

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Educational Planning & Policy Committee
July 12, 2001**

A meeting of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, July 12, 2001, at 10:15 a.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Michael O'Keefe, presiding; Robert Bergland, Dallas Bohnsack, Warren Larson, and Maureen Reed.

Staff present: President Mark Yudof; Executive Vice President and Provost Robert Bruininks; Chancellors Donald Sargeant and Samuel Schuman; Senior Vice President Frank Cerra; Vice Presidents Tonya M. Brown, Christine Maziar, Charles Muscoplat; Interim Vice President Robert Jones; Executive Director Ann Cieslak; Provost David Carl; Associate Vice Presidents Steve Cawley, Robert Kvavik, Donna Peterson, and Richard Pfitzenreuter.

Student Representatives present: Kyle Althoff and Nicholas Maxwell.

**UNIVERSITY PLAN AND PERFORMANCE REPORT:
DRAFT REVIEW & CRITIQUE**

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks noted that in October 2000 the Committee had discussed a proposal to develop a single University plan and performance report. In November 2000 the Committee reviewed a conceptual framework for a consolidated report and by resolution directed the administration to replace the annual Institutional Measures Report and the University Plan with a single report entitled University Plan and Performance Report (Plan). The Plan also will bring together several other reports that have come to the Board individually, including reports on the compact process, interdisciplinary initiatives, institutional partnerships, and reallocation measures.

The Plan has been designed to:

- articulate the University's vision, aspirations, and goals;
- integrate and align planning, evaluation and resource allocation strategies;
- analyze results and outcomes;
- identify trends;
- assess progress; and
- measure the University's impact in Minnesota and beyond.

Bruininks identified the following four core questions that will drive the process and the Plan itself:

- In what areas does the University intend to excel?
- How do we act strategically to accomplish our goals?
- How did we do?
- What does this mean for the future of the University?

The Plan will be organized around six broad themes (as described in the docket materials) and will assess the priorities and

purposes of the University, including coordinate campuses and the University of Minnesota, Rochester. The Plan also will identify major directions, policy issues, and adjustments required to continually improve the University and provide comparisons with peer institutions.

Bruininks introduced Vice President Kvavik, who demonstrated how institutional measures will be presented in the Plan and the complexities and nuances involved. Kvavik described the types of data the Plan would include and how the data would be used in the compact process, to track progress toward institutional goals, and for comparisons over time and with peer institutions.

Regent O'Keefe observed that this year's legislative requests represent a very clear statement of the ways in which the legislature expects the University to be accountable. Regent Reed noted that the legislature is really asking for the same things the Board has asked to receive for several years. The beauty of the Plan is its potential to address most of the legislature's requests. The challenge will be to communicate information in a manner that provides the legislature with a clear picture of the University.

In response to a question from Regent Bergland, Bruininks explained that the level of student interest is a determinant of which degree programs are considered high priority, but that the legislature's interest in identifying high priority degree programs more likely reflects their interest in the creation of centers of excellence.

O'Keefe suggested that the University's response to the legislature might need to (a) identify and acknowledge existing centers of excellence and (b) identify curricular areas that relate to future economic needs of the state. It then will be necessary to establish investment priorities that maintain or strengthen centers of excellence and support economically significant curricular areas. President Yudof agreed, adding that the legislature has sent a clear message about accountability, a message he views positively.

In response to a question from Regent Larson, Bruininks indicated that the public nature of this process will require that data presented in the Plan be credible, reliable, and valid. One frame of reference will be quantitative and qualitative results from a number of external and internal audits. Bruininks emphasized, though, that the Plan should not become a pass/fail test but an honest assessment that uses information in an intelligent, strategic way to continually improve the University.

Reed expressed her support for the direction of the Plan and the categories evaluated. She acknowledged the potential usefulness of the Plan for many audiences, but she cautioned that this document should not appear to be a marketing effort; rather, it should have such credibility that those looking for accountability will find it.

O'Keefe recommended that the Plan organize information in a coherent and intelligible way so that it becomes a source document for a variety of communication and reporting purposes, even though what is prepared for the general public might be very different from what might be prepared for a legislative hearing.

Bruininks asserted that fairly good alignment already exists between the institutional evaluation and assessment prescribed by the Plan and the reporting and accountability requirements adopted this year by the legislature.

ANNUAL BUDGET PROPOSAL: IMPACT ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS & INITIATIVES

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks recalled that during the discussion of the University's budget in June 2001, Committee members were informed of a letter of support prepared by the Twin Cities Council of Deans and on file in the Board Office. At the Committee's request, Robert Elde, dean of the College of Biological Sciences and chair of the Twin Cities Deans' Council, was asked to comment on the impact of the University's budget proposal on academic programs and initiatives.

Elde underscored several points in the Deans' Council statement and acknowledged how difficult it will be to redirect the University's course toward a higher tuition model. He reported, though, that the Council supports President Yudof's recommendation for a substantial increase in tuition.

Bruininks reminded the Committee that the University's budget will be balanced in thirds: one-third with state funds, one-third through a tuition increase, and one-third through cuts in aspirations, costs, and expenditures.

Alternatively, Bruininks cited a variety of funding allocations that will benefit students, including:

- substantial increases in need-based aid in 2002-03;
- increased fundraising for scholarships;
- additional investments in faculty and career advising;
- support for core academic infrastructure (i.e., libraries, classrooms, and training);
- additional funding available through the compact process to drive the academic investment agenda;
- increased support for student disability services; and
- increased support for student services, such as the registrar, financial aid, and admissions offices.

Yudof noted that decisions about the budget were guided by the philosophy that the University must provide a high level of service to undergraduates and maintain the quality of the faculty.

In response to a question from Regent Reed, Yudof agreed that there is a natural tension between assets available to colleges where tuition is generated and the collection of overhead to fund University-wide priorities. Although he admitted the current system probably does not provide adequate funds to increase the level of central direction, he acknowledged the contributions of Bruininks and the success of the compact process in reordering priorities within colleges.

In response to a question from Larson, Yudof suggested that parents make aggressive adjustments in planning for the future education of their children because inexpensive comparable alternatives will not be available.

BIOMEDICAL INNOVATION AND COMMERCIALIZATION INITIATIVE: UPDATE

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks introduced Mark Paller, Assistant Vice President, Academic Health Center, who updated the Committee on the status of the proposed Biomedical Innovation and Commercialization Initiative (BICI). Paller reported that the legislature had appropriated the full \$10 million requested to fund BICI's start-up costs. BICI is now in the process of identifying the private sector investors who will contribute the \$30 million in matching funds.

Regent O'Keefe applauded the administration's success in gaining the legislature's support for BICI during what had been a very difficult legislative session.

CONSENT REPORT

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following:

New Academic Programs:

- Graduate School: Post baccalaureate Addiction Studies Certificate;
- College of Continuing Education: Undergraduate Addiction Studies Certificate;

- College of Education and Human Development: Certificate in Talent Development and Gifted Education;
- College of Education and Human Development: B.S. in Technology Education; and
- Carlson School of Management: New Major in Supply Chain Management.

Changes in Academic Programs:

- UMD: Concentrations in B.S. in Industrial Engineering; and
- UMD: Concentrations in Environmental Studies.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Regent O'Keefe referred Committee members to the docket materials and invited Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks to comment on national trends and policy issues in accreditation.

Bruininks identified the two forms of national accreditation: regional and specialized. Regional accreditation is periodic. Specialized accreditation is field-based and occurs continuously across disciplines (such as the recently completed accreditation of the Carlson School). All accreditation processes involve extensive self-study protocols plus external peer reviews and ongoing monitoring. Many of the requirements of the Plan will complement and facilitate these processes.

Bruininks noted that accreditation standards are driven by policies and regulations of the U. S. Department of Education, which can deny financial aid to students in any institution that is denied accreditation. The accreditation process is very costly and specialized accreditations are often too prescriptive, so there is a serious effort for reforms to make them as useful as possible.

Bruininks cited a number of policy issues in accreditation, including:

- the role of accreditation in distance education;
- the role of accreditation in a world of outcomes;
- the extent to which accreditation processes are intrusive (cost, requirements, cycles, and goals); and
- the relationship between the cost of accreditation and its benefits.

Bruininks reported on a reform movement within institutions of higher education to push accreditation entities to change processes to reflect policy principles.

The meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.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