatives in the Office of Academic and Student Services, and Dr. Penny Garcia, Assistant Professor of Education at UW-Oshkosh. They detailed some of the other partnerships that are ongoing in the areas of shared, institution-wide responsibility for quality teacher education, and several grant initiatives, including the VIVA (Vital Issues in Virtual Assemblies) grant that prepares teachers to use advanced technology with their students. All three presenters thanked the Board for its leadership in promoting PK-16 collaboration over the last two years. Regent Mohs commended Regent Burmaster for her remarkable leadership and work to enhance the quality of education across all sectors of the state.

g. UW-Milwaukee Charter School Proposal

Provost John Wanat and Dr. Robert Kattman, Director of the Office of Charter Schools, UW-Milwaukee, were present to answer questions about the proposed chartering of the Woodlands School, Inc. In response to questions from Regents Mohs, Provost Wanat noted that this was the sixth school to come before the Board for charter status, and that it is similar to several others already approved by the Board. In response to a question from Regent Axtell, Provost Wanat and Dr. Kattmann explained the review process that is used to determine the success and quality of the charter schools, which includes a five-year review and an assessment model adopted from

Baldrige. They also explained that UW-Milwaukee has no financial obligation to the schools it charters: no GPR money is used; and the charter schools pay fees to cover UW-Milwaukee staff time.

I.1.g.: It was moved by Regent Axtell, seconded by Regent Smith, that, upon the recommendation of the Chancellor of UW-Milwaukee and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents approves the charter school contract with Woodlands School, Inc.

There were no closed session items to come before the Committee. Resolutions I.1.e. and I.1.g. were referred as consent agenda items to the full session of the Board of Regents at its Friday, June 6, 2003 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.