

Last Fall the President and the Provost and Vice President called an open Conference on Undergraduate Education, inviting the faculty, staff and students to study a dozen issues central to the undergraduate experience here. More than 450 responded during the two days the Conference was in session. But CUE '71 did not end with its last agenda item of October 2. Work groups continued to discuss and debate the issues raised at the Conference. They worked out the detailed recommendations below, and by the time the report itself was compiled they had already seen some of its provisions go on toward reality: action on freshman seminars to start next Fall, approval of an expanded residential college program, and even the appearance of a dozen guest artists this Spring in a chamber-music series that grew out of a workshop. As the report submitted by CUE Chairman Ralph Amado points out, "... many of these options already exist, but they are nearly invisible to most students and faculty." CUE '71 makes visible some of those existing options along with new proposals in the text that follows.

Reinforcement and Change in Undergraduate Education

The Conference on Undergraduate Education (CUE '71) was held October 1 and 2, 1971. The purpose of the Conference was to define more clearly the place and goals of undergraduate education at Pennsylvania and to work out and consolidate initiatives for full use of the wide resources of the University in that education. In planning the Conference to explore these goals, the Conference organizing committee took a pluralistic approach. The main work of CUE '71 was organized in twelve workshops, each devoted to a well defined topic. At the core of each workshop was a group of 10-15 people chosen from the University Community—faculty, administration, students. These core groups met over the summer and early fall months to structure and sharpen their topics. The response and hard work of these groups was very gratifying and showed clearly the broad base of concern for undergraduate education at the University. At the Conference the workshops met in open session to discuss their work and suggestions with the University community. Many workshop groups decided to meet again to draw together these discussions in their reports.

There is to be no final report on CUE '71, both because of the atomistic approach of the workshops, which precludes a single sweeping summary, and because we believe our suggestions for change and reinforcement in the undergraduate program at Pennsylvania are not "final." We have simply assembled from the various workshops reports, working papers, and general impressions formed at the Conference a set of suggestions or recommendations and submit these here. Rather than make our suggestions in a long document, or support them with contextual material, we have chosen to make them without "whereases." (The working papers are available from the Office of the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Room 104, College Hall.) Though most workshops have made recommendations, few are formal or unanimous. Some are even contradictory. In fact, many of these options already exist, but they are nearly invisible to most students and faculty. Thus many of the impediments perceived to new programs or options are more imagined than real. This makes them no less serious. Hence, many proposals emerging from the Conference are for strengthening and codifying existing options and programs and for increasing their visibility.

We plan to take these recommendations to a number of individuals and groups that have the interest and authority to

act on them. Many will require continuous attention, all will require sifting and refining, and some may even require rejection. We believe the natural focus for these continuing activities is the new Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies.

CUE '71 ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

*Ralph Amado, Chairman
Lucy Behrman
Joseph Bordogna
Rochel Gelman
Edwin Hartman
William Keller*

*Patricia Meyers
Kenneth Rothe
John Russell, Jr.
Matthew Stephens
Samuel Thier
Henry Wells*

Workshop 1. Combined Degree Programs and Calendar Changes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We would like the administration to take on the task of coordinating and publicizing the availability at the University of programs of study of alternate lengths (three-year B.A., four year B.A., etc.) and of combination degree programs (B.A.-M.A., etc.). In regard to the latter, publicity would be facilitated if the University would require all departments to make a statement as to whether or not such a program would be encouraged, what the requirements would be, and what a proposed program of study would look like.

2. The quality and type of courses offered at the summer school should be reexamined. Further, the University should use the summer school period to provide a variety of courses, some of which will be of the type now given, while others might run less than one summer session or might run for a regular semester period (two summer sessions). Flexibility, in other words, should be built into the format of summer courses.

Workshop 2. Pre-Medical Education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Despite arguments in favor of the broadest possible undergraduate education, a more specifically defined premedical program is necessary. This statement does not imply a premedical curriculum, but simply a structural recognition of the particular problems facing premedical students. There should be a course or an intensive orientation program defining health careers. Students interested in such careers should learn about ways they can serve in this sphere in addition to or rather than in the capacity of physician. Perhaps a Health Career Advisory Office, instead of a Pre-Medical Advisory Office should be instituted.

2. An effort to reduce the number of large enrollment classes should be coupled with an attempt to:

a) Enable students to demonstrate scientific rigor, insight and technical competence in meaningful and satisfying ways;

b) Provide such scientific experiences not only in biological and physical sciences, but in other disciplines, as well (e.g., the behavioral sciences).

c) Produce interdepartmental, interdisciplinary and inter-school courses, devised both to meet pre-medical requirements, and to offer systematic education of depth and scope.

Though a critical mass of interested individuals exists in the medical school to help design and teach the new courses, the effort to develop such courses should be initiated by the undergraduate departments. The new courses should be separated into requirements for medical school admission and non-required courses. Courses should also be developed that permit students to pursue disciplines or programs across undergraduate-graduate lines. Non-required courses should be offered on a pass-fail basis, in which personal evaluations should be encouraged in lieu of grades.

3. Inter-university consortium efforts to provide complementary programs, exchange between universities and flexibility for students should be actively encouraged. In addition, modifications in pre-medical education, accepted by a consortium of high quality universities, are more likely to be translated into nationally accepted solutions.

Workshop 3. Vocational Decision Making and Advising and

Workshop 5. Student-Faculty Academic Interaction

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Every freshman should have the opportunity to participate in a small seminar. There should be a student-faculty committee to assume responsibility for offering a wide range of freshman seminars in both semesters. Some would be specialized, some would deal with a specific body of information, some would emphasize method rather than content. We can envisage rigorous and interesting seminars on women's liberation, ecology, epic poetry, and modern political thought. We are aware that a full program of freshman seminars and advising may require either a reallocation of fiscal resources or sacrifice on the part of the faculty. The students' view of what is needed is predictable; what is surprising is the strength of sympathy among the faculty, particularly assistant professors, for that view. The undergraduates and the junior faculty seem to be reasonable in demanding of the nearly fifty per cent of the professorial faculty who are full professors a larger effort in what must be the primary business of the University.

2. In addition each student should have a primary assignment to a qualified General Advisor in the office of his particular school—in the event of the formation of one undergraduate school, to someone in that office. Only advisors who deal every day with all programs available and problems inherent in the academic process can adequately advise a student about the myriad options available to him at the University of Pennsylvania. Such General Advisors should have academic ties to the University, but must have many hours available to learn of all the programs being formulated, offered, and changed, and to deal with students on a continuing and available basis. The advising process at the University does not simply entail signing an original roster of courses for a student. The entering students, freshmen and transfers, require immediate attention soon after they arrive on campus as changes occur in their roster requirements—they place out of languages or other courses; they need help to get into courses; they find certain courses beyond their preparation and need advice about other courses relevant to their needs and also open to them. Enrolled students meet the same kinds of problems, and additionally need advice about choosing a major, policies of submatriculation, policies about dual degrees, circumstances for leave of absence, procedures for study at other universities in the U.S. and abroad, how to do an Individualized

major, etc. Distribution to hundreds of faculty members of such constantly changing information would be needlessly time consuming and extremely uneconomical. Yet one person necessarily must watch over this process for the student.

3. Further, each student would also be asked to indicate his area of primary interest, and any academic area from which he would like to receive a faculty advisor. Students would be encouraged to contact the faculty member and vice versa. A freshman seminar system could also be used as a mechanism for instituting faculty-student advising. General Advisors always find it desirable for the student to have contact with a faculty member involved in a field of interest for the student. At the moment one faculty member, the Undergraduate Chairman, is usually inundated with requests for interviews from both freshmen and transfers as well as pre-majors. In many cases his colleagues could share the burden of numbers and enjoy the student contact in the process. Perhaps initial contact would be made in the seminars previously suggested.

Students now occasionally have the opportunity to build rewarding advisor-advisee relationships with faculty, and their opportunity could be increased by assigning advisors early, and making it clear to the student that he-she might change direction in the future and could require introduction to another faculty member with a different interest to offer advice on a new interest.

4. Greatly expanded opportunities for undergraduate participation in faculty research and scholarship should be developed. There should be mechanisms, offices, etc. available for gathering information on such opportunities.

Workshop 4. Goals of Undergraduate Education at Pennsylvania

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Although the major as a concentration should be maintained, more alternative paths to the major, not just between disciplines but in a given discipline, should be made available. In many cases the structuring of a major—with the advice and consent of faculty—can be an important part of the intellectual experience of the major itself.

2. "Minor" programs should be developed as an alternative to the distributional requirements. These should be "concentrations" up to the intermediate level in some area distant from the major.

Workshop 6. Teaching Methods

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. An Educational Resources, Services, and Curricula Development Center be established at the University level and budgeted within the Provost's offices. This Center should have both its own physical space and a full-time Director with sufficient professional and technical staff to (a) assist faculty and students in setting goals and in the use of multi-media in teaching and learning, (b) provide facilities and technical assistance for faculty and students in developing and evaluating innovative teaching-learning strategies, and (c) serve as an advisory resource on instructional problems.

2. The Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies be responsible for *undergraduate* educational development. He should be particularly concerned with item (c) of recommendation 1 and be responsible for establishing an academic atmosphere in which curricular innovation and subsequent publication of accomplishments have valid meaning in a research context.

3. A University-level administrative structure be established to make possible increased and continued use of graduate and professional school resources (both persons and facilities) to enhance undergraduate teaching at all levels.

4. Teaching at the undergraduate level be expanded well beyond the classroom including intimate association of undergraduates with both faculty and graduate students and specific undergraduate research experiences.

5. The University roster be modified to minimize the number of middle-sized classes and optimize the balance between a small

number of large-sized classes and a large number of small-sized classes. This is possible through the application of educational technology and can free teacher time for closer personal contact with students in tutorials, seminars, and other similar teaching-learning experiences. Eventually, the large-sized classes could be phased out as lectures are video-taped for transmission over a University television system. This could help in separating curriculum from certification in many beginning or basic-concepts-type courses thus allowing students to enter advanced courses at stages more commensurate with their individual abilities and efforts.

6. A Grant Program (similar to the summer research grant program) be instituted to provide faculty members with both the time and resources to develop innovative approaches to teaching. Also, a variety of courses be provided on campus to staff members for professional development.

Workshop 7. Accreditation and Certification

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To focus the goals of the first two years of study and to provide a natural break in the four year program, the Associate of Arts (AA) degree should be awarded.

2. A "minimajor" program be developed. Each minimajor being a set of courses (4-6) from some theme (e.g. 18th Century Romantic Literature, the Renaissance, war, etc.). Three such topic clusters would be required for the A.A. and/or in lieu of distributional requirements.

3. There should be much more certification by examination. This would be appropriate for the minimajor and for the major.

4. The University should offer a B.A. in General Studies. This might particularly suit the needs of pre-medical and pre-law students.

5. Grading and evaluating of students are needed and generally wanted. Means should be found to make them more flexible without making them more dilute.

Workshop 8. Undergraduate Professional Education

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Professional undergraduate programs should be as flexible with respect to course requirements and innovations as possible (within the restrictions placed by professional licensing).

2. There should be better advising, both on academic programs and on how these relate to professional activities.

3. Combined Bachelor-Master programs should be developed and publicized.

4. Courses in the catalogue should be cross-referenced by subject area (e.g. Medieval Studies).

Workshop 9. Extending Education outside 18-21 Age Group

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Students from a much wider age and experience range (degree candidate or no) be sought and encouraged to attend regular classes.

2. Apply a cost accounting analysis to the College of General Studies' budget to determine the current contributions (and/or deficits) of this program.

3. Consider lodging the primary responsibility for continuing education in the College for General Studies or in an umbrella administrative unit, whichever is more feasible.

4. Transfer the present Continuing Education Program to the College of General Studies providing

a) a full-time counselling service for women returning to study be retained.

b) a similar service be provided for men

5. Examine and reorganize the Summer School programs to-

ward improving their usefulness to regular and part-time students, degree and non-degree candidates.

6. Consider seriously the possibility of certifying students by examination. In this way, experience and knowledge gained outside the classroom might count toward course and/or degree credit. This option might begin with study committees in one or two departments to design examinations for specific elementary course certification (much like advanced placement exams).

7. Move to establish education by consortium for both part and full-time students on a much broader scale than at present. This would be especially advantageous if students from participating schools could fill some of the empty places in our under-applied but well-known departments and vice versa.

8. Continue and expand the alumni college. Encourage alumni to take regular courses during the year, either through specially constructed programs for alumni or on their own initiative.

9. Authorize the Director of Continuing Education and/or CGS to employ emeritus professors to teach and counsel students in the College of General Studies.

10. Change the name of the College of General Studies. This would be valuable from the promotional point of view. If the continuing education component of the University were lodged primarily in this school such a name change might reflect this purpose.

Workshop 10. Teaching Incentives and Evaluation

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There should be faculty awards for research into teaching, for the study and planning of courses, of methods of teaching, experimentation in teaching, etc. These awards should be equal to the present system of faculty awards for scholarly research and should count as "research" even when no publication results.

2. A determined effort by all administrative offices in the University to apply salary increases to good teaching as well as productive scholarship. The pressure for this can only come from a considerable investment of time and energy on the part of faculty and students in organizing an all-University teacher evaluation survey which must be carried out every year in every classroom. The results should be analyzed in highly sophisticated statistical fashion and published in such a way that it is available to all students and faculty. The present system is haphazard and unsatisfactory at best.

3. The University should create models for good teaching. It should either fund itself or receive foundation support for distinguished lectureship. Such chairs should also be arranged for full faculty, instructors, and newly recruited faculty.

4. The Workshop on Teaching Incentives and Evaluation recommends that the President and Provost appoint an ongoing committee to consider the questions raised in this workshop of CUE. This committee should be composed of faculty and students dedicated to educational reform and the revitalization of undergraduate education.

5. The Workshop on Teaching Incentives and Evaluation recommends that the Deans and Department Chairmen appoint student personnel committees to consider the teaching potential of candidates for tenure, promotion, reappointment, and for outside candidates for appointment. These personnel committees will be independent of the regular department committees but will forward their recommendations to these committees, department chairmen, Deans, and Provost.

6. We also recommend that a member of each faculty personnel committee be charged with evaluating the teaching ability of all candidates brought before the committee. This person should make known his or her findings to the committee, the Department Chairman, the Dean, and the Provost.

7. The Workshop on Teaching Incentives and Evaluation recommends that the University make its Lindback Awards more visible.

Workshop 11. Intellectual Life-Style Outside the Classroom

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Existing facilities should be modified to provide coffee houses, cafes and lounges that are visible and readily accessible at all times. Simple things that could be done immediately include: placing a concessionary stand with tables and chairs in the large open plazas and quadrangles around the University; turning the Rathskellers in the hi-rises into coffee houses.

2. Establish a President's Advisory Council on the Arts to make recommendations about extra-curricular programs, e.g., art exhibits, chamber concerts, an artist-in-residence program; the use and modification of existing facilities; and the way in which accredited academic offerings in studio and performing arts should be and could be expanded.

3. Support a full-blown programming office which has the responsibility for sponsoring programs that are geared towards providing events that are unique and which interface with the various University programs and departments which address themselves to the arts.

4. Encourage the expansion of living arrangement experiments like College House that seek to integrate the in- and out-of-classroom phases of the educational process. Penn has the opportunity to develop a variety of undergraduate living styles and should do so. It should do this in coordination with the various offices that affect the development of dormitory facilities so as to be sure that the goals of each living arrangement plan are achieved.

5. Make it clear that a rich intellectual life style is a viewed goal and coordinate future planning with the activities of the various offices that have some responsibility for this goal.

Workshop 12. Special Programs

RECOMMENDATIONS

Study-Abroad Programs

The Workshop recommends that the undergraduate schools officially recognize study abroad as, in principle, a desirable educational experience, and that the University Administration make the institutional and procedural changes necessary to give positive assistance to students interested in studying abroad. Specifically, the Workshop recommends the following:

1. That the budget of the Office of Fellowship and Study Programs Abroad be increased so that it can expand its services to students seeking advice on study abroad, and perform more effectively the following functions:

(a) collect information on all study-abroad programs sponsored by other colleges and universities which are open to Penn undergraduates;

(b) evaluate these programs in order to advise students concerning their respective advantages and disadvantages;

(c) provide information on foreign universities, including data on their admission requirements, academic programs, calendars, etc.;

(d) facilitate the obtaining of permission to study abroad by working with Penn's undergraduate schools to set up flexible rules and simplify procedures;

(e) assist the Admissions Office in evaluating students' studies abroad for the purpose of granting credits toward a U. of P. degree;

(f) arrange "feedback" situations in which returned students can share their experiences abroad with other members of the University community.

2. That the University publicize opportunities for undergraduate study abroad through announcements in such media as—

(a) the *Undergraduate Courses of Study* bulletin. Part II, under the heading "General Academic Information," should contain a section called "Study Abroad," which would state the policies of the several undergraduate schools and call attention to the information and counseling services available at the Office of Fellowship Information and Study Abroad.

(b) registration and pre-registration materials, as distributed to students and academic advisers

(c) the *Daily Pennsylvanian*

(d) the *Pennsylvania Gazette* (to interest parents and alumni and enlist their support of the program).

3. That the University find ways of helping scholarship students to participate in study-abroad programs without making extra demands on their limited financial resources.

4. That the University explore with the Development Department the possibility of obtaining donors to support the awarding of financial aid to undergraduates who could not otherwise spend their sophomore or junior year at a foreign university.

5. That the President appoint a committee to study the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a University of Pennsylvania program of study abroad. The committee would base its recommendations on an analysis of such alternatives as the following:

(a) the Stanford plan, under which a university sets up branches in foreign countries, staffs them with regular university personnel, offers courses available on the home campus, transports students to and from the foreign branch, provides meals and housing for them in its own dormitories abroad, and charges them at its regular rates for tuition, board, room, and fees.

(b) the conventional junior-year-abroad program, in which an American college or university has an arrangement with a foreign university whereby the foreign institution provides instruction, the American institution provides administration services, and the students make their own or U.S.-supervised living arrangements.

(c) special-purpose programs, such as the Eastern European semester of De Pauw University, the Art History Tour sponsored by Hiram College, and the Central American Field Study Program sponsored by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest which provides supervised field work in Costa Rica for students majoring in biology, geology, geography, anthropology, sociology, economics or political science.

Exchange and Cooperative Programs

The Workshop regards all our exchange and cooperative programs as valuable means of enriching undergraduate education and believes that their effectiveness at the University of Pennsylvania should be enhanced. It therefore recommends:

1. That a statement concerning the exchange program with Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore be included in Part II of the *Undergraduate Courses of Study* bulletin, under the heading "General Academic Information".

2. That the Dean's office of each undergraduate school acquire the annual catalogs of the above colleges and of Morgan State College and make them available to students interested in examining them.

3. That the academic advisors of each undergraduate school familiarize themselves with the options available to students under the exchange program with Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore and under the cooperative program with Morgan State.

4. That the chairman of the undergraduate program in political science explore the possibility of reactivating the University's participation in the Washington Semester program at American University.

5. That the co-chairmen of the undergraduate program in international relations explore the possibility of participating in the Drew University Semester on the United Nations.

Field-Work Programs

Field work opportunities be made available in connection with academic programs and departments in which undergraduates are enrolled.

Furlough Programs

The Workshop recommends that the President appoint a committee to study the advantages and disadvantages of the several furlough programs now in existence and to recommend to the faculties of the undergraduate schools a uniform policy concerning furlough leaves of absence.