

Citizens League Report

"Commitment to Focus:"

More of Both

Prepared by
University of Minnesota Committee
David Graven, Chair

Approved by
Citizens League Board of Directors
August 27, 1986

Citizens League
708 South Third Street, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55415
338-0791

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	1
Background	5
The State of the University Today	9
Findings	9
Conclusions	14
The "Price" of CTF for the University	15
Findings	15
Conclusions	19
Recommendations	23
The "Price" of CTF for Students	25
Findings	25
Conclusions	28
Recommendations	30
The "Price" of CTF for All Post-Secondary Education in Minnesota	31
Findings	31
Conclusions	33
Recommendations	35
The "Price" of CTF for Taxpayers	37
Findings	37
Conclusions	40
Recommendations	42
Background of this Study	45
Charge to the Committee	45
Committee Membership	46
Resource People for the Committee	47
Footnotes	49
Appendix 1 - Commitment to Focus Proposals and Regent Action	55
Appendix 2 - Average Cost Funding and Statewide Tuition Policy	57
Appendix 3 - Excerpts from Preliminary Legislative Request, 1987-89 Biennium	58
Appendix 4 - State Policies for Admission to Higher Education	59

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Minnesota is strong. But it cannot be complacent. It is too vulnerable to a decline in quality.

The University administration, its Board of Regents, other public higher education institutions and the Legislature all must work to define precisely what "Commitment to Focus" means and chart a specific course to get there.

Commitment to Focus is the name given to a proposal of University President Kenneth H. Keller to upgrade the quality of education at the University.

Its basic theme is that the University cannot improve quality without narrowing its focus as to what is taught and to whom. Its goal is to make the University one of the top five public universities in the nation.

Although the University ranks well in many national comparisons of higher education institutions, it also ranks below some of its close competitors in academic reputation. If it does nothing to improve itself, it will decline in stature because many other major institutions have undertaken aggressive programs of improvement.

In fact, even if the University does improve, it still might not move up in national rankings because so many other schools are trying to do the same. Nonetheless, Commitment to Focus is a goal well worth pursuing because it makes sense irrespective of the rankings.

Commitment to Focus represents a rare opportunity

The State Legislature has an opportunity to make major changes in the entire system of post-secondary education in Minnesota, because of the University's focus initiatives.

It is almost impossible to imagine that non-University sources could successfully originate a proposal that the University drop certain programs and cut its enrollment.

In the current extraordinary situation, the University itself has taken an initiative that might not occur again for generations. The question is whether the state is ready to take advantage of this unusual opportunity for change.

Minnesota spends a great deal of money on post-secondary education. The Legislature ought to give Minnesotans a post-secondary system that is more efficient, provides better service for citizens, and offers higher quality education to all.

Reduce enrollment and curriculum

The University has spread itself too thinly. Reduction in enrollment is central to the success of Commitment to Focus because it will allow the University to concentrate on a more limited number of curricular areas, assure closer attention to the needs of the undergraduates and attract higher-quality faculty members and graduate students.

The Board of Regents should act now to set specific annual enrollment limits to reduce undergraduate enrollment on the Twin Cities campus by at least 8,000 students over the next 10 years. Institute of Technology enrollment should remain constant.

Meanwhile, the University faculty should propose and the Regents should adopt a long-term goal for the number of curricular areas that the University should have. No university in the nation is known to have more disciplinary departments than the University's 174. The Regents, on recommendation of the faculty, should identify criteria to determine whether a curricular area should remain in existence.

Individual University departments should be given additional money to pursue excellence from funds appropriated for Commitment to Focus. Distribution of the money should be based upon proposals from the departments so that key decisions about upgrading quality emerge at the grass roots.

The functions performed by General College do not belong in the University and should be distributed elsewhere. Remedial programs for the educationally handicapped should be handled by community colleges. Remedial programs for students of ability who have not completed preparation requirements should be handled by appropriate departments of the University. High school graduates who might have enrolled in the General College because they did not qualify for admission to other colleges of the University could attend community colleges or state universities and perhaps later transfer to the University.

Seek agreements on transfer of credits

The Board of Regents should take the initiative to seek agreements with the other systems of post-secondary education in the state on transfer of credits to the University. Students who are deterred from applying to the University for the first years of post-secondary education are entitled to know before they take certain courses whether their credits will transfer.

Make preparation requirements apply to incoming freshmen

The University should not delay imposing newly-adopted preparation requirements until students apply for upper division (junior and senior level courses). Instead the requirements should be applied to incoming freshmen. The requirements now provide that effective in September 1991 students will not be admitted to upper division degree-granting curricular areas unless they have previously completed certain high school level courses: four years of English, three years of math, three years of science, two years of social studies, and two years of foreign language. However, those students who, because of special circumstances, might not comply technically could be declared "qualified" upon special application.

From those who qualify, the University would select students for admission in numbers consistent with its enrollment limits.

Advance deadlines for applications, tuition refunds

To encourage students to be less casual about enrolling in the University, the deadline for applications should be advanced considerably earlier than July 15 and no tuition refund should be provided later than after the second week of classes.

The fact that the University is a land grant institution created under the Morrill Act of 1862 is not a bar to the Commitment to Focus effort. The land grant concept was intended to democratize education; at the time the University stood alone as a public post-secondary educational institution in Minnesota. Now democratization of post-secondary education is a reality involving the University, state universities, community colleges, area-vocational-technical schools and, because of student aid programs, private institutions as well.

Examine all higher education

The University's examination of its role and performance gives an immediate incentive for the Legislature to look at all post-secondary education in Minnesota. Indeed, Commitment to Focus must be examined in the context of the state's entire system of post-secondary education, of the state's level of spending on education and of its tax resources.

As previously recommended by the Citizens League, the Legislature should in 1987 remove Minnesota's vocational-technical schools from the jurisdiction of local school districts and make them state institutions. It also should make possible the ultimate unification of vocational schools and community colleges.

The Legislature should direct the State Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to prepare a proposal for the 1989 session that would bring more order to the entire post-secondary education scene. To aid HECB and the Legislature in this effort, the State University System, the State Community College System and the State Board for Vocational Technical Education should prepare their own plans for focusing their activities.

The Legislature should repeal a state statute that allows schools in the State University System to offer doctorate degrees. None of the state universities currently has a doctorate program. Now is the time to make sure none does in the future.

Look skeptically at need for another four-year school

As part of its charge to the HECB, the Legislature should ask it to determine whether another four-year college is needed in the Twin Cities metropolitan area to accommodate those students who do not gain admission to the University or who seek a different educational experience.

With a 20,000-student decline in post-secondary public institutions projected for the next 10 years, the idea of adding capacity must be carefully examined, particularly in light of the possibility that the post-secondary system is already too large.

Impose conditions on approval of additional dollars

Funds for Commitment to Focus should be given by the Legislature if the Board of Regents guarantees that: (1) undergraduate enrollment will be cut by 8,000 students by 1995; (2) more dollars will be devoted to undergraduate education as well as graduate education; (3) marginal curricular areas will be cut; (4) application and tuition policies will discourage casual applicants, and (5) Commitment to Focus will be implemented as proposed.

The Legislature need not abandon the current system of average cost funding for post-secondary education to implement the Focus program. The Legislature should provide special appropriations beyond average cost funding for the higher cost of professional schools at the University rather than continue the current system under which, in effect, students in lower-cost programs help subsidize students in higher-cost programs.

More spending justified

Minnesota can be proud that it stands first among the states in voluntary support of its public universities. So far the private sector and the Legislature have been willing to provide dollars without suspicions that the contributions by one will reduce contributions by the other. Commitment to Focus cannot succeed without private contributions as well as state appropriations.

But the University has received a proportionately smaller share of post-secondary education appropriations than is true of flagship institutions in other states with which the University competes.

Additional state spending on Commitment to Focus is justified. The University is among the most important factors in the state's economic and social achievements. Although education is one of the reasons Minnesota is a high-tax state, education also contributes immeasurably to the state's high quality of life.

BACKGROUND

I. Commitment to Focus--Commitment to Focus (CTF) is the name given to a plan to upgrade the quality of education at the University of Minnesota that was proposed by University President Kenneth H. Keller and approved in principle by the Board of Regents.

CTF has been modified since originally presented, although the main message of CTF remains unchanged: the University cannot improve its quality without narrowing its focus, in terms of what is taught and who is educated.

II. The goal--Explicitly, CTF is designed to make the U one of the top five public universities in the nation. Implicitly, CTF is designed to breathe new life into the institution, arrest decline in quality before it becomes more visible, and restore academic excellence to a preeminent position.

III. Principal components of CTF--CTF first was outlined in writing by Keller in early 1985.¹ Since then the plan has been elaborated upon and modified through statements by Keller and actions by the Regents. Although no single document was available in mid-1986 to describe CTF, University officials agreed that five components are central:

A. Reduce enrollment--Undergraduate enrollment on the Twin Cities campus would decrease by about 25 percent, or 8,000 students, by 1995; graduate enrollment would be held constant. The result would be that the ratio of undergraduates to graduates would drop from about 4:1 to about 3:1.

B. Give special emphasis to some programs and phase out others--A major effort would be undertaken to upgrade the quality of the faculty in selected programs that have potential--with some assistance--to be ranked among the best in the nation. More dollars would be invested in these programs to recruit outstanding faculty throughout the nation, to promote faculty development, and to encourage less productive faculty members to retire or transfer.

C. Increase preparation requirements--Students would be encouraged to come to the University better prepared. This component of CTF, already adopted by the Board of Regents, provides that, as of 1991, students will not be admitted to upper-division degree-granting programs unless they have completed these courses in high school or later: four years of English, three years of math, three years of science, two years of social studies, and two years of foreign language.

D. Increased, and complementary, focus on the part of the other post-secondary systems--These systems would establish clear, non-duplicative missions, with mutual cooperation (not individual system interest) in mind, expanding in areas where the University cuts back and cutting back in areas in which the University is focusing. One part of this mutual cooperation would mean that community colleges and state universities would assure access to post-secondary education for those students whose high school performance does not qualify them to enter the University of Minnesota, at least immediately.

E. Obtain additional dollars from the State Legislature--The University is seeking a significant increase in its level of funding from the Legislature.

IV. Origins of CTF--CTF originated with a three-phase planning process that began in April 1979 under former President C. Peter Magrath. In the first phase, all units of the University submitted comprehensive plans, including their missions, goals, and objectives for the 1980s. In the second phase, which began in 1981, six University task forces were formed to propose specific strategies to carry out goals and objectives.

One task force, chaired by David Lilly, then dean of the School of Management, recommended higher admissions standards, more emphasis upon recruitment of mature, qualified students, and other steps to "raise substantially" academic quality.²

Much of the emphasis on improvement in graduate education comes from a task force headed by Robert T. Holt, dean of the graduate school, which said that graduate education needs to improve if the U is to compete successfully with other graduate schools.³

The third phase, which began in the summer of 1984, was designed to identify a few high-priority items for action.

In June 1984 Magrath foreshadowed Keller's CTF proposal of some eight months later by recommending that the University undertake improvements with a goal of doubling the number of its graduate programs that are ranked among the highest in reputation in the nation.⁴

In November 1984 Governor Rudy Perpich encouraged the Regents to undertake a "thorough evaluation of the University's mission. I do not believe that the University can continue to attempt to be 'all things to all people,'" Perpich wrote in a letter to the Board of Regents.⁵

It fell to Keller to assemble the central ideas for improvement and give them a name, "Commitment to Focus." Keller, while serving as interim president, presented his proposal to the Board of Regents on February 8, 1985.⁶ He was named president one month later. The ultimate selection of Keller, while not a formal endorsement of CTF, indicated that the Board of Regents looked favorably upon Keller's initiative.

V. Development of major fund-raising effort--Almost simultaneously with the announcement of Commitment to Focus, the University obtained approval of a bill in the Legislature to change the restrictions on the Permanent University Fund so that the fund can be used to help endow professorial chairs. The University then moved to supplement the dollars in the Permanent University Fund with a private fund-raising effort. A goal of \$300 million over three years was set. The campaign was announced to the public in March 1986.

The actual amount of new money to be raised is about \$115 million. Normally, the U raises from the private sector about \$40 million annually, or \$120 million over three years (the life of the campaign.) In addition, the state would supply about \$65 million in matching funds through the Permanent University Fund. Thus the new dollars being sought from the private sector (above this \$185 million) total about \$115 million.

Of the \$300 million, \$130 million would endow 100 chairs. Endowment of chairs provides permanent financial support for highly regarded professors.

VI. Developments since CTF was proposed--As recommended by CTF, the Board of Regents has eliminated two-year degree programs at all colleges except Crookston and Waseca, and has eliminated two-year and certificate programs at the General College. The Board also has adopted preparation requirements that will go into effect the fall of 1991. These requirements will not be imposed upon entry to the University, but will be used to determine whether a student is qualified to take upper-division courses. It is still unclear whether applicants who have completed the course preparation requirements before entering as freshmen will be granted preferential admission over applicants who have not completed them.

The 1985 Legislature appropriated approximately \$30 million for the 1985-87 biennium specifically for CTF. Subsequently, this amount was cut back to about \$11 million because of state budget constraints.

Most major elements of CTF remain to be implemented. They include (a) reducing undergraduate enrollment, (b) reducing the number of educational programs, (c) specifying exactly how preparation requirements will be imposed, (d) obtaining cooperation from other institutions, and (e) obtaining funding from the Legislature. As of July 1986, specific proposals had not yet been developed, other than a preliminary budget proposal for the next biennium, to be submitted to the 1987 Legislature.

University officials were speculating in mid-1986 that CTF, even as a proposal, might be showing results already. As of August 22, 1986, freshman applications for fall admission to the College of Liberal Arts were up by 25 percent over the previous year and up by nine percent for the entire University.⁷ The officials said that a possible explanation for the increase in applications--at a time when the actual number of high school graduates is declining--is that applicants view CTF as evidence of a new emphasis on quality at the University.

Whether the growth in applications is mirrored in other systems could not be determined immediately. An official of the State University System reported that applications to the state universities were up between 8 percent and 25 percent over the previous year. Some community colleges in the metropolitan area reported applications running at least about the same as last year, if not higher.⁸

(For more detail on CTF developments see appendix.)

THE STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY TODAY

I. Findings--CTF applies to all University of Minnesota campuses in the state. The Citizens League analysis will be concentrated on those dimensions of CTF that apply to the Twin Cities campus.

This section includes several comparisons between the University and other institutions. In some cases we refer to a group of seven institutions that the Citizens League singled out for special comparison with the University. The seven competitors are (a) the highest-ranking public institution in the nation: the University of California at Berkeley; (b) a university in a metropolitan area with demographics similar to that of the Twin Cities area: the University of Washington at Seattle; (c) three recognized Big Ten competitors: the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, and (d) two public institutions that have been rising in reputation: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the University of Texas at Austin.

A. The University ranks below close competitors in academic reputation--In terms of national reputation of its graduate faculty in 32 curricular areas, the Twin Cities campus of the University--while above average among all institutions--ranks below such competitors as Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, and the University of California at Berkeley, above Washington and North Carolina and equal with Texas.

This ranking is based on a survey conducted in 1981 by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils of the opinions of graduate faculty across the nation.⁹

The University placed 16th in the ranking that included both public and private institutions.

University of Minnesota officials contend this survey of graduate faculty is the most reliable of all efforts to compare quality among institutions.¹⁰

In the survey, 11 University curricular areas ranked among the top 15 percent in the nation: chemical engineering, geography, mechanical engineering, economics, psychology, mathematics, political science, chemistry, statistics, microbiology and sociology. Of the 11, chemical engineering and geography at the University ranked first in the nation.

Seven University curricular areas barely missed placement in the top category and are highlighted by CTF for special treatment: physics, history, biochemistry, Spanish and Portuguese, physiology, electrical engineering, and philosophy. Lower-ranking but still above average were: zoology, botany, English, German, computer science and civil engineering.

Ranking below average were cellular/molecular biology, music, French, art history, anthropology and the classics.

If 26 University curricular areas rather than 11 were ranked among the top 15 percent, then the University would be second only to the University of California at Berkeley.

The Conference Board survey covers 32 of 174 curricular areas at the University. Other sources place some University curricular areas, unlisted in the Conference Board survey, among the top in the nation. For example, agricultural economics at the University ranked second in the nation behind the University of California at Davis in a 1981 survey.¹¹

The School of Management's MBA program at the University ranked among the top 20 national MBA programs in a survey of executives of 134 national companies.¹² Another ranking placed the School of Management in the top ten of undergraduate business programs.¹³

B. The University ranks comparatively high in a New York Times guide but is missing from a list of "Public Ivys"--The Twin Cities campus of the University received a four star academic ranking, out of a possible five, in the New York Times' 1984-85 guide to colleges.¹⁴

The guide considers institutions' ranking in the academic world, the quality of the faculty, the level of teaching and research, the academic ability of students, the quality of libraries and other facilities, and the level of academic seriousness among students and faculty members.

A four-star ranking means the institution "has some particularly distinguishing academic feature, such as an especially rich course offerings or an especially serious academic atmosphere."

But in the book The Public Ivys, by Richard Moll, dean of admissions at the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Minnesota was not included among his selection of the eight best public institutions in the nation, nor among nine runners-up.¹⁵ Moll used the following criteria in developing his list:

- Admissions selectivity
- A quality undergraduate experience and importance accorded the liberal arts
- Money, from whatever source, to assemble personal, academic, and physical strength--and the resourcefulness to manage funds wisely
- The prestige, the mythology, and the visibility that enhance the place and the name.

C. Competitors have lower undergraduate-graduate ratios than does the University--The ratio of undergraduate enrollment to graduate enrollment is not an end in itself, but is a general indication of how the University measures up against other major research universities. The undergraduate-graduate ratio at the Twin Cities campus of the University is better--i.e., lower--than the average of research universities nationally but not as good as California, Michigan, North Carolina, and Wisconsin.¹⁶

D. Part-time students at the University have low graduation rates--The percentage of students at the Twin Cities campus of the University who ultimately graduate is the lowest in the Big Ten, according to a University report.¹⁷

The report found a close correlation in all institutions between graduation rates and percentage of full-time students. (A full-time student is taking 12 or more credit-hours.) It illustrated that about four out of five full-time students of a 1977 group at the University graduated, while about three out of four part-time students did not graduate. Minnesota has the lowest percentage of full-time undergraduates in the Big Ten.

The study showed that, of freshmen who entered the University in the fall of 1977, 16.9 percent graduated after four years. By five years the percentage was 36.5 percent and after six years, 44.2 percent.

By comparison, the rate was 26.7 percent after four years, 43.9 percent after five years, and 48.5 percent after six years at Ohio State; 30.7 percent, 50.6 percent, and 55.7 percent, Iowa; 33.7 percent, 56.2 percent, and 61.0 percent, Michigan State; 48.9 percent; 66.3 percent, and 69.9 percent, Michigan; 45.9 percent, 65.1 percent, and 70.1 percent, Illinois; 60.8 percent (after six years), Wisconsin; and 80.0 percent (after six years), Northwestern. Data were not reported for Indiana.

"Graduation rates at Minnesota derive from being a major land-grant university in the midst of a large city," the report said. "Compared to other large universities, it attracts students who are more likely to center their lives in spheres outside the University--in work and off-campus homes. In turn these students are likely to attend part time, and less likely to graduate in the traditional time period.

"Those University students who are able to commit themselves to the traditional full time attendance pattern do well--as well or better than students at schools where full time attendance is the norm. To improve its retention rates, Minnesota would need either to change the types of students it attracts or find ways to increase the commitment of its current students to full-time education."

The University also experiences low graduation rates for its athletes, according to a 1986 report from the Big Ten conference.¹⁸

E. The University ranks lower in attracting top freshmen--The above-mentioned report from University Student Support Services revealed that the Twin Cities campus of the University ranks sixth in the Big Ten in the percentage of freshmen in the top ten percent of their high school graduating classes, and seventh in the mean freshman high-school rank, excluding freshmen in the General College.

F. The University ranks about average in overall revenues per student but below average in the portion from state government--Revenues per student at the Twin Cities campus of the University--including state appropriations and student tuition but excluding government grants and contracts--were \$8,525 in fiscal year 1981-82, which was 99 percent of the average for all public research universities with medical schools in the nation.¹⁹

At the same time, however, the University was at 87 percent of the national average in state appropriations per student, which placed it 17th among the 28 states with comparable institutions. Minnesota was at 88 percent of the national average in tuition, but 184 percent of the national average in private gifts, grants, and endowment income per full-time student.

G. The University as "flagship" institution receives less special attention than its counterparts--Even though Minnesota was at 87 percent of the national average in appropriations to the Twin Cities campus of the University, overall the state spent about 121 percent of the national average on all of higher education.²⁰

What this means is that the Minnesota Legislature distributes its appropriations for higher education more evenly among all institutions, thereby giving less attention to its flagship university than is the case in most other states with research universities. Minnesota, 20th in population in the nation, ranks 11th in the number of public post-secondary institutions.²¹

H. The University is below average among competitors in professors' salaries--In comparison with seven close competitors, the Twin Cities campus of the University ranks below average in 15 of 24 curricular areas in salaries for full professors on nine-month contracts and below average in 11 of 20 areas for assistant professors for the 1985-86 school year.

The curricular areas were selected by the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE), a voluntary association of major research universities in the nation.²²

In a comparison with all 24 research universities in the study, not just seven close competitors, the University ranks above average in 15 of 24 curricular areas in salaries for full professors on nine-month contracts and above average in 15 of 20 curricular areas for assistant professors.

I. Universities across the nation are engaged in special efforts to improve quality--As of March 1986 at least 13 states were conducting special studies or had established blue-ribbon commissions on higher education. Another eight states had completed such studies in 1985 and early 1986.²³

The University of Wisconsin at Madison--long regarded as a major competitor of the University of Minnesota--recently announced it will reduce undergraduate enrollment from 31,000 to 29,000 over five years and hold enrollment at that level. Without capping enrollment, Wisconsin officials believe the number could grow to 38,000 by the year 2000.²⁴

The possibility of major restructuring of post-secondary education in California is being explored by an independent commission set up by the California Legislature. Part of the controversy in California is the future of a master plan for higher education that gives preference to the University of California over other public institutions in the state.²⁵

The University of Iowa has started a new program called Iowa Fellows, designed to bring 20 first-class Ph.D. students to the university every year, with fellowships that "are competitive with every Big Ten university and virtually every university in the country."²⁶

J. High-ability students give mixed reactions to the University--Some 451 applicants who graduated in the top 10 percent of their high school classes were surveyed by the University of Minnesota in late 1983. Of the 148 applicants who chose the University, 33.6 percent rated the U's academic quality below that of the institutions they would have attended had they not enrolled at the U; 30.8 percent rated the U the same, and 35.5 percent rated the U above the institutions they would have attended.

Of the 301 applicants surveyed who chose other schools, 54.9 percent rated the University's academic quality below that of the schools they picked; 22.0 percent rated the U the same, and 23.1 percent rated the U higher.²⁷

The report's authors said the survey provided evidence that financial aid is a factor in applicants' choosing schools other than the University. Of the applicants who chose other schools, 59.1 percent said the cost of tuition, room, and board at the University was more favorable. However, when total cost including financial aid was considered, the percentage who said the University was more favorable dropped to 43.3 percent.

In another survey, of 656 close-to-graduating University students who had been in the top 10 percent of their high school classes, 23.0 percent said they "definitely" would recommend that other high-ability students enroll at the U; 62.6 percent said they "probably" would make such a recommendation.

Some 26.6 percent in the same survey were "very satisfied" with their overall experience at the U; 43.1 percent were "moderately satisfied"; 13.6 percent, "slightly satisfied"; 8.1 percent, "slightly dissatisfied"; 5.5 percent, "moderately dissatisfied," and 3.1 percent, "very dissatisfied".²⁸

K. Minnesotans have been generally favorably impressed with the University--In the latest (1977) statewide public opinion poll of the University, 80 percent of the respondents said they had a favorable impression of the University; 10 percent had an unfavorable impression, and 10 percent had no opinion.²⁹ The highest rating of the University occurred in a Minnesota Poll survey taken in 1964 when 85 percent had favorable impressions; the lowest was in 1972, 67 percent favorable.

L. The University has played a central role in significant developments affecting the state's economy--Taconite processing, which gave new life to the Iron Range in the 1960s and 1970s, was developed at the University. Another example: the emergence of the Twin Cities area as a center for growth in technology and medicine would not likely have occurred without the presence of the University. It has served as a source and incubator of technological improvements and business ventures.

Graduate students who come from outside Minnesota often find employment here when they graduate. Such a pool of talent enriches a region's economy. An economic resurgence in Massachusetts recently is largely attributed to its pool of bright young people who have come to the state for their education.³⁰

The University is the only Big Ten institution that is located in an urban area that is both (1) the biggest population center in the state, and (2) the location of the state capital.

II. Conclusions

A. The University is strong, but it can't be complacent--The University, while not the best in the nation, certainly is among the better. However, it cannot afford to stand still, for it likely would lose ground because other institutions with which it is in national competition are working toward improvement.

No single comparison listed above is, by itself, of overriding concern. But the message in total is inescapable: the University is in a precarious position. Too many of its characteristics make it vulnerable to a possible decline in quality. Has such a decline occurred already? It is difficult to say. But the University ought not risk making plans on the assumption that no problem exists.

B. The University is important to the quality of life in Minnesota--It is impossible to imagine that any list of factors contributing to the quality of life in Minnesota and the Twin Cities area would not feature the University. Some persons might argue whether the University is the most important ingredient, but no one is likely to dispute that it is among the most important.

C. The University needs to improve itself even if it can't change its national ranking--Whether Minnesota is able to improve its ranking ought not be a basis for supporting any program of improvement. It is admirable that the University is seeking to improve its standing nationally. It ought to work very hard to be among the top institutions. But legislators, citizens, and the University should not be too surprised if a change in ranking is extremely difficult to realize, because other institutions are working to improve themselves as well. Nevertheless, a goal of trying to move up in the rankings is clearly worth pursuing.

THE "PRICE" OF CTF FOR THE UNIVERSITY

I. Findings--CTF proposes that the University preserve its longstanding tradition as the pre-eminent post-secondary institution in Minnesota, continuing (a) to teach large numbers of undergraduates, (b) to maintain strong graduate and professional schools, (c) to emphasize research, and (d) to provide public service.

CTF proposes that the University concentrate at this time on improving undergraduate and graduate education and on research.

Historically, the University has sought to serve as many students as possible, if they ranked in the upper half of their high school graduating classes and attained certain scores on entrance exams, and to offer almost any program that students might want to take. The U also has provided, through the General College, a place for students who do not qualify to enter its regular colleges. But CTF calls for a significant reduction in enrollment and in number of curricular areas.

A. The Twin Cities campus of the University is the largest public post-secondary campus in the nation--With a total enrollment of 64,179 students, of which 37,634 were fulltime and 26,545 parttime, the Twin Cities campus of the University was the largest public campus of higher education in the nation in 1983.³¹

Its total enrollment was more than 10,000 students higher than the next largest institution, Ohio State University. Two institutions had more full-time students than the University: Ohio State, 43,441, and the University of Texas at Austin, 41,438. Ohio State's part-time enrollment was 10,316, and Texas', 6,193.

B. The extent of the recommended drop in enrollment is not clear--Officially the University has not set a specific goal for enrollment reduction. In the fall of 1985, the U had 32,501 undergraduates and 8,346 graduate students on the Twin Cities campus. That produces a ratio of about 3.9 to 1. Keller has proposed that the ratio become about 3 to 1. He is recommending that graduate enrollment remain basically stable, meaning that a decrease in undergraduate enrollment is necessary. In the fall of 1985, a 3:1 ratio could have been realized with 7,463 fewer undergraduate students, assuming no change in graduate enrollment.

The closest to an official target for decreasing enrollment is a recommendation by the University's Coordinating Committee for Commitment to Focus, the group that is overseeing implementation of CTF for Keller, that undergraduate enrollment be cut by 25 percent by 1995.³² If that proposal is carried out, undergraduate enrollment would drop by 8,125 students by 1995.

The Institute of Technology's enrollment is not projected to drop. Its enrollment is to be capped at or near its present level. The Institute currently limits enrollments by setting high academic standards.

The University's office of Management Planning and Information Services in July 1986 reported its first enrollment projections reflecting CTF.³³ These projections indicate a drop in

enrollment on the Twin Cities campus of 5,867 students from 1985 to 1991. Of that drop, 3,361 would occur without CTF, and another 2,236 as a result of CTF. The projections do not extend beyond 1991. Although the projections represent an expectation of what might happen, they do not represent any policy decision to impose a cap on enrollment.

Even without CTF, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) is projecting that undergraduate enrollment at the Twin Cities campus will drop by slightly more than 6,000 students by the fall of 1995, because the number of Minnesota high school graduates will decline absolutely.³⁴ The goal of CTF would be reached by a reduction of 2,000 more, for a total of 8,000.

C. Enrollment reduction seen as key to quality--University officials say they cannot provide quality education in coming years without consciously focusing their resources. They contend a drop in undergraduate enrollment will improve both graduate and undergraduate education. Students unable to attend the University of Minnesota because of enrollment reductions will have ample opportunity to attend other post-secondary institutions in the state, the University contends.

The Coordinating Committee for Commitment to Focus contends that a reduction in the size of the undergraduate student body is "the fundamental characteristic which we feel drives the quality of education on the Twin Cities campus."³⁵

D. The University is unsurpassed in number of disciplinary departments--No institution in the nation is known to have more disciplinary departments than the 174 at the University.³⁶

E. Changing the role of the General College--The General College has been the only college of the University that would accept any high school graduate, regardless of class standing or test score. It limits its enrollment to 3,300 students, on a first-come, first-served basis. In one of its first actions implementing CTF, the Board of Regents abolished associate and bachelor's degrees by the General College after September 1991.

The General College, however, would stay in existence. Students could enroll in General College and take courses intended to qualify them for a regular college of the University.

The General College performs three significant functions for Minnesota post-secondary education, according to its leaders.³⁷ It:

1. Serves the education needs of adults who are functioning substantially below their potential. These students fall in two categories: (1) about 600 of them cannot read beyond the 5th grade level and also cannot perform straightforward math functions like adding and subtracting and (2) another 300-400 are at the 8th to 10th grade level.

2. Equips the learning disabled and the physically disabled to participate in post-secondary education.

3. Conducts research on teaching the educationally disadvantaged, the learning disabled and the physically disabled.

General College officials say they seek to prepare disadvantaged and disabled students for acceptance by AVTIs, community colleges, state universities and the University of Minnesota.

Many General College students are Southeast Asian refugees who need to become literate in English before they can further their post-secondary education. Many others are racial minorities born in the United States.

F. CTF does not spell out a specific strategy for discontinuing marginal curricular areas--CTF emphasizes the improvement of certain programs to place the University among the best public institutions in the nation. The strategy for carrying out this emphasis includes such steps as special recruitment of outstanding graduate students and graduate faculty and encouraging less-productive faculty to seek jobs elsewhere.

CTF is silent, however, on how to discontinue programs that are not a significant contribution to the University's mission. The original CTF document discusses general criteria for identifying high-priority programs but does not spell out how low-priority programs would be identified or how they would be discontinued.

G. Concern and disagreement are present over improvements to undergraduate education--Upgrading the quality of undergraduate education--albeit for fewer students--is a major part of CTF. A reduction in enrollment is seen as an essential component of devoting more resources per student. Nevertheless, many persons inside and outside the University are concerned that interest in undergraduate education will diminish as the proportion of undergraduates declines. They fear the University will give more attention to research and graduate education.

The University has had a good deal of internal debate regarding the quality of undergraduate education. The Coordinating Committee for Commitment to Focus outlined several strategies, in addition to reducing enrollment, to improve undergraduate education, including:

- forming lower division curricular tracks, and
- insuring that adequate incentives and resources are available to departments and faculty to devote attention to undergrads.³⁸

A second Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education made several recommendations including:

- promoting "active" teaching and learning, and
- giving a high-ranking administrator responsibility for protecting and enhancing undergraduate education.³⁹

A third Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning made more than 30 pages of recommendations to improve undergraduate education. Some of these suggestions included:

- merit pay for excellence in undergraduate teaching,
- rewards for departments which excel in undergraduate education, and
- establishing appropriate faculty/student ratios for each department.⁴⁰

In addition other proposals have been made to help undergraduates feel more a part of the University, by making it easier for them to cope with complexities of a large institution.

H. The question of whether CTF is consistent with the University's role as a land grant institution is a source of controversy--Some critics state that limiting enrollment is inconsistent with the University's designation as a land grant institution under the Morrill Act of 1862.⁴¹

The Morrill Act provided for a permanent source of revenue in each state for the "endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college..." The revenue came from interest on money derived from the sale of certain public land in each state.

The main purposes of the Act were to be: "without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislature of the States may respectively prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life..."

Land grant money did not go only to public institutions. That choice was left to the state. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, neither a university nor a public institution, received money.⁴²

The University of Minnesota still receives a small amount of money--\$50,000 in 1985, about .0048 percent of its budget--from the original land grant legislation. The money is used to pay for some teaching positions in mechanical arts and agriculture.

Some persons claim that another fund, called the Bankhead/Jones fund, also is part of the original land grant appropriation. The University received about \$905,000 from this fund in 1985. Even if this amount were included, the total would be less than one-tenth of one percent of the University's annual budget.⁴³

I. Time that ranked faculty spend with undergraduates appears stable from year to year--During the 1984-85 school year, the average number of contact hours with students in the classroom per ranked faculty member was 6 hours and 6 minutes per week.⁴⁴

Another source of information indicates that the amount of direct instructional time by ranked faculty is fairly stable over time. In 1980-81, for example, an average load for a ranked faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts was seven instructional credit hours per quarter. That figure did not change in the next four years.⁴⁵

J. Continuing Education and Extension (CEE) will not change under CTF--CEE enables individuals to take University courses without being admitted to a college of the University. Most CEE courses are offered at night. CEE is financed by tuition that it charges. CEE sometimes helps relieve overload in regular colleges by offering courses when regular sections become filled.

The original CTF document proposed a more limited role for CEE than it now performs. University officials have since concluded that CEE complements rather than conflicts with CTF objectives. They now are suggesting that CEE continue largely in its present role.

Some 38,500 persons were enrolled in CEE courses in 1985-86. About 95 percent of them took courses that offered University credit. About 60 percent of credit hours taught by CEE were for upper division and graduate courses. The other 40 percent were for lower division courses. Approximately one-half of the individuals in CEE state they are pursuing a degree. About one-fifth also are enrolled in the day school.⁴⁶

II. Conclusions

A. Reduction in enrollment is central to success of CTF--The University has spread itself too thinly. As a consequence, too much importance has been attached by individuals to attendance at the University rather than other institutions in the state.
Reduction in enrollment would:

--allow the University to concentrate on quality and to focus on a more limited number of curricular areas.

--assure much closer attention to the needs of the undergraduates.

--attract higher-quality faculty members and graduate students.

--indicate that the University senses its partnership with other post-secondary education systems in Minnesota. The other systems would not be ignored as the University seeks CTF dollars from the Legislature. By agreeing to cut undergraduate enrollment--except in the Institute of Technology, which would be held constant--and discontinue programs that others can do as well or better, the University would encourage other systems to focus on their strengths.

It would have been unrealistic for the University to have proposed CTF 30 years ago. Then Minnesota had a much different system of post-secondary education. At that time the only public alternatives to the University were five state colleges and a few junior colleges operated by local school districts.

Other systems of post-secondary education generally support CTF. They see the benefits, such as higher enrollments, that they will receive. It is not likely such support would be present if the University were seeking to increase appropriations and maintain its current level of enrollment.

B. Enrollment reduction will be difficult to achieve--CTF might produce many more applicants to the University than it would have received otherwise, on the expectation of improved quality. As noted earlier, University officials are speculating that an unexpected increase in applications for admission in the summer of 1986 is partly a result of public support for improved quality, even before CTF changes are implemented.

Moreover, opposition to decreasing enrollment exists within the University itself. For example, lack of enthusiasm for the idea is evident in a report of the special committee on undergraduate education which, despite comments from the coordinating committee about the importance of a decrease in enrollment, did not even see fit to comment on the possibility.⁴⁷ Some regents also oppose reduction in enrollment.⁴⁸

Recent action by the Board of Regents to delay imposition of preparation requirements until students enroll in upper division courses could produce more applicants to the U than if the requirements were effective upon initial admission.

C. Retention of General College is inconsistent with the mission of the University--The General College is not needed to assure that Minnesotans have access to post-secondary education. The state has ample numbers of institutions that will admit any high school graduate, regardless of class standing. As long as the General College remains within the University, it is doubtful that its functions will be rightfully acknowledged, given the fact that the University's programs in general are geared to a substantially higher-performing group of people. The average high school graduating rank for incoming freshmen, fall of 1985, in the General College was at the 30th percentile (30.9 percent), compared to 73.7 percent for the College of Liberal Arts and 87.8 percent in the Institute of Technology.⁴⁹

Remedial training for students who cannot read beyond the fifth- or sixth-grade level obviously needs to be provided, somewhere, if these individuals are to participate in post-secondary education. It is appropriate that such education be offered in secondary schools or by an institution more identified with remedial education, not one that is increasing its preparation requirements and narrowing its focus.

Some General College remedial programs are offered to students of ability who have not obtained the necessary requirements. A General College is not necessary for that function. It can be handled by individual colleges to which the students apply.

D. CTF is deficient in failing to address the problem of marginal curricular areas--State resources are limited. We applaud the University's effort to concentrate improvement in some of its curricular areas. A natural corollary of that effort, however, must be that curricular areas that are not essential to the University's focused mission, that fail to live up to the University's standards, or that can be handled better by others should be discontinued rather than allowed to drain valuable resources from other curricular areas. The words "Commitment to Focus" should mean just that.

We cannot expect that the University would publicly name curricular areas earmarked for phase-out. Yet it is surprising that no mention is made even of a possible procedure that might be followed.

Some curricular areas, such as English composition, provide services to other majors, and obviously would be continued even if degrees are not offered.

E. Personal attention must be given to undergraduate and graduate education--The University has no shortage of proposals for improving undergraduate education. Several groups within the University have outlined specific strategies that might be followed. While we have not examined these proposals in detail, we are encouraged by the depth of concern that is present. The University would do well to consider seriously its own internal proposals.

CTF represents an opportunity to improve both graduate and undergraduate education.

Much of the emphasis of CTF involves strengthening the graduate school. The University's own objective, to be one of the top five public institutions in the nation, is related to the reputation of its graduate faculty. Reduction in undergraduate enrollment means, automatically, that the graduate school will make up a larger percentage of total enrollment in coming years.

We support the University's efforts at improving its graduate school. That step is essential if Minnesota is to attract the most talented faculty and graduate students around the nation. Many graduate students decide to take jobs here after graduation, which helps support the overall quality of life and economy of the metropolitan area and state.

F. Land grant question poses no problems for CTF today--The land grant concept represented a national commitment by Congress to the democratization of education. It was applied to the University of Minnesota, which then stood by itself in public post-secondary education in the state. Democratization of post-secondary

education now is a reality--involving the University, state universities, community colleges, area vocational-technical schools and, because of student aid, private institutions, too. The University by itself has no obligation growing out of its century-old designation as a land grant institution to set aside CTF and admit everyone for whatever purpose.

G. Minority students will benefit from CTF--In the spring of 1985, shortly after CTF was announced, some minority leaders said they were deeply concerned that many talented black students are not enrolling at the University. For example, none of the talented students honored by the Urban League in 1985 chose to attend the University, said Wenda Moore, member of the Board of Regents.⁵⁰ A university that clearly identifies itself with quality will attract and serve top students of whatever ethnic group.

Another concern is that CTF might reduce post-secondary opportunities for minorities. Minority enrollment at the University is highest among freshmen, 10 percent, and lowest among seniors, 6 percent.⁵¹ A change in the role of the General College, with a minority enrollment of 20.6 percent in 1985, means that more minority students who now find the General College suitable to their needs will be seeking education in other institutions.

CTF will affect all students, minority and majority. The key question that needs to be answered is whether the programs make sense for all students. Undoubtedly making it more difficult to attend the University will pose a particular challenge for some students who have not been well prepared. But no student--of whatever ethnic group--will benefit if the same standards are not applied equally to everyone.

A special committee at the University to review the impact of CTF on access by minorities was approximately one-third through its work as of June 1986.

H. Preserve Continuing Education and Extension (CEE)--We support CEE as a service to students seeking education that reflects the University's academic competencies. Curricular areas that receive special emphasis in the regular colleges of the University can be a legitimate part of CEE. Conversely, courses that might be discontinued in regular colleges should not be offered by CEE. Contrary to impressions that some persons have, CEE provides mainly university-level training. In addition it provides a way for the University to be responsive, quickly, to perceived needs of the general public, without interfering with the University's mission. Because it is in a position to add courses on demand, CEE has become a primary instrument of administrative flexibility, enabling all University departments to respond to unanticipated changes in enrollment.

III. Recommendations

A. Reduce and limit headcount undergraduate enrollment at the Twin Cities campus--We recommend that the Board of Regents act now to set specific annual enrollment limits that would reduce headcount undergraduate enrollment on the Twin Cities campus over the next 10 years by at least 8,000 students, keeping the Institute of Technology enrollment constant.

To help community colleges, state universities, and other institutions, as well as the U itself, in their own planning, we recommend that the Board of Regents establish a ceiling on headcount undergraduate enrollment on the Twin Cities campus of not more than 25,000, which is approximately 8,000 students fewer than were enrolled in the fall of 1985. We recommend that the Regents set interim enrollment ceilings for each year between now and the date when the 25,000 figure would be reached, which should not be later than the fall of 1995.

B. Reduce number of University curricular areas--To assure that University resources aren't spread too thinly and to make it possible for departments to excel, the number of curricular areas at the University should be reduced.

The University faculty should propose, and the Regents should adopt, a long-term goal for the number of curricular areas that the University should have.

When a goal has been established, the Regents, on recommendation of the faculty, should identify criteria to determine whether a curricular area should remain in existence. (CTF recommends that each area should (a) include research at the leading edge of knowledge, stimulated by the needs of society, with (b) results of research transmitted to society through active teaching programs, outreach, service, and technological transfer.)

Some criteria should be objective, such as evidence that a curricular area that includes graduate study is attracting a significant percentage of students who ultimately receive graduate degrees.

C. Give departments a chance to excel--To assure that individual University departments are given incentives to improve themselves, a significant amount of new dollars appropriated for CTF should be distributed based upon proposals from the departments. This means that key decisions about upgrading quality would originate at the grass roots level of the University.

Departments that receive more funding have an obligation to support the University in other controversial actions that must occur under CTF, such as the de-emphasis or phase out of marginal departments.

D. Transfer the functions of General College elsewhere--The functions of the General College should be distributed elsewhere so that the General College no longer would be a unit of the University.

--Remedial programs for the educationally handicapped could be handled by community colleges or high schools.

--Remedial programs for students of ability who have not completed preparation requirements should be handled by appropriate departments of the University.

--High school graduates who otherwise might have enrolled in the General College because they do not qualify for admission to regular colleges of the the University could attend community colleges or state universities and, possibly, transfer to the University later.

--Research on ways to improve teaching of the educationally handicapped should be handled by appropriate departments of the University in cooperation with the institutions providing the training.

E. Adopt objective methods for measuring success of CTF--We recommend that the Board of Regents adopt objective ways whereby the success of CTF can be measured over both the short term and long run. Subjective rankings by graduate faculty across the nation have their place, but the Legislature, citizens of Minnesota, students and faculty at the University and the Regents need more specific information, sooner.

Some possible measurements:

--annual changes in undergraduate and graduate enrollment.

--changes in the number of curricular areas.

--changes in graduation rates.

--changes in the number of doctoral candidates in individual departments.

--changes in the proportion of the total budget devoted to departments earmarked for improvement, or phase-out.

--changes in the percentage of freshmen who rank in the top 10 percent of their high school graduating classes.

THE "PRICE" OF CTF FOR STUDENTS

I. Findings

A. New preparation requirements to take effect in 1991--The University Board of Regents in July 1986 adopted increased preparation requirements. Students who will be freshmen in high school in September 1987 will be potential enrollees at the University in September 1991. Those students and all enrollees thereafter will not be admitted to upper division degree-granting curricular areas unless they have previously completed certain high school level courses: four years of English, three years of math, three years of science, two years of social studies, and two years of foreign language.

1. Preparation requirements will supplement admission standards--The preparation requirements will be imposed in addition to existing admission standards. Admission standards vary among colleges of the University. In the College of Liberal Arts, students who rank in the upper half of their high-school graduating classes and who score a certain level on college entrance exams are admitted automatically. Others who do not technically meet these standards are permitted to apply for special consideration. About one-half of such applicants are subsequently admitted.⁵² Admissions standards are higher in the Institute of Technology and the School of Management. See Appendix IV for a comparison of admissions standards among several universities.

2. Preparation requirements are consistent with Department of Education regulations--Effective with the 1985-86 school year, the state Department of Education is requiring all high schools in the state to offer a breadth of course offerings wider than the preparation requirements of the University.⁵³

According to preliminary data for the 1985-86 school year, nine high schools in the state's 437 school districts were out of compliance in social studies; 12 schools were out of compliance in science; three schools, math; and 59, foreign language. Of the 59, 26 were technically out of compliance because they were offering only the first year of a foreign language and planned to start the second year in 1986-87. More non-compliance was found in physical education, 241 schools, and art, 85 schools, areas not covered by University preparation requirements.⁵⁴

The State Board of Education has power to withhold state aids from a district that persists, after notice, in not complying with State Board regulations. Such power rarely has been exercised.

3. Preparation requirements are consistent with HECB recommendations to students--In 1986 the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) and the Minnesota High Technology Council distributed a booklet to all eighth graders in Minnesota containing recommendations for the kind of courses they might take in high school.⁵⁵ If students follow the

HECB recommendations, (four years of communications skills, three or four years of mathematics, two or three years of science, three years of social studies, and two or three years of world languages) they will fulfill the University's preparation requirements.

4. Preparation requirements can be satisfied after initial admission--A special committee recommended to the Board of Regents that preparation requirements be satisfied before students enter the University.⁵⁶ The Board of Regents, however, stepped back from this recommendation and decided that "required or recommended course work may be completed in the lower division and is not required for admission to the University."

If a student takes necessary courses to satisfy preparation requirements while at the University, the student will receive credit for these courses, but the credit will not apply toward a degree. University officials state that it is necessary to give college credit for the courses so that students are eligible for reimbursement from financial aid. The fact that they will not apply toward a degree means that a student will have to take additional credits to qualify for a degree, more credits than otherwise would be required.

For example, a student who did not take two years of foreign language in high school must satisfy that requirement before being admitted to the upper division. If the requirement is fulfilled at the University, the student will receive credit for those courses but the credit will not apply toward a degree. It would not be essential for a student to take such courses at the University. To illustrate: a student enrolled at the University might fulfill preparation requirements at a community college.

5. New preparation requirements are ambiguous--The mechanics of implementing preparation requirements have not yet been worked out. A literal interpretation of the Regents' resolution implies that preparation requirements would be ignored for freshmen. That is, a freshman who has completed preparation requirements would be treated the same as one who has not. The only distinction, then, would arise when time came for admission to the upper division.

Such an interpretation means, of course, that someone who completed preparation requirements in high school has no particular advantage in gaining admission to the U, other than that the student will not have the expense of college tuition for courses that could have been taken without charge in high school.

Another interpretation, one favored by some administration officials, is that freshman applicants who have completed preparation requirements will receive preferential admission to the University over those who have not completed the preparation requirements. Under such an interpretation, the

vast majority of freshmen would be admitted based on completion of preparation requirements in advance, with a certain number of slots held open for persons who are otherwise qualified but have not yet completed the requirements.

University officials hope that preparation requirements will help establish a pattern in which many students will choose to attend other schools instead of applying at the U. In that event, the University will not need to reject otherwise qualified applicants to keep enrollment within limits.

B. Policies on accepting transfer students are being explored--Under CTF more students are expected to attend community colleges and apply later to the University for their junior and senior years, thereby increasing the importance of the transfer question. A state community college campus provost was scheduled to be stationed at the University of Minnesota for the 1986-87 school year to work on a possible agreement between the community colleges and the University on transfer of credits. Students often do not know which credits earned at community colleges will transfer to the University.

In 1985 the Community College System and the State University System signed an agreement providing that state universities will recognize completion of Associates in Arts degrees at community colleges as fulfillment of a 60-credit "distributed general education" requirement for a bachelor's degree at state universities.⁵⁷ We know of no similar agreements between the University and the other systems.

C. Additional requirements are being considered by the College of Liberal Arts--Separate from CTF, a College of Liberal Arts task force has released a draft report on writing standards that would establish a system of entrance and graduation requirements in writing proficiency for liberal arts students.⁵⁸ The system would raise admission standards, sharply increase the need for staff in composition courses and make graduation more challenging for students.

The task force recommends that all applicants submit samples of narrative, deliberative, and persuasive writing. Freshmen without such a portfolio "would be diverted to one of the University's other 'ports of entry,' such as the General College, with admission to CLA becoming possible only after the portfolio has been produced."

Students also would have to produce a portfolio during their college years. The present freshman composition course would be expanded to two quarters and would require that students produce four acceptable short writing samples. Sophomores would have to write a paper, about 10 pages in a content course, before achieving junior status. Juniors would have to produce a 15-page research paper in a writing course taken in tandem with a content course. Seniors would have to complete a senior project in their major department.

D. Casual approach to University attendance is possible--Certain features of admissions and tuition policy at the University make it possible for students to be casual about their commitment. For example:

1. Registration deadline is late--The University has an extraordinarily late deadline, July 15, for applications. The College of Liberal Arts was proposing in the summer of 1986 to advance that deadline to February 15.

2. Tuition refund policy is generous--The University's tuition refund policy, in effect since 1923, is the most generous of any institution in the nation.⁵⁹

At the University a person may quit a class after one week and receive a 90 percent refund; after the second week, 80 percent; after the third week, 70 percent; after the fourth week, 60 percent; after the fifth week, 50 percent, and after the sixth week, 40 percent.

By contrast, Michigan State University allows a 75 percent refund through the first five days of classes and 25 percent through mid-term. Stanford University allows no refund after the first day of class. The University of Chicago allows no refund after the second week of class.⁶⁰

In Minnesota, the state university system allows no refund after the first day of class with some exceptions. The Minnesota community college system allows a 60 percent refund during the second week of class but nothing thereafter.

II. Conclusions

A. Preparation requirements are fair and helpful to students--Students in Minnesota high schools should have ample opportunity to complete the preparation requirements before graduation. School districts will have had two full years to comply with new rules of the State Board of Education before students who would need to satisfy the University's requirements enroll as freshmen in high school. Given the independent, 1985 conclusion of the State Board of Education, the comparatively small number of non-complying school districts in 1985-86, and the support from HECB, preparation requirements seem eminently reasonable.

These preparation requirements help the high school student develop skills critical to success in college studies and provide a broader base of experience in learning and knowledge with which to enter collegiate programs. College students without this preparation are disadvantaged, and making up the preparation requirements as a college student only partly erases this disadvantage.

B. The imposition of preparation requirements should not be delayed but special circumstances should be taken into account--Imposition of preparation requirements should not be delayed until students apply for upper division.

The University should not be a prisoner of its own requirements. It should follow the same procedure for exceptions in preparation requirements as it follows with admissions standards. That is, an individual who might not fulfill the requirements exactly is permitted to ask for special consideration. If admitted, a student could be required to satisfy the requirements within a prescribed time. Only a limited number of persons should be admitted by special application.

Special circumstances that need to be recognized:

--Some applicants with high aptitude might be technically deficient in one or two areas of preparation.

--Applicants might come from another state with lesser preparation requirements.

--Other applicants might not have taken high school seriously in their early years but done well as juniors or seniors.

--Some applicants might be adults who have been in the workforce for several years and who have not taken the required courses.

Certainly those students who took the preparation requirements seriously and got them out of the way before graduating from high school should receive preferential treatment. Part of the University's problem with its enrollment is the large number of casual enrollees. Strict application of the preparation requirements will help reduce the number of enrollees who might not be serious about attending in the first place.

C. Transfer policies need to be addressed--Students who choose other institutions with the intent of transferring to the University later are entitled to know in advance whether they can expect to transfer their credits to the U. This is particularly true under CTF, when more students presumeably will attend community colleges and state universities.

D. The University's application and tuition policies should reward commitment-- Students applying for admission to the University should have a commitment to follow through. That means that deadlines ought to be early enough to convey the sense of importance to application.

Refunds for tuition can be justified for the first week or two but make little sense for a long period of time. In fact a longer period for refunds might convey an impression that the institution is not too concerned about dropouts from courses. We recognize that students change their minds about courses of study but they should not be allowed to do so with such ease.

III. Recommendations

A. Apply preparation requirements to incoming freshmen--To comply with the spirit of CTF, we recommend that the University make it clear that entering freshmen who have completed the requirements will be admitted preferentially over others who have not completed them.

Here is how the University could implement the preparation requirements and impose limits on enrollment, as we recommend: A two-level application process would occur. At the first level, persons who fulfill the admissions standards and the preparation requirements would be declared "qualified" for admission, although they would not be admitted officially at this level. Others who, because of special circumstances, might not comply technically with the preparation requirements or the admissions standards could be declared "qualified" upon special application.

All persons deemed "qualified" would be placed in the same pool of names. From that pool the University then would select a certain number of persons for admission, consistent with its enrollment limits.

The University has several options for limiting enrollment:

- It could admit people from the qualified pool on a first-come-first-served basis, that is, based on the date of application.
- It could admit people from the pool according to a lottery.
- It could admit certain students first based on their high-school ranks or college-entrance exam scores.
- It could first admit applicants who graduated in the top 10 percent of their high school classes, and then apply a different procedure for selecting the remainder.

B. Adopt policies on transfer of credits--We recommend that the Board of Regents take the initiative to reach agreements with the other systems of post-secondary education in the state on transfer of credits to the University. Students who are deterred from applying to the University for the first years of post-secondary education are entitled to know before they take certain courses whether credits will transfer.

C. Modify registration and tuition policies--To encourage students to be more serious about their education at the University, we recommend that:

- the deadline for applications for fall admissions be advanced considerably earlier than July 15.
- no tuition refund be provided later than after the second week of classes.

THE "PRICE" OF CTF FOR ALL POST-SECONDARY
EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA

I. Findings

A. Minnesota supports a large system of public post-secondary education--The University has five campuses. The rest of the public system includes seven state universities, 18 community college campuses, and 33 vocational-technical schools.

(Another 37 private colleges and professional schools and 60 private vocational schools complete the picture. Private colleges, while not a subject of this report, are a significant part of post-secondary education in Minnesota. Some are ranked among the best liberal arts colleges in the nation. The state's private colleges serve as important "feeders" to the University's graduate school. About 10 percent of the University's graduate students received undergraduate degrees from Minnesota private colleges.)

B. Enrollment is projected to drop in all public systems--Total post-secondary enrollment in public institutions in the state is projected to decrease from about 154,000 in 1985 to about 134,000 in 1995, a drop of some 20,000 students.⁶¹

C. Governance of post-secondary education is decentralized--Four separate governing boards control post-secondary education in Minnesota: the University Board of Regents, the Minnesota State University Board, the State Community College Board, and the State Board for Vocational-Technical Education. The HECB is an advisory body that coordinates the activities of the various systems. Under the constitution, the members of the Legislature elect the Board of Regents. The boards of the other systems and the HECB are appointed by the governor.

D. State universities are involved in graduate programs--Approximately 4,000 graduate students were enrolled in state universities in the fall of 1985. Another 8,000 graduate students were enrolled at the University.⁶² State universities have statutory authority to offer doctorate programs, although to date they offer only master's. Two state universities are considering a proposal to the State University Board that they be allowed to offer an Ed.D. (a non-research education doctorate).

E. Systems have been instructed to differentiate their missions--The HECB in mid-1986 was coordinating a legislatively-ordered effort to differentiate the missions of the four public post-secondary systems. This effort so far has resulted only in a policy statement adopted by the community college and vocational systems to avoid duplication in the two-year post-secondary sector. That policy statement does not apply to Waseca and Crookston Technical Colleges, two-year institutions operated by the University.

Other areas being discussed include (a) uniform standards for associate degrees, (b) meaning of applied research and basic research, (c) agreements on transfer of credits between institutions, and (d) the implications of CTF for the other systems of post-secondary education in Minnesota.

The Higher Education Advisory Council, an advisory body to HECB, was preparing recommendations for HECB in the summer of 1986 on mission differentiation. Its report was expected in the fall of 1986. The advisory council is made up of the president of the University, the chancellors of the State University System and the State Community College System, the director of State Board of Vocational Technical Education and representatives of the State Private College Council and the Minnesota Association of Private Post Secondary Schools.

Each state system is required by law to prepare a planning document each biennium. A recent change in law requires that a mission statement be a part of this plan. The HECB reviews these plans and presents them to the Legislature.⁶³

F. Expectations of other institutions about CTF--Under CTF the University would voluntarily relinquish some of its enrollment--at the very time the other institutions are experiencing severe declines. CTF would ease the decline for these institutions somewhat by giving them a chance to enroll students who would not be admitted to the U.

While generally receptive to CTF, other institutions are waiting to see exactly what the University proposes to reduce its enrollment.

G. Question of a special need in the seven-county Twin Cities area--University officials have said that another four-year public post-secondary opportunity in the Twin Cities area would help students from the area who, because of preparation requirements or limitations on enrollment, would not be admitted to the University. Currently, six community colleges provide public two-year opportunities in the metropolitan area. The only public four-year opportunities available in the area are those offered at the University of Minnesota and Metropolitan State University. Metro State, a "college without walls," offers individualized programs for students, not the structured curriculum common in other post-secondary institutions.

H. Metro State is considering changes to accommodate Twin Cities area students--A concept paper prepared by Metro State in response to CTF predicts that other options will have to be provided for "non-traditional, part-time learners and perhaps minorities and educationally disadvantaged people" plus others who might not qualify for, or seek admission to, the University.⁶⁴

The concept paper recommends that Metro State add four to six new structured programs to its core of offerings during the 1988-89 biennium. Metro State currently has one structured program, leading to a B.A. in nursing. The concept paper identifies the following areas as most frequently suggested: accounting, business administration and management, communications, computer science and management information systems, continuing education services, international studies, liberal arts programs, and restaurant/hotel management. A tentative budget for the next biennium calls for five lead faculty persons to develop new curricular areas. The cost would be about \$500,000 for the biennium.

II. Conclusions

A. CTF should be evaluated in the context of the state's overall level of taxation, its spending on education and its entire system of post-secondary education--No one would deny it would be ideal for Minnesota to have here one of the five best public universities in the nation. But the achievement of such an objective cannot be examined in isolation.

Minnesota is a high-tax state with a clear current political tendency to move that ranking downward, which means relatively less over-all state spending.

The state already spends a great deal on education, including post-secondary public education.

The state maintains a huge post-secondary system with its various components competing for students and money.

The University has the largest enrollment on one campus in the nation and the broadest spectrum of curricular areas. It also maintains, and wants to continue to maintain:

- A regional institution, including programs such as engineering and medicine, at Duluth, which more nearly resembles one of the state universities.

- A small "gem" of a liberal arts college, at Morris, only 90 miles from a state university, which more nearly resembles the College of Liberal Arts on the main campus or one of the state's many private colleges.

- Two two-year technical schools, at Waseca and Crookston, at least one of which, Crookston, more nearly resembles a community college than an extension of the College of Agriculture.

- A General College, which largely serves the non-transfer function (in the Twin Cities area) of a community college.

B. Rare opportunity afforded by CTF--The State Legislature has an opportunity to make major changes in the entire system of post-secondary education in Minnesota, because of the initiatives of the University in CTF.

It is almost impossible to imagine that non-University sources could successfully originate a proposal that the University drop certain programs and cut its enrollment.

In the current extraordinary situation, the University itself has taken an initiative that might not occur again for generations. The question is whether the state is ready to take advantage of this unusual opportunity for change.

Minnesota spends a great deal of money on post-secondary education. The Legislature ought to give Minnesotans a post-secondary system that is more efficient, provides better service for citizens, and offers higher quality education to all.

C. Leadership by HECB is important--Extremely complicated and controversial questions are present over the size and structure of post-secondary education in Minnesota. How is overall leadership to assert itself? In recent years the HECB has increasingly gained respect of the post-secondary education systems by functioning more as a facilitator of cooperation than an independent advocate. The role of facilitator is invaluable, but the HECB also must make proposals to the Legislature in areas where the systems cannot be expected to reach consensus, such as the question of how many post-secondary institutions the state should support.

In carrying out the responsibility for differentiating the missions of the post-secondary systems the HECB is relying heavily on a hoped-for consensus among the systems themselves.

D. Addition of doctorate programs at state universities is not consistent with CTF--The Legislature needs to come to grips with the question of where doctorate-level education will be offered.

Minnesota cannot have it both ways. The University's graduate programs and the graduate programs at the state universities cannot be treated equally. That would be "Commitment to Non-focus."

The tradeoff here is obvious. The University of Minnesota must be willing to reduce its undergraduate enrollment below a level that would occur normally because of demographics, allowing other institutions to pick up those students that otherwise would be going to the University. It must cut back curricular areas that others can do as well or better. At the same time, the University's graduate school must be allowed to improve without being diluted by a proliferation of doctorate programs in state universities.

Some persons say that the addition of Ed.D.s at state universities would not be inconsistent with CTF, because such doctorates are not research degrees. While such doctorates might technically not represent a conflict, they would represent a precedent. In coming years efforts might be made to expand the doctorate programs to research doctorates at the state universities as well. Certainly the state universities ought to be proposing to fill gaps. If adequate opportunities are not afforded for doctorate programs in education now, then the U of M ought to demonstrate why it cannot expand.

E. Look skeptically at assertions that an additional four-year public institution is needed in the Twin Cities area--The need for additional facilities for the third and fourth year in the Twin Cities area at a future time is not clear. The HECB projects a decline of 20,000 students in Minnesota post-secondary public institutions over the next 10 years. This is no time to become preoccupied with adding more capacity, particularly when serious questions need to be faced about whether the state's post-secondary system is already too big.

Although hasty action is not needed, the possibility that students who are unqualified to attend the University will be denied a post-secondary opportunity in the Twin Cities area needs to be examined closely. Large numbers of University students never reach the third or fourth year now. If those are the types of students who would be denied admission under CTF, their needs will be fulfilled among the ample supply of two-year post-secondary institutions in the Twin Cities area.

But if it were determined that a broader post-secondary opportunity were needed in the Twin Cities area, several options would need to be examined carefully. Is it desirable, for example, to impose a structured B.A. program on a non-structured institution such as Metro State? Is it desirable to impose a four-year traditional program on top of an existing two-year traditional program, such as at Normandale Community College? What about the availability of other possibilities such as the private institutions in the metropolitan area?

III. Recommendations

A. Bring more order to all of post-secondary education--The Legislature already has been asked to make specific changes in the roles and relationships of the community colleges and the area vocational-technical schools. In 1987 it should take these steps, as previously recommended by the Citizens League⁶⁵:

- make vocational-technical schools fully state institutions, removing them from jurisdiction of local school districts, and

- make ultimate unification of vocational schools and community colleges possible.

The Legislature should evaluate how Crookston and Waseca Technical Colleges might relate to such steps. The technical colleges might be allowed to remain under University jurisdiction to the extent that they carry out functions directly related to the activities of the University, such as research by the College of Agriculture. If either or both also plays the role of a general community college or vocational school, the institution could be placed in same system that handles vocational-technical schools and community colleges.

What to do about the four-year institutions is less clear. Should Duluth and Morris stay under the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents or be made part of the state university system?

B. Charge the HECB with responsibility to prepare an implementation plan--The Legislature should charge the HECB to prepare an implementation proposal for the 1989 session to bring

more order to the entire post-secondary education system. In such action the HECB should concentrate less on satisfying the desires of the individual systems and more on addressing the broad public interest and satisfying the Legislature with a unified proposal.

C. Urge other systems to prepare CTF-type plans--We recommend that the State University System, the State Community College System and the State Board for Vocational Technical Education each prepare their own plans for "focus", to assist the HECB in preparing an implementation plan and to help the Legislature in responding to such a plan. "Focus" plans should deal with issues similar to those included in the University's CTF plan, including goals for number of students and number and type of curricular areas.

D. Prohibit doctorate degrees at state universities--The Legislature should repeal a present provision of state law that allows state universities to offer doctorate degrees. Fortunately, none yet does. Now is the time to make sure none does in the future. Simultaneously, the Legislature should make it clear to the University that it has a responsibility to provide access to education doctorate programs to Minnesotans.

E. Review the question of a Twin Cities area solution--The Legislature should instruct the HECB as part of its overall implementation plan to determine whether an additional four-year opportunity is needed in the Twin Cities metropolitan area because of CTF, specifically considering the current capacity of Minnesota's post-secondary education system.

THE "PRICE" OF CTF FOR TAXPAYERS

I. Findings

A. The University is seeking changes in state funding--The University's CTF funding proposal has three components:

(1) to bring the University's instructional expenditures to the equivalent of third in the Big Ten--The University has included "rank funding adjustments" for certain programs in its 1985-87 and 1987-89 legislative requests. The appropriation approved for the 1985-87 biennium included \$8 million for this adjustment. The University's preliminary 1987-89 legislative request presented to the Board of Regents in July 1986 included \$49 million for rank funding adjustments. Such appropriations are intended to bring instructional expenditures to a level of third in the Big Ten.

(2) to keep revenue from declining as enrollment declines--Currently the University and other post-secondary systems receive most of their state appropriations for instructional expenditures through a legislative formula known as "average cost funding". Under this formula all post-secondary systems are given lump sum appropriations that are based on enrollment and average costs in previous years. (See Appendix II for a more detailed description of average cost funding.)

In his CTF proposal, Keller said that the University would be voluntarily relinquishing state appropriations if no adjustment in average cost funding were made, because the University's appropriations would decline as it voluntarily reduced the size of its enrollment. To overcome this problem, Keller proposed that the state continue to provide funds to the University as if enrollment had remained constant, not declined. He estimated such a change would produce about \$5 to 10 million a year more in state appropriations than if average cost funding were applied strictly on the basis of actual enrollment.

(3) to avoid passing the higher costs of educating some students, particularly in professional schools, on to undergraduates through higher tuition--The University has been critical of a requirement by the Legislature that 33 percent of the overall instructional appropriation be recovered from tuition. Tuition has been more than 33 percent for students in low-cost programs in order to hold down tuition for students in higher-cost programs. Students in the higher-cost programs still pay more than students in lower-cost programs. But they do not pay as much as they would if they were responsible for one-third of the cost.

Under CTF, enrollment would drop more in the low-cost programs. Unless tuition were raised even higher for the remaining students in the low cost programs, dollars for the higher-cost programs would be reduced. The University has argued that higher-cost programs could not be competitive if tuition increases had to cover the costs, as many of these programs already have among the highest tuition in the nation.

The problem is particularly acute among six high-cost professional schools, according to University officials. About \$5.5 million in costs of these programs are expected to be shifted to other students in extra tuition, amounting to about \$127 per student for 1986-87.66

The six schools, including the estimated amount by which their tuition will be subsidized, per student, are: veterinary medicine, \$6,130; dentistry, \$4,661; pharmacy, \$873; medicine, on the Twin Cities campus, \$853; medicine, on the Duluth campus, \$6,075, and public health, \$492.

The University will ask the Legislature to mediate this problem either by changing the average cost funding formula or through special appropriations to offset the tuition charged to undergraduates by an amount equal to the total they subsidize the high-cost programs.

University officials contend they will not seek from the 1987 Legislature the full amount needed to implement CTF. However, over a period of about three or four bienniums, as enrollment declines, they expect CTF to be fully funded.

B. The University's attempt at funding CTF so far--The 1985 Legislature appropriated \$29.3 million for CTF for the biennium ending June 30, 1987. Subsequently, that amount was reduced to about \$11 million because of state budget-balancing problems. In effect the Legislature provided the first dollars for CTF outside average cost funding.

The \$11 million is built into the University budget now, permanently, and, therefore, is part of the average cost funding calculations for upcoming bienniums. In that sense, therefore, average cost funding has been modified to take account of the dollars appropriated in 1985.

C. The nature of proposal coming to 1987 Legislature--The University is adopting the same approach for seeking CTF funds in 1987 as it did in 1985. That is, it is asking for specific appropriations, which if granted for the biennium ending June 30, 1989, will subsequently be built into the budget base and average cost funding automatically.

A preliminary legislative request for the biennium ending June 30, 1989, totalling \$1.1 billion, was submitted to the University Board of Regents at its July 1986 meeting. That request represented approximately a 15 percent increase over the current biennium 1985-87 (including an increase in state special appropriations for research, which is not built into the funding base.) Excluding the portion for state specials, the requested increase was about 16.3 percent, or \$139.5 million. The preliminary request listed approximately \$85.8 million specifically for CTF, or about a 10.5 percent increase.

(See Appendix III for a detailed breakdown of the \$85.8 million.)

As of August 1986 University officials still were refining the legislative request. It is possible that the request and amounts attributable to CTF will be different when the University formally adopts its proposal for the 1987 Legislature.

D. Funding levels of curricular areas at the U compared to other institutions--Instructional expenditures of many University curriculum areas, including, notably, the Institute of Technology, are significantly below many other Big Ten institutions, according to a report from Management Planning and Information Services.⁶⁷

The report stated that the following curriculum areas were at least \$1 million below the third place Big Ten school in 1984-85 instructional expenditures (after adjusting for differences in enrollment): computer and information sciences, \$1.4 million; public health, \$1.9 million; engineering, \$1.9 million; physical sciences, \$2.4 million; life sciences, \$2.5 million, and visual and performing arts, \$3 million.

University officials said that the shortfall in three categories, computer and information sciences, \$1.4 million; engineering, \$1.9 million, and physical sciences, \$2.4 million, a total of \$5.7 million, represents underfunding of the University's Institute of Technology.

Total dollars needed to bring the University to third place in the Big Ten is estimated to be \$23 million.

E. Minnesota's tax capacity is slightly below average in comparison with all states--Minnesota was 98 percent of the national average in tax capacity, 24th in the nation in 1983, the most recent year for which figures are available.⁶⁸

In comparison with other states with major universities with which the University is competing, Minnesota's capacity ranks higher than that of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and North Carolina but below that of Texas, California, and Washington. "Tax capacity" is a measure of each state's theoretical yield in taxes as compared to the theoretical yield of all states if average rates were applied to all taxes imposed by state and local governments.

F. Minnesota's tax effort is above average--Minnesota's tax effort was 123 percent of the national average in 1983, seventh in the nation, according to the National Institute of Education.⁶⁹ Minnesota's tax effort was higher than that of Illinois, Washington, California, and Texas and below that of Wisconsin and Michigan. The National Institute of Education defines "tax effort" as state and local tax revenue collected as a percentage of tax capacity.

G. Minnesota spends an above-average amount on higher education--Minnesota spent about \$245 per capita on higher education in 1984, which placed the state 121 percent of the national average.⁷⁰ In comparison with its competitors, Minnesota ranked higher than Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, and Texas but below Washington and Wisconsin. It was the same as California.

Although Minnesota is above-average in dollars devoted to higher education, it is slightly below average in the percentage of its state budget devoted to higher education. Approximately 9.4 percent of total state and local spending in Minnesota was devoted to higher education in 1984.⁷¹ The average of all states in that same year was 9.5 percent.

How can Minnesota be above average in dollars spent on higher education but only average in the proportion of its spending devoted to higher education? The reason is that Minnesota's total spending is above average. Thus an average proportion applied to a higher-than-average total yields a dollar amount that is above average.

H. The University receives substantial dollars from federal sources--With \$80,356 in government contracts per faculty member, the University of Minnesota in 1982 was 136 percent of the national average and ranked 6th among 28 states with graduate universities with medical schools.⁷² This placed Minnesota in dollars per faculty member above the Universities of California, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, and Texas. Minnesota ranked below Washington and Wisconsin.

I. The University ranks very high in private income--With \$1,353 in private gifts, grants, and endowment income per full-time-equivalent student, the University in 1982 was 184 percent of the national average.⁷³ This placed Minnesota above California, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

II. Conclusions

A. CTF can be supported without dismantling average cost funding--The Legislature adopted average cost funding in 1983 upon recommendation from the HECB. It is largely proving itself as an equitable way to deal with the four competing post-secondary education systems in the state. Governing boards are empowered to allocate the funds within their respective systems. Depending upon how the University makes its proposal for CTF support, the Legislature can provide the dollars while retaining the average cost funding principle.

B. But undergraduate students should not be required to subsidize professional schools--The Legislature requires the University to recover 33 percent of its instructional expenses through tuition. Some students in lower cost programs, such as undergraduate education, pay more than 33 percent. Others, particularly in professional schools, pay less than 33 percent. The University believes that professional school tuition would be too high relative to sister institutions if students in such high cost programs had to pay the full amount. For example, tuition in veterinary medicine, estimated to be about \$4,768 for 1986-87, would be \$10,898, if veterinary medicine students paid the full 33 percent.

The University must bring a stop to such cost-shifting. Unless a change is made, the University might find it almost impossible to reduce undergraduate enrollment. Under the existing system the only way to hold down the amount of cost-shifting per student is to spread the cost among as many students as possible. If the University drops its enrollment--without a halt in cost-shifting--the amount that each remaining undergraduate subsidizes professional schools will increase.

One option is to let the tuition in professional schools rise to 33 percent of instructional cost. Some professional schools might be forced to close because students could be educated at other institutions for lower cost.

Another is for the Legislature to adopt a targeted appropriation so that the entire state would pay the professional schools' subsidy.

A third option is a combination of higher tuition at professional schools and additional state appropriations.

C. CTF funds ought not be given automatically--Whether dollars are appropriated through average cost funding or in some other way, the Legislature in each session ought to insist that the University spell out exactly how CTF dollars will be spent.

D. CTF should not be used to justify virtually any increase in spending--University leaders should be cautious about allowing proposals for increased spending to use the umbrella of CTF as a justification. Preliminary budget proposals presented to the Board of Regents in June 1986 indicated that CTF was a justification for a substantial amount of the dollars in the budget. If CTF is overused, the strategic importance of the concept inevitably will be devalued.

E. Additional state spending for CTF is justified--Minnesota is a high-tax state. Education contributes to that high tax level. Minnesota also is a state with a high quality of life. Education contributes to that condition as well. CTF is a courageous effort, emerging from within the institution itself, to increase quality.

The University has received a proportionately smaller share of post-secondary appropriations than is true of flagship institutions in other states with which the University is competing. Moreover, data show that in some areas, such as the Institute of Technology, the level of funding for the University is significantly below many other Big Ten schools. Therefore, additional state funds should be committed to the University's drive to attain excellence.

But dollars should not be made available without the Legislature's insisting that the University follow through with other dimensions of CTF.

G. The Legislature and the private sector should continue their cooperation in providing financial support for the University.--The level of private contributions to the University illustrates the high degree of respect and confidence that the U enjoys in Minnesota. Minnesota can be proud that it stands first among the states in voluntary support of its public university. So far the private sector and the Legislature have been willing to provide dollars without suspicions that the contributions by one will reduce contributions by the other.

The University obviously recognizes the importance of the private sector, particularly considering its current \$300 million fundraising campaign. CTF cannot succeed without private contributions; it cannot succeed without governmental appropriations.

III. Recommendations

A. Approve additional dollars if conditions are met--We recommend that the Legislature approve additional appropriations for CTF only if the Board of Regents has adopted the following:

--A schedule for trimming undergraduate headcount enrollment year by year for a total drop of at least 8,000 students by 1995.

--A program for strengthening undergraduate education, along with assurance that more dollars will be devoted to undergraduate education as well as graduate education.

--A goal and criteria for cutting marginal curricular areas.

--Application and tuition policies that undergird the concept that a student's decision to attend the University represents a serious commitment.

--An itemized plan that demonstrates specifically how the requested dollars would be used specifically for CTF.

Obviously, the Legislature should not give the University a blank check. At this time (late summer 1986) the University still is preparing its biennial request for appropriations. We cannot yet evaluate a specific dollar amount. We are more concerned with other steps the University should take, as outlined above. These are the critical elements that make CTF a feasible goal. If, for example, the Board of Regents does not cut enrollment and curricular areas, we would be hard pressed to justify even a meager appropriation for CTF. But if action is taken as we recommend, we believe the Legislature ought to provide significant funding for CTF.

B. Legislative action on reforming post-secondary education system--At the same time it takes action on the CTF appropriation, the Legislature should take steps to bring more order and less bulk to Minnesota's post-secondary education system. Those steps, as outlined in detail earlier in our recommendations, include unification of the state's two-year post-secondary systems and the preparation by the HECB--for action by the Legislature--of a "focus" plan affecting all post-secondary education systems.

C. Subsidize professional schools with state appropriations, not higher tuition for other students--We recommend that the Legislature provide special appropriations beyond average cost funding for the higher cost of necessary professional schools at the University. Other possibilities, in combination with special appropriations, would be a further increase in tuition at professional schools (a step that University officials claim would make the schools noncompetitive) and a review of the state's responsibility to provide such education. In any event, the Legislature should see that the existing practice of requiring other students to pay higher tuition as a subsidy to professional schools is stopped.

BACKGROUND OF THIS STUDY

Sensing the University's critical importance to the state's economy, the Citizens League in November 1984 recommended that the Governor and Legislature direct the University to develop a plan for the University to pursue distinction as one of the top public universities in the nation.⁷⁴

The League felt that the state's best strategy should be to build upon the educational institutions that had been so beneficial in the past. The League looked coolly upon economic development gimmicks.

Two functions of the University, particularly, are significant for economic growth, the League said: (1) supplying trained personnel for state businesses, especially at the graduate level, and (2) conducting research.

Early in 1985, at a joint meeting of the Citizens League Program Committee and the Citizens League Community Information Committee, University President Kenneth H. Keller described CTF. He urged the Citizens League to undertake its own study of CTF. The study was approved by the Citizens League Board of Directors and started in the fall of 1985. This report is the result.

CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE

The Citizens League Board gave the committee the following charge:

"Evaluate the new 'commitment to focus' plan of the University of Minnesota--A new plan proposed by the University President and adopted in principle by the Board of Regents calls for several steps designed, according to the Regents, to make the University one of the top five public institutions in the nation. Among the steps are that the University will enroll a higher proportion of graduate students and a lower proportion of undergraduates than today.

"The committee should proceed as follows:

"First, it should evaluate whether Minnesota should endeavor to elevate the national ranking of its University and how such a change in ranking would compare to the expectations which Minnesota citizens have for their University.

"Second, it should look ahead, assuming that the plan were adopted, and examine its implications, including:

"implications for student access to undergraduate programs.

"implications for other post-secondary institutions in the state, whose own undergraduate and graduate enrollments and programs would be affected by a shift in priorities at the University.

"financial implications of the plan, including an examination of how adoption of the plan relates to the way the state provides money to post-secondary education (average cost funding).

"how the long-established purposes of the University--teaching, research and service--would be affected by the changes.

"Third, based on an analysis of the implications, the committee should develop its own conclusions on implementation of the 'commitment to focus' plan."

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The following persons participated actively in the deliberations of this committee:

David Graven, chair	Solveig Levitt
John Adams	Maxine Mandt
Janice Anderson	Susan McCloskey
David Berg	Mary Ann McCoy
John Boland	Allan (Pat) Mulligan
John Costello	Charles Neerland
Curtis K. Carlson	David O'Fallon
Wayne Cox	Gordon Ortler
Gary Dodge	Lorraine Palkert
Bright Dornblaser	Joan Peters
Jay Fonkert	Daniel Peterson
Leah Harvey	David Smith
Judith Healey	Paul Taylor
Glenn Hendricks	Peter Vanderpoel
Katherine Howard	Victor Ward
S.M. Hunt	Erling Weiberg
Herbert Johnson	Debra Wing
Stephen Kelley	Donald Woods
Scheffer Lang	Nancy Zingale
Gregory Leslie	

The committee was assisted by Citizens League staff persons Paul Gilje, Curt Johnson, Deborah Loon, Robert de la Vega, Laura Merriam, Eric Premack, Nancy Jones, and Joanne Latulippe.

The first meeting of the committee was held October 15, 1985 and the final meeting August 19, 1986.

The committee received the full cooperation of officials of the University of Minnesota, the other systems of post-secondary education in the state, and the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Without their cooperation this report would not have been possible. Information was willingly provided at all times.

The committee spent the first several months receiving testimony from a wide variety of resource persons. Later it went into internal deliberations and prepared several drafts of its report before reaching final agreement.

RESOURCE PEOPLE FOR THE COMMITTEE

John Adams, professor, Geography, University of Minnesota; member of 1983 University Task Force on Higher Education and the State Economy

Alfred Aeppli, professor, Mathematics, University of Minnesota

Gene Allen, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Minnesota

David Berg, assistant vice president, University of Minnesota

Patrick Borich, director, Minnesota Extension Service, University of Minnesota

Richard Caldecott, special assistant to the president, development of technology transfer, University of Minnesota

Lyndon Carlson, state representative and member of the Education Division of Appropriations, Minnesota House of Representatives

Gerald Christenson, chancellor, Minnesota Community College System

Margorie Cowmeadow, director, University of Minnesota Intercollege Program

Tom Daniels, student representative to Board of Regents, University of Minnesota

Matt Francis, student, University of Minnesota

Richard V. Heydinger, special assistant to the president, University of Minnesota

Wally Hilke, student regent, Board of Regents, University of Minnesota

Evelyn Hansen, acting director, General College, University of Minnesota

Robert Holt, dean, University of Minnesota Graduate School

Ettore Infante, dean, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota

Sheila Kaplan, vice-chancellor, State University System

Kenneth Keller, president, University of Minnesota

David Lebedoff, member, Board of Regents, University of Minnesota

David Longanecker, director, Higher Education Coordinating Board

Fred Lukermann, dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota

Jeanne Lupton, dean, General College, University of Minnesota

Terrence MacTaggart, vice president, academic and administrative affairs, Metropolitan State University

John Malmberg, director of evening classes, Continuing Education and Extension, University of Minnesota

Harold Miller, dean, Continuing Education and Extension, University of Minnesota

Ruth Randall, commissioner, Minnesota Department of Education

Andrew Seitel, president, Minnesota Student Association

Phil Shiveley, professor, Political Science, University of Minnesota

Wally Storbachen, student, University of Minnesota

Preston Townley, dean, School of Management, University of Minnesota

Neal Vanselow, vice-president, Health Sciences, University of Minnesota

While the above-mentioned persons all met personally with the committee, several others provided valuable information outside regular committee meetings. They include:

Mary Blomquist, director, Budget Planning and Data Services, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota

Irv Chorn, State Department of Education
Ruth Chovancek, senior analyst, programmer, Graduate School, University
of Minnesota
Carol J. Cline, admissions officers, Office of Admissions, Student
Support Services, University of Minnesota
Trudy Dunham, Office of Research and Evaluation, General College,
University of Minnesota
Doug Easterling, vice chancellor, Minnesota Community College System
Dean Honetschlager, staff, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating
Board
Ed Kawczyaski, Office of Prospective Student Services, College of
Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota.
Rhetha Clark King, president, Metropolitan State University
Philip M Lewenstein, staff, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating
Board
Tom St. Martin, executive budget officer, Minnesota Department of
Finance
Mitchell Rubenstein, staff, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating
Board
Winifred Schumi, assistant director, information services, Office of
Research and Technology Transfer Administration, University of
Minnesota
Craig Swan, associate dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of
Minnesota

FOOTNOTES

1. "A Commitment to Focus", report of interim President Kenneth H. Keller to the Board of Regents, University of Minnesota, February 8, 1985.
2. "Report of the Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy of the State," University of Minnesota/Twin Cities, July 1983.
3. "Graduate Education and Research," University of Minnesota/Twin Cities, April 1983.
4. Memorandum from C. Peter Magrath to provosts, deans, and directors, University of Minnesota, president's office, June 20, 1984.
5. Letter from Governor Rudy Perpich to Lauris M. Krenik, chair, University Board of Regents, and Kenneth Keller, acting president, University of Minnesota, November 12, 1984.
6. "A Commitment to Focus," report of interim president Kenneth H. Keller to Board of Regents, University of Minnesota, February 8, 1985.
7. "Applications and Admissions Summary", Office of Admissions, University of Minnesota, August 22, 1986.
8. Phone interviews between Citizens League staffers and officials of the State University System and selected community colleges, July 1986.
9. National Academy of Sciences (1982). An Assessment of Research-Doctoral Programs in the United States. 5 vols. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.
10. Berg, David, assistant vice president, director, Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota.
11. Letter to Citizens League from Michael Boehlje, department head, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota, May 20, 1986.
12. "Survey Says Top Business Schools May Not be Top Business Schools," The Wall Street Journal, Oct. 11, 1985, p. 31.
13. "College Students Get Down to Business," Ellie McGrath, Money, December 1985, Vol. 14, No. 12, pp. 127-144.
14. Fiske, Edward, New York Times Selected Guide to Colleges, 1984-85, New York Times.
15. Moll, Richard, The Public Ivys, New York, Viking Penguin Inc., 1985.
16. McCoy, Marilyn, and Halstead, D. Kent, Higher Education Financing in the Fifty States, Fiscal Year 1982, Fourth Edition, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems and National Institute of Education, November 1984.
17. "Understanding Twin Cities Campus Graduation Rates: a Background Paper and Study of Fall 1977 Entering Undergraduates," University of Minnesota Student Support Services, March 6, 1986.

18. "Graduate Rate of 'U' Athletes Ranked Lowest in Big Ten, 1978-83," Minneapolis Star and Tribune, January 31, 1986.
19. Higher Education Financing in the Fifty States.
20. Governmental Finances in 1983-84, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, October 1985.
21. World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1986, and Digest of Educational Statistics, 1983-84, National Center for Educational Statistics.
22. Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota, unpublished data from Association of American Universities Data Exchange, 1986.
23. McGuinness, Aims C., Jr., The Search for More Effective State Policy Leadership in Higher Education, Recent State Higher Education Studies and Trends in Coordination and Governance, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado, May 1986.
24. "A Message for Our Families and Friends from Chancellor Irving Shain," Home Address, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Spring 1986.
25. Roark, Anne C., "State Education Panel Delves into Four-Year Colleges," Los Angeles Times, May 1, 1986, page 3.
26. "University of Iowa's president...An interview with James O. Freedman," Des Moines Register, July 8, 1986.
27. Matross, Ron and Hannaford, Katherine, "High Ability Shows and No-Shows: Key Findings of University of Minnesota Applicants," Office of Student Affairs Research Bulletin, Volume 24, Number 2, April 14, 1984, Office of Student Affairs, University of Minnesota.
28. Hendell, Darwin and Solburg, Jeanne, "High Ability Students' Evaluation of the University of Minnesota," Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Minnesota, December 1, 1984.
29. Minnesota Poll, Minneapolis Star and Tribune, November 13, 1977.
30. Moscovitch, Edward, "The Massachusetts Miracle," The Wall Street Journal, July 8, 1986.
31. Fall Enrollment in Colleges and Universities 1983, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, June 1985, p. 70.
32. Memorandum from Coordinating Committee for Commitment to Focus, office of the president, University of Minnesota, April 7, 1986.
33. "July, 1986 Enrollment Projections, Effects of Commitment to Focus," Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota, July 25, 1986

34. "Minnesota Public Post-Secondary Education Enrollment Projections Fiscal Years 1986-2005," Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, March 1986.
35. Memorandum from Coordinating Committee for Commitment to Focus, office of the president, University of Minnesota, April 7, 1986.
36. David Berg, director, Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota.
37. Jeanne T. Lupton, dean of the General College, University of Minnesota, interview with Citizens League staff, July 22, 1986.
38. Heydinger, Richard B., "Memorandum to Professor William Hanson, Chair, Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus," Coordinating Committee for Commitment to Focus, University of Minnesota, Office of the President, April 7, 1986.
39. Hanson, William H., "Final Report of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower-Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus", Department of Philosophy, University of Minnesota, May 8, 1986.
40. Page, Roger, "Report of the Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning," Council of Undergraduate Deans, University of Minnesota, August 1985.
41. Hill, Kirk, "The coming end of democratic education at the University of Minnesota Part 2, An interview with Cal Bradford, senior fellow, Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs," Tenant Inquirer, Minnesota Tenants Union,
42. de la Vega, Robert, and Jenkins, Laura, Memorandum to University of Minnesota study committee, Citizens League, Nov. 19, 1985.
43. David Berg, director, Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota, interview with Citizens League staff, Aug. 13, 1986.
44. Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota, July 1986
45. Mary Blomquist, director, Budget Planning and Data Services, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota, July 1986.
46. John Malmberg, director of extension classes, Continuing Education and Extension, University of Minnesota, interview with Citizens League staff, Aug. 13, 1986.
47. "Report of Special Committee on Coordinating Lower-Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus," University of Minnesota, May 8, 1986.
48. "Regents approve tougher standards for 'U' Freshmen," Minneapolis Star and Tribune, July 12, 1986, p. 1A.
49. Newton Smith, Office of Central Admissions, University of Minnesota.

50. "U of M Considers Minority Issues," Twin Cities Courier, May 23, 1985.
51. "Minority Enrollment Report, Fall Quarter 1985," University of Minnesota Office of Student Affairs, Office of Admissions and Records, November 5, 1985.
52. Kawczyaski, Ed, Office of Prospective Student Services, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota.
53. Rule no. 3500.210, Required Curriculum Offerings for Four-Year Senior Secondary Schools, State Board of Education, Minnesota Department of Education, 1985.
54. Chorn, Irv, State Department of Education, interview with Citizens League staff, July 31, 1986.
55. "Future Choices A Challenge to 8th Graders: Dare to Prepare," Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, January 1986.
56. Collins, W. Andrew, "Final Report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements," University of Minnesota, March 26, 1986.
57. Christenson, Gerald W., and Wefald, John M. "Agreement for Transfer of General education from the Minnesota Community College System to the State University System, Sept. 25, 1985.
58. Simler, N. J., "Draft report of the Task Force on Writing Standards," College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota, July 23, 1986.
59. Lewis, Sam, Office of Admissions and Records, University of Minnesota.
60. "Tuition Refund Policies at Selected Institutions," Office of Admissions and Records, University of Minnesota, August 23, 1984.
61. "Minnesota Public Post-Secondary Enrollment Projections, Fiscal Years 1986-2005," Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, March 1986.
62. Ibid.
63. Honetschlager, Dean, Higher Education Coordinating Board staff, interview with Citizens League staff, Aug. 13, 1986.
64. "Directions for Growth: Supporting Change, Metro U's Role in the System Response to the Keller Program," Office of the President, Metropolitan State University, April 2, 1986.
65. Adaptability--The New Mission for Vocational Education, Citizens League, January 8, 1986; Community Colleges for the Metropolitan Area, Citizens League, June 28, 1967.
66. "Tuition in Unique Professional Programs, 1986-87 Estimates", Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota, Aug. 12, 1986.

67. Management Planning and Information Services, University of Minnesota, August 1986.

68. Halstead, Kent, How States Compare in Financing Education, 1984-85, National Institute of Education, May 1985.

69. Ibid.

70. Governmental Finances in 1983-84, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, October 1985.

71. Ibid.

72. Higher Education Financing in the Fifty States.

73. Ibid.

74. Building on Strength: A Competitive Minnesota Economic Strategy, Citizens League, Minneapolis, November 28, 1984.

APPENDIX I

COMMITMENT TO FOCUS PROPOSALS AND REGENT ACTION

August 14, 1986

PROPOSAL

REGENTS'/UNIVERSITY ACTION

Undergraduate education

* Eliminate 2-year degrees except at Crookston & Waseca

Regents approved no two-year degrees from CLA in Twin Cities or UMD after 6/30/86

* Eliminate degree & certificate programs from General College

Regents approved effective 9/91 Regular reports required on impact of change

* Eliminate University Without Walls; General College & CEE provide individualized programs

Regents maintained UWW, approved 25% enrollment decrease, changed name to Individualized Learning Program to expand such programs

* Unify and increase entrance requirements across all Twin Cities colleges (except General College), UMDuluth and UMMorris

Regents approved entrance requirements of 4 years English, 3 years math, 3 years science, 2 years social studies, 2 years second language; effective 9/91

Professional Education

* Reduce undergraduate class size in Management

Regents approved reducing majors except accounting by 30%; service load to be reduced by 25%.

* Reduce undergraduate class size in Nursing

Regents approved reducing from 150 to 90 undergraduates.

* Others

Regents approved cap on IT enrollment; reductions in Veterinary Medicine and Medical Residency; reduction in PharmD, increase in Pharmacy BS and expansion in Pharmacy graduate program.

Duluth

* Function as land grant institution of NE Minnesota

Regents eliminated two-year degrees; approved entrance requirements as at Twin Cities; approved reducing enrollment "Supportive Services Program" for underprepared students from 400 to 200 by fall 1987; access only to Duluth-area residents.

Morris

* Enhance role as liberal arts college

Regents approved college plan to improve undergrad programs, focus on existing programs, not proliferate new programs.

Crookston

* Focus on agricultural programs and integrate with Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics

Regents approved college proposal to eliminate institutional food service management, family services program, and general business management; consolidate retail and small business management; and develop general education component.

Waseca

* Focus on agricultural programs and integrate with IAFHE (above)

Regents approved college agreement with CTF request.

Funding

* Carry out Minnesota Campaign to raise \$300 million over 3 years; include \$65 of Permanent Univ. Fund, \$130 new private money

Campaign in place with \$140 million by July 1986; PUF given to University by MN Legislature.

PROPOSALS WAITING REGENT ACTION

Undergraduate education

* Coordinate lower division across Twin Cities units

Regents to review call for center for undergraduates and prospects December 1986.

* Reduce undergraduate class size in Education

Regent action in fall 1986 after college makes proposal.

* Reduce undergraduate size overall by 8,000 by 1995

No official plan before Regents as of August 1986; administration expressed plan to cap at August meeting of Regents.

Continuing Education and Extension

* CTF calls to focus on special strengths of University; eliminate overlap with other systems of higher education; consider admissions standards for credit offerings; increase efforts at access to specialized programs at graduate level.

Funding

* Biennial request to Legislature in process by August 1986

APPENDIX II

AVERAGE COST FUNDING & STATEWIDE TUITION POLICY

What is average cost funding?

The 1983 Minnesota Legislature, in its concern for the future of post-secondary education, adopted a state-level package of interrelated governance and finance initiatives. The policies in this package included average cost funding.

Average cost funding was to be used to determine state instructional appropriations for Minnesota's four public post-secondary education systems, based upon actual enrollments and costs. It was designed to (1) require post-secondary systems and institutions to compete for students, (2) provide strong incentive for governing boards to use resources efficiently, and (3) treat public systems equitably. Average cost funding assumes that the state should cover about 67 percent of the costs to instruct students, and the students should pay the remaining 33 percent in tuition. This does not include non-instructional costs.

How average cost funding works:

1) The average instructional costs per full-time student are calculated by each post-secondary system and approved by the Minnesota Department of Finance. The costs are calculated in up to four levels of instruction -- lower division, upper division, graduate, and professional -- and in three cost categories within each level -- low, medium, and high. There are, therefore, a maximum of twelve cells, depending upon how many levels of instruction the system may have.

The average instructional cost in each cell is based upon the systems' actual cost experiences of the previous year, with multipliers for such factors as inflation. Some overhead costs are included in these instructional figures.

2) The average instructional costs calculated above are multiplied by the corresponding number of students in each cell two years ago.

3) The total instructional expenditures are yielded by adding all cells together.

4) The calculation of state appropriations and tuition is as follows:

state appropriation = 2/3 of total instructional costs

tuition = 1/3 of total instructional costs

5) In next biennium, adjustments are made if actual enrollment of last biennium was either higher or lower than enrollment that average cost funding was based upon.

6) The governing boards of each system are given complete discretion in allocating funds to colleges, campuses and programs.

APPENDIX III

The Board of Regents considered a preliminary legislative request for the 1987-89 biennium at its July 1986 meeting. The following figures are extracted from that preliminary request:

(in \$000s)

Preliminary 1987-89 biennium budget request= \$ 1,115,541.9

Of that budget, the following items are attributed to CTF:

Faculty Market & Retention	\$ 8,000.0
Instructional Computing	10,000.0
Equipment Replacement	8,000.0
Basic Sciences	unknown
Public Health	2,000.0
Veterinary Medicine	2,000.0
Coordinated Campuses	5,000.0
CLA	1,400.0
CBS	2,000.0
Management	1,200.0
IT	8,000.0
Neurosciences	1,000.0
Geriatric Medicine	500.0
Student Recruitment, Retention & Honors	3,200.0
Graduate Tuition Fellowships	2,050.0
Graduate School Fellowships	1,080.0
Minority Prof. School Fellowships	246.5
OMSSA Counselors	160.0
Financial Aid Services	200.0
International Education	400.0
Eliminate ICR Offset	16,000.0
Prof. Colleges Tuition Offset Reduction	7,060.0
Fellowships for Health Sciences	
Fellow Spec.	6,300.0

TOTAL CTF 87-89	\$ 85,796.5
CTF 85-87	\$ 11,000.0

The U requested approximately \$43 million in CTF money for 85-87 biennium and received about \$30 million. Some \$18 million was "unallotted" in the last session, leaving about \$11 million.

APPENDIX IV

"State Policies for Admission to Higher Education"

This report was compiled and written by Margaret E. Goertz and Linda M. Johnson of Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. It was published by the College Entrance Examination Board.

The policies stated are of the 1984-85 academic year. Information has been pulled for the following institutions or states: California (Berkeley), Illinois (Champaign-Urbana), Michigan (Ann Arbor), Minnesota, North Carolina (Chapel Hill), Texas (Austin), Washington (Seattle), and Wisconsin (Madison).

University of California:

Applicant must meet one of three criteria:

- (1) complete prescribed pattern of high school course work with minimum GPA of 3.3;
- (2) have a GPA between 2.78 and 3.29, and qualify on Eligibility Index (if GPA of 2.78 must score 1,600 on SAT; required SAT score decreases as GPA rises); or
- (3) score a total of 1,100 or higher on SAT plus 1,650 on three College Board Achievement Tests with minimum of 500 on each of the three.

Effective fall 1986, students entering University of California must take an additional year of high school mathematics and four advanced college preparatory courses.

University Illinois at Champaign-Urbana:

Applicant must present a combination of class rank and SAT or ACT scores which indicate at least a fifty-fifty chance of obtaining a C average the first semester on campus.

Applicants are required three years of English and one year each of algebra and geometry. Board of Higher Education is reviewing recommendation that public universities adopt following high school courses as minimum requirements: four years English; three years each social studies, mathematics and laboratory science; two year electives in foreign language, music or art.

University of Michigan:

Qualified applicants generally have minimum GPA of 2.0 and standardized test scores comparable to freshmen pursuing similar programs in the University (mean scores 1983-84 enetering freshmen were 532 SAT verbal, 597 SAT math and 26 ACT composite).

University recommends high school course work for applicants of: four years English, three to four years mathematics and science, two to three years social studies, two years foreign language, and total of 20 units.

University of Minnesota:

Applicant must be in upper half of graduating class and meet one of the following three formulas for admission:

- 1) Using PSAT: high school rank percentage + PSAT Math score + PSAT verbal score = 140 or higher (students scoring 120 - 139 will receive individual review)
- 2) Using SAT: same formula as PSAT although score is reduced to two-digit number (example, score of 500 = 50)
- 3) Using ACT: high school rank percentage + (2 x ACT composite score) = 96 or higher (review if just lower).

Effective fall 1991, student must meet course requirements to be admitted into upper division: four years English, three years each of mathematics and science, two years each of social studies and foreign language.

University North Carolina at Chapel Hill:

Applicant's admission is based on student's high school record and college entrance test scores.

Effective fall 1988, all entering freshmen must have completed four year English, three years each mathematics, science and social studies. Also recommended is two years of one foreign language and a foreign language course and mathematics course taken in 12th grade.

University of Texas at Austin:

Applicant must have the following combination of high school rank and SAT or ACT score: (1) if in top 25 percent of class, then any test score is acceptable; (2) if in lower 75 percent of class, then SAT score of 1,100 or more or ACT score of 27 or more is needed.

Applicant also must have completed prescribed pattern of high school course work.

University of Washington:

Uses an admission index that combines high school GPA and test scores.

Applicant also must complete prescribed pattern of high school course work.

University of Wisconsin:

Applicant must rank in upper one-half of graduating class.

Three institutions also require 16 units of high school coursework rather than the state minimum of 9 units of coursework.