

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning & Policy Committee

December 13, 2001

A meeting of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, December 13, 2001 at 2:45 p.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: William Hogan, presiding; Dallas Bohnsack, Jean Keffeler, Richard McNamara, Michael O'Keefe, and Maureen Reed.

Staff present: President Mark Yudof; Executive Vice President and Provost Robert Bruininks; Chancellors Kathryn Martin, Donald Sargeant, and Samuel Schuman; Senior Vice President Frank Cerra; Vice President Christine Maziar; Executive Director Ann Cieslak; Provost David Carl; and Associate Vice Presidents Mary Heltsley and Robert Kvavik.

Student Representatives present: Kyle Althoff and Nicholas Maxwell.

CONSENT REPORT

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following:

New academic programs:

- B.S./B.A. in Biology, Society, and Environment College of Biological Sciences and College of Liberal Arts;
- Minor in New Media Studies College of Liberal Arts;
- Major/Minor in Anthropology University of Minnesota Morris;

and

- Major/Minor in Statistics University of Minnesota Morris.

Academic Program Changes:

- M.B.A. at University of Minnesota Rochester University of Minnesota Duluth.

Academic Program Name Changes:

- College of Liberal Arts: Department of Speech Communication to Department of Communication Studies;
and
- University of Minnesota Duluth: B.F.A. in Art Education K-12 Emphasis to Art Education K-12.

UNIVERSITY PLAN & PERFORMANCE REPORT

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks indicated that the University Plan & Performance Report (Plan), before the committee for review, is a revision of a draft version last presented for discussion in July 2001. He described the purpose of the Plan and highlighted key findings (on file in Board Office), noting that the main body of the report is system-wide, with the unique qualities of coordinate campuses detailed in a separate section.

Bruininks reviewed a number of policy issues related to the University's academic priorities of academic excellence, students, outreach, human resources, physical heritage, and institutional efficiency and effectiveness. He noted that the Plan is intended to capture the University's successes, goals, and plans as well as to reveal areas in which there is still room for improvement.

Bruininks also identified the following issues related to the content of the Plan:

- Does the report serve its intended purpose?
- Do the institutional measures and indicators effectively delineate the areas and activities that the University should measure?
- How are coordinate campuses best represented?
- Should the timeline for submission of updates be adjusted?

In response to questions from Regents Reed and Keffeler, Bruininks indicated that the final version will restate measurements as goals, include a new section on the University's financial health, and identify critical relationships (such as the effect of low freshmen retention rates on graduation rates).

Student Representative Maxwell suggested that the report also capture what it means to be a research university, such as the benefits of research for agriculture or industry. Yudof concurred, indicating his commitment to developing better measures of the benefits of University-sponsored research through surveys of alumni, private industry, and the public.

In response to a question from Regent Reed, President Yudof agreed that in some areas the administration is looking for direction from the Board. He added that the Plan will be of great value to him in applying benchmarks and reporting back to the Board on results achieved. With the planned addition of a section comparing the University to peer institutions, he believes that the Plan will be an excellent resource for the development of documents suitable for a variety of audiences.

Hogan suggested that committee members be prepared to discuss policy issues related to the content of the Plan when it comes before the committee for action in February 2002.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS: FRAMEWORK AND SCOPE

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks reviewed the timelines and requirements for the five accountability reports requested by the legislature, focusing on the Academic Priorities and Postsecondary Planning reports, which are to be submitted by February 15, 2002.

Bruininks noted the six major components of the Academic Priorities report, the policy issues related to each component, and the conceptual framework used in developing a response to the legislature's request that that University identify the five undergraduate degree programs of highest priority (on file in the Board Office). This process resulted in the selection of the following five high priority areas:

- Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Engineering and Computer Science
- Business
- Biological and Life Sciences
- Visual and Performing Arts

In response to questions from Keffeler, Hogan, and O'Keefe, Bruininks acknowledged that it will be very important not only to comply with the legislature's request, but also to provide a broader context within which the five high priority areas are identified. This broader context would include an assessment of the cost of achieving excellence in these five areas along with a caveat explaining why it is not customary for the University, or other research universities, to prioritize undergraduate programs in this fashion. Another important component of the report should be the University's view of what is the most valuable way not only to improve undergraduate education, but also the quality of the educational experience and educational outcomes.

In response to a question from Hogan, Bruininks proposed that a draft version of the Academic Priorities report be sent to committee members in January.

Regarding the Postsecondary Planning accountability report, Bruininks reminded the committee that the legislature has requested a report on progress in the development of a master academic plan for the metropolitan area. This report is to be prepared in cooperation with the Board of Trustees of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) System and submitted by February 15 of each year. He reviewed required components of the report, specified a number of policy questions to be addressed, and highlighted the trends and data that will inform the process (on file in the Board Office).

Bruininks reported that cooperation between the University and the MnSCU System has resulted in progress in the areas of academic partnerships and credit transfers and transferability, but that the leadership of the two systems also must address such important issues as access, preparation, technology, workforce development, and lifelong learning.

In response to a question from Hogan, Bruininks observed that the Postsecondary Planning accountability report has no major financial implications, but that a more detailed version of the workplan does address this important issue and may result in cooperation between MnSCU and the University on a joint legislative agenda.

In response to a question from O'Keefe, Bruininks assured the committee that the final report will include more detailed information that clearly identifies the costs and benefits incurred when students transfer between the University and MnSCU institutions. Vice Provost Swan also described several soon-to-be-implemented systems that will improve the information available to students about degree requirements and transferability between the two systems.

In response to a question from Regent Bohnsack, Bruininks noted that there is now substantial research underway to assess the relationship between K-12 and higher education. He stressed that improving success rates for postsecondary students is important not only for the students themselves, but also for local communities and Minnesota's economy in general.

Hogan requested that committee members submit to him any comments on the workplan for the joint MnSCU/University work group prior to that group's next meeting on January 8, 2002.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks referred committee members to the docket materials.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

ANN D. CIESLAK
Executive Director and

Corporate Secretary

©2005 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.

[Trouble seeing the text?](#) | [Contact U of M](#) |
[Privacy](#)

The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

Last modified on September 7, 2005