

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS
Educational Planning & Policy Committee

September 12, 2002

A meeting of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, September 12, 2002, at 3:15 p.m. in Room 241, Kiehle Building at the University of Minnesota Crookston.

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

Staff present: Executive Vice President and Provost Christine Maziar; Chancellors Donald Sargeant and Samuel Schuman; Senior Vice President Frank Cerra; Vice Presidents Carol Carrier and Robert Jones; Interim Vice President David Hamilton; Executive Director Ann Cieslak; and Provost David Carl.

Student Representatives present: Jacob Elo and Danielle Stuard.

CONSENT REPORT

A motion was made and seconded and the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Consent Report, which included the following:

New Academic Programs:

College of Education and Human Development -- B.S. in Business and Marketing Education

Academic Program Additions:

College of Natural Resources -- Two new tracks in Recreation Resource Management Major

Academic Program Name Changes:

- o College of Natural Resources -- Urban Forestry Major to Urban and Community Forestry; and University of Minnesota Duluth -- Department of Industrial Engineering to Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

COMMITTEE WORKPLAN, 2002-03

Regent Hogan and Executive Vice President and Provost Christine Maziar led the discussion of the committee's workplan for 2002-03. Maziar observed that the workplan includes required committee business, proposed discussion topics, and presentation strategies. The schedule of topics also reflects the Board's decision to reduce the number of

committee meetings from 10 to 8 by eliminating one committee meeting in the fall and one in the spring.

The committee stressed the importance of maintaining the focus of discussions on policy issues. Regent Reed proposed that the committee's discussions be sorted into one of the following categories:

- 1) an iterative discussion in which the Board and the administration work together to develop policy in a new area;
- 2) a recommendation or decision;
- 3) updates or monitoring of key Board or administrative policies; and
- 4) direction regarding administrative policies.

Such a typology would help the committee assess the appropriateness of topics and the time allocated for their discussion.

Among additional items proposed for the workplan were continuing discussions with the Educational Policy Committee of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System and follow-up on the report of the Commission on Excellence.

DISTRIBUTED AND DISTANCE EDUCATION: POLICY ISSUES

Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar introduced Billie Wahlstrom, Vice Provost for Distributed Education and Instructional Technology, who led the discussion. Wahlstrom reviewed the history of the University's technology-enhanced learning initiative, summarized strategies that have enhanced efficiency, and described strategies designed to improve the quality of teaching and learning (materials in the docket and on file in the Board Office).

Wahlstrom identified the following as emerging policy issues in technology-enhanced learning:

- funding allocations between physical and online resources;
- balancing access and transparency against the need for privacy and security;
- managing intellectual property, copyright, and fair use issues in a digital environment; and
- ensuring access to digital environments for persons with disabilities.

She noted that policy decisions in these and other areas will determine what the University looks like in five years. Among the administration's challenges will be balancing the spectrum of technology needs, developing the technological capacity of faculty and research staff, and maintaining cutting-edge technologies and user skills across the institution.

Regent O'Keefe added that the University's challenge will be to recognize technology-enhanced learning as a new tool rather than a substitute for existing tools and to maintain the technology-enhanced learning skills of faculty.

In response to a question from Regent Keffeler, Wahlstrom indicated that it is too early to quantify the investment that will be required for leadership in distributed and distance education.

PROGRAM AND FINANCIAL REVIEW: UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA CROOKSTON

Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar introduced Chancellor Sargeant and Douglas Knowlton, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Robert Nelson, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and Dean McCleary, Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs, who led the discussion. Sargeant reviewed the strategic objectives of the University of Minnesota Crookston (UMC) and profiled UMC's current enrollment, students, academic programs, and collaborative partnerships. Sargeant also presented a financial plan for FY03-07 based on underlying assumptions about tuition and new academic course offerings (materials in the docket and on file in the Board Office).

Future challenges for Crookston include the potential for adding new programs; high faculty workloads; a small research funding base; and market constraints on tuition levels.

In response to a question from Regent Keffeler, Maziar confirmed that the academic programming assumptions critical to UMC's FY03-07 financial plan have not been evaluated to determine the demand for such course offerings, their cost, or their current availability through other institutions.

In response to questions from Regent Reed, Sargeant explained that it is difficult to export UMC's successes because the ability of UMC graduates to enter the workforce at the baccalaureate level is predicated on the currency of polytechnic course offerings in technology-enhanced applied programs. It also is difficult for other campuses to benefit from UMC's technology-enhanced learning and instruction when students do not have laptops and faculty lack the required instructional skills.

Maziar added that UMC can provide leadership in the area of technology and learning environments because the coordinate campuses have the potential to implement change more quickly than the Twin Cities campus.

INFORMATION ITEMS

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 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