

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning & Policy Committee

December 11, 2003

A meeting of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, December 11, 2003 at 9:30 a.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

Regents present: Peter Bell, presiding, Anthony Baraga, William Hogan, Richard McNamara, and Patricia Simmons.

Staff present: Chancellors Velmer Burton, Kathryn Martin, and Samuel Schuman; Executive Vice President & Provost Christine Maziar; Vice President Sandra Gardebring; Interim Vice President David Hamilton; General Counsel Mark Rotenberg; Executive Director Ann Cieslak; Provost David Carl; and Associate Vice Presidents Gail Klatt and Donna Peterson.

Student Representatives present: Gina Jennissen and Andrew Sorsoleil.

CONSENT REPORT

Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar announced that this month there was no consent report for the committee's consideration.

TUITION POLICY ISSUES, PART II

Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar reported that President Bruininks has appointed an advisory committee to review and recommend changes, if any, to Board of Regents Policy: *Tuition*, which identifies the principles and guidelines that govern University tuition rates. She stated that the purpose of today's discussion is to enhance the committee's understanding of current policy in advance of any subsequent recommendations about the policy itself or tuition levels for the next academic year. She then introduced Vice Provost Craig Swan and Director Peter Zetterberg, who led the discussion.

Swan and Zetterberg clarified terminology relating to tuition assessments and explained the rationale for provisions relating to residency, reciprocity, and the guaranteed tuition plan.

Zetterberg noted that the Board has approved the University's participation in eight reciprocity agreements. The oldest agreement is with Wisconsin, and students from that state, who are guaranteed equal treatment for admissions purposes, account for the majority of Minnesota's tuition reciprocity. Unlike the other seven agreements, the Wisconsin agreement requires that students pay the same tuition in both states, eliminating any financial incentive for students to leave Minnesota.

In response to questions from several committee members, Zetterberg observed that students value reciprocity and it is an effective tool for recruiting nonresidents to Minnesota, a state with a small population and a large university. He added that neither state pays more to educate students than the other state is paying; that all funds transfers occur at the state level; and that any financial adjustments are made by the Higher Education Services Office, which receives appropriations to cover reciprocity balances. The Minnesota legislature also appropriates funds for reciprocity students as though they are Minnesota residents. These agreements are reviewed annually and may be revised from time to time, but they remain in force as long as both states agree to continue them.

Swan explained that only about 150 students currently take advantage of the guaranteed tuition plan, which was adopted by the Board about 10 years ago in response to student and parent concerns over rising tuition. He commented that tuition banding, which was implemented in 2002 to encourage more timely completion of degrees, may have lessened its appeal. The advisory committee will consider whether the guaranteed tuition plan should be continued, and if so, what modifications might be appropriate. Maziar proposed that one logical change would be to revise the language so that it is an option that the University *may* choose to offer.

In response to a question from Bell, Maziar emphasized that tuition rarely covers the full cost of a student's education, but the University receives the same state appropriation for each student, regardless of the college in which they are enrolled. Furthermore, a good undergraduate education exposes students to disciplines in several colleges so that all students benefit indirectly even if there are differential allocations of support. The University will be in a difficult position, however, if state support continues to decline, requiring direct subsidies of some programs.

Simmons commented that she has few concerns that students in one college might be subsidizing students in another college since tuition currently provides only about 14% of the University's total budget. Furthermore, differential subsidies are appropriate because students, once admitted, should be able to select courses without cost considerations. The committee agreed that it is important to track and recognize cost differentials by college, but that at this time a single undergraduate tuition best serves the University and students.

Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar and Director John Ziegenhagen led the discussion of issues related to the University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report (UPPAR), which will be submitted to the legislature in February 2004. Maziar reminded the committee that its primary obligation is to assess the format of the draft UPPAR and to discuss its implications for educational planning and policy.

Ziegenhagen noted that the 2004 draft includes campus-by-campus profiles, more data comparing the University to top public and private institutions, and new measures for public engagement and intercollegiate athletics. The emphasis also has shifted from reporting activities to specifying performance-based goals and outcomes.

At the committee's request, a performance scorecard is being developed and will appear in the final version of the report. Ziegenhagen highlighted the seven areas that will be a part of the performance scorecard, suggesting that the areas of public engagement, academic quality, and student quality and experience (as they relate to graduation and retention) will be of particular interest to this committee.

In response to several comments regarding comparisons to national rankings, Simmons proposed that UPPAR references to such rankings be accompanied by appropriate caveats.

In response to comments from several Regents, Maziar and Ziegenhagen agreed to include additional data analysis, comparative data for major research areas, and executive summaries by chapter. Maziar also stressed the importance of differential investments across the University to maintain highly ranked programs; to enhance promising programs; and to support areas considered important to Minnesota or designated by the University as academic priorities.

Bell expressed his hope that the UPPAR will be reflected in committee workplans and used throughout the year. The final version is scheduled for Board action at a subsequent meeting.

### INFORMATION ITEMS

There were no Information Items this month.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 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