



# Governance & Policy Committee

October 2015

October 8, 2015

8:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.

East Committee Room, McNamara Alumni Center

## GOV - OCT 2015

### 1. 2015-16 Committee Work Plan

Docket Item Summary - Page 3

Draft work plan - Page 4

### 2. Habits of Highly Effective Boards

Docket Item Summary - Page 6

Article - Page 7

Summary slide - Page 13

### 3. Board Policy Review Process

Docket Item Summary - Page 14

2015-16 Policy Work Plan - Page 17

Board Policy Owners - Page 18

Presentation - Page 21

### 4. Board of Regents Policy: American Indian Advisory Boards - Review

Docket Item Summary - Page 27

Revised policy - Page 29

Current policy - Page 32

Presentation - Page 33

### 5. Board of Regents Policy: Namings - Review

Docket Item Summary - Page 41

Revised policy - Page 42



# BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

---

**Governance & Policy**

**October 8, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM:** 2015-16 Committee Work Plan

**Review**

**Review + Action**

**Action**

**Discussion**

*This is a report required by Board policy.*

**PRESENTERS:** Regent Linda Cohen  
Brian Steeves, Executive Director & Corporate Secretary

## **PURPOSE & KEY POINTS**

To review and discuss the 2015-16 committee work plan.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The charge of the Governance & Policy Committee is as follows:

The Governance & Policy Committee oversees and makes recommendations related to policy and processes to ensure the integrity and high performance of the Board.

Specifically, this committee recommends:

- amendments to the Bylaws and changes to the structure and function of the Board;
- amendments to Board policies not routed through one of the other standing committees; and
- consideration of other University policy matters as they arise.

This committee provides governance oversight to:

- evaluate the effectiveness of the Board through periodic self-assessment;
- ensure that Regents are fully oriented and receive ongoing education; and
- identify best practices in governance for possible implementation.

**Governance & Policy Committee  
2015-2016 Work Plan**

Date	Topics
<b>2015</b>	
October 8-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Review Charge and 2015-16 Committee Work Plan</b></li> <li>• <b>Habits of Highly Effective Boards</b> The committee will review the <i>Trusteeship</i> magazine article “10 Habits of Highly Effective Boards” and discuss the extent to which the Board of Regents exhibits those habits.</li> <li>• <b>Board Policy Review Process</b> Committee members will learn about and discuss the process used to guide the 92 Board policies through review and revision. This item is the first in a three-part series on policy review.</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>American Indian Advisory Boards</i></b> (review)</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>Namings</i></b> (review)</li> </ul>
December 10-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Culture of the Board</b> The committee will review the <i>Trusteeship</i> magazine article “R<sub>x</sub> for a Successful Board: A Healthy Board Culture” and discuss related concepts and questions in preparation for the January 2016 retreat (tentative) and/or a Board self-assessment. An external facilitator may be present to share content or facilitate the Board’s discussion.</li> <li>• <b>Administrative Policy Review Process</b> Committee members will learn about and discuss the process used to guide nearly 300 administrative policies through review and revision. This item is the second in a three-part series on policy review.</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>Awards, Honors, and Recognition</i></b> (review)</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>Namings</i></b> (action)</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>American Indian Advisory Boards</i></b> (action)</li> </ul>
<b>2016</b>	
January	<b>2016 one-day Board retreat</b> (tentative)
May 12-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Board Education and Development</b> The committee will learn about and discuss the effectiveness of current methods used to educate the Board on higher education issues, governance, and the University.</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>Board Policy Development</i></b> With knowledge of current Board and administrative policy review processes as context, committee members will discuss and provide input regarding changes to Board of Regents Policy: <i>Board Policy Development</i>. This item is the third in a three-part series on policy review.</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>Awards, Honors, and Recognition</i></b> (action)</li> <li>• <b>1-2 Board of Regents policies for review (TBD)</b></li> </ul>

2016, continued	
June 9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Shared Governance: Overview of the University Senate</b> The committee will learn about and discuss what the University Senate is, how it works, and what it does as part of the University's shared governance structure.</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Annual Planning Process</b> The committee will learn about and discuss the effectiveness of the process used to develop the Board's annual priorities, planning calendar, and committee work plans.</li> <li>• <b>Board of Regents Policy: <i>Board Policy Development</i></b> (review)</li> <li>• <b>1-2 Board of Regents policies for review (TBD)</b></li> <li>• <b>1-2 Board of Regents policies for action (TBD)</b></li> </ul>
July 6-8	<b>2016 two-day Board retreat</b> <i>(tentative)</i>

Listed below are the policies on the Board's 2015-16 policy work plan that will come through the Governance & Policy Committee if revisions are recommended by the policy owners or sought by the Board:

1. Board of Regents Policy: *American Indian Advisory Boards*
2. Board of Regents Policy: *Awards, Honors, and Recognition*
3. Board of Regents Policy: *Board Authority*
4. Board of Regents Policy: *Board Policy Development*
5. Board of Regents Policy: *Code of Conduct*
6. Board of Regents Policy: *Foundations at the University*
7. Board of Regents Policy: *Gift Solicitation and Acceptance*
8. Board of Regents Policy: *Individual Conflicts of Interest*
9. Board of Regents Policy: *Institutional Conflict of Interest*
10. Board of Regents Policy: *Legal Defense and Indemnification of Employees*
11. Board of Regents Policy: *Namings*



# BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

---

**Governance & Policy**

**October 8, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM:** Habits of Highly Effective Boards

Review                       Review + Action                       Action                       Discussion

*This is a report required by Board policy.*

**PRESENTERS:** Regent Linda Cohen  
Brian Steeves, Executive Director & Corporate Secretary

## **PURPOSE & KEY POINTS**

The purpose of this item is to review key habits of highly effective boards, as outlined by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), and to facilitate a committee discussion of the extent to which the Board of Regents exhibits those habits today.

Included in the docket is the article [“The 10 Habits of Highly Effective Boards”](#) (Richard D. Legon, *Trusteeship*, March/April 2014). The article details 10 characteristics or habits that help governing boards maximize their governance effectiveness:

1. Create a culture of inclusion.
2. Uphold basic fiduciary principles.
3. Cultivate a healthy relationship with the president.
4. Select an effective board chair.
5. Establish an effective governance committee.
6. Delegate appropriate decision-making authority to committees.
7. Consider strategic risk factors.
8. Provide appropriate oversight of academic quality.
9. Develop a renewed commitment to shared governance.
10. Focus on accountability.

This item also provides an opportunity for the committee to identify or discuss potential development areas for future Board retreats or ongoing Regent education and development.

# The 10 Habits of Highly Effective Boards

Rick Legon, Trusteeship Magazine  
March/April 2014

Most boards of colleges and universities don't reach their fullest potential for effective governance. In fact, many may suffer from boardroom dysfunctions that might not be fully apparent. Yet now, more than ever, boards need to strive toward a higher level of performance. Today's challenges and expectations demand nothing less.

Policy makers, corporate leaders, accreditors, and others are asking much more of higher education and increasingly questioning its quality, efficiency, and effectiveness. They are at the ready to offer advice, comments, and critiques; leverage their influence; and expand their oversight in order to ensure that higher education institutions are achieving their missions and meeting their public purposes. Calls for increased accountability demand a greater degree of transparency, trust, and independence—as well as a boldness that only comes from a smarter and more focused level of engagement by boards and true collaboration with college and university administrators. Getting governance right calls for boards to hit their own “refresh” button as they adapt to changing expectations.

Boards are made up of successful leaders, mostly from outside the academy, who need to respect the culture of the institution they serve. At the same time, they must also recognize that the pace of change requires a new level of fiduciary engagement. In an environment of constant challenges, boards must move to “strategic governance” – which means, primarily, forming a far more robust partnership with institutional leaders.

In fact, the success of any college or university ultimately depends on an effective working relationship between the board and the president. Unfortunately, that relationship has grown strained at too many institutions. In a number of conversations recently, I've sensed the increased pressures of leadership and the related tensions that often result between chief executive officers and their governing bodies. Whether in the traditional areas of board oversight or in other, more expansive aspects of board engagement, we at the Association of Governing Boards see boards asking more questions and presidents wondering whether the line between policy and administration has become so frayed that it has largely disappeared.

Voluntary boards can't and shouldn't be trying to manage the complex structures and issues of higher education. At the same time, however, presidents and chancellors shouldn't be seeking to limit board involvement in the strategic challenges confronting their institutions. The stakes for higher education today are too high, and boards, which hold ultimate authority, should expect to be full partners.

The truth is that presidents can't succeed in a vacuum, and visionary leadership requires support as well as a sense of partnership – between the board and the president, and with the participation of faculty members and other key stakeholders – to meet institutional goals. Higher education is grappling with some fundamental shifts that require new, entrepreneurial thinking. How that plays out in the boardroom requires a willingness on the part of boards to take, and administrators to welcome, a fresh look at how governance is implemented.

The men and women who serve on a college, university, or system governing boards would do well to recognize that they must collaborate with and support campus administrators in order for their

## TAKEAWAYS

There are 10 characteristics and habits of boards that meet the test of strategic governance. Highly effective boards:

1. Create a culture of inclusion.
2. Uphold basic fiduciary principles.
3. Cultivate a healthy relationship with the president.
4. Select an effective board chair.
5. Establish an effective governance committee.
6. Delegate appropriate decision-making authority to committees.
7. Consider strategic risk factors.
8. Provide appropriate oversight of academic quality.
9. Develop a renewed commitment to shared governance.
10. Focus on accountability.

institution to achieve its mission and succeed. For their part, presidents and chancellors, who depend on board support, must recognize that we are in a moment (one that is unlikely to change any time soon) when board members will assert their thoughts and expectations. A new standard of board engagement—reflected through broader awareness, curiosity, imagination, and input—will enable boards to meet the realities of reduced state support for public institutions, tuition and other revenue challenges at all institutions, and new and disruptive approaches to delivering an academic program. Boards will be better positioned to consider and assess risk. And, they will come to understand that their most essential value during these times of change may be as the story tellers of their institution’s mission, value, and impact.

The goal is to make this higher level of board engagement work—for the students who expect our institutions to meet their needs, for policy makers who want to be sure that the public’s investment in higher education is providing collective societal benefits, and for others among our stakeholder groups who care about the product that we offer.

## **THE ART OF GETTING GOVERNANCE RIGHT**

High performance should be the goal of the governing bodies of all institutions and systems. So, how can boards become more effective? AGB’s National Commission on College and University Board Governance, under the leadership of former Governor Philip N. Bredesen (D-TN), is working to ensure that boards have the capacity and awareness to meet their responsibilities in an era that often calls for answers to challenging problems. We will share the commission’s recommendations this fall.

In the meantime, based on my experience of more than 30 years working with boards and their institutions, I’d like to share a list of 10 characteristics and habits that I believe meet the test of strategic governance through high performance. High-performing boards:

### **1. CREATE A CULTURE OF INCLUSION**

The importance of board culture shouldn’t be overlooked by boards committed to making a difference. Highly effective boards have a culture of engagement built upon a commitment to inquiry—knowing that it is better to ask the hard questions within the structure of the board’s meetings than to publicly critique board decisions after the fact. Establishing a culture within the board that facilitates the kind of strategic consideration and decisions so essential for the times requires that all important issues be put on the table and that all board members become aware of those issues. Such a culture relies upon a structure that encourages smart engagement—based on dashboards, metrics, and other meaningful data that inform decisions and provide transparency—especially between the board and the administration.

Strategic governance works best when boards understand the business of higher education and the stakes involved. That requires a commitment to what matters most: the priorities of the business model in an environment where revenue and expense decisions are increasingly uncertain, strategies for teaching and learning are changing quickly, and the public’s trust in higher education is eroding and must be reclaimed.

### **2. UPHOLD BASIC FIDUCIARY PRINCIPLES**

The legal expectations of the duties of care, loyalty, and obedience are the essentials of board responsibility. Board members should be aware of what each principle requires of them as individual trustees as well as part of the board as a whole, and how those principles relate to the hard work of serving on a governing body of a college or university. Those basic principles should, along with more specific institutional issues and priorities, frame the board’s orientation program. They reinforce that the board is accountable for the reputation and independence of the institution it serves.

The principles call upon boards to recognize that they hold ultimate authority and should act both independently and prudently in making policy decisions and meeting their responsibilities. Board



members should be informed about, and focus their actions on, what is in the best interests of their college or university. The institution and its mission and needs—not the interests of any other party and especially not a board member’s personal interests—should inform the decisions of the full board.

Certainly, individuals who are appointed or elected to boards of public institutions have a responsibility to meet state interests and broader statewide agendas; serving the public interest is always an element of a board’s fiduciary responsibility. However, loyalty and commitment to institutional priorities and interests should remain paramount.

The fundamental fiduciary principles also serve to remind board members that the parameters of their voluntary commitment are not unlike the decision-making standards of corporate law: Members should not presume any individual authority to make policy decisions. Asking the hard questions, demonstrating periodic skepticism when merited, and even expressing strong and dissenting views are all appropriate and welcome elements of board-member engagement. Yet the board acting as a whole must make the final decisions and meet its fiduciary responsibility to hold the institution in trust. Boards should enforce a process of principled discipline when one of their members presumes a level of personal authority to which fiduciary authority does not extend.

### **3. CULTIVATE A HEALTHY RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PRESIDENT**

Today, we need boards and presidents to work actively to establish a strong working relationship—again, perhaps the most fundamental element of achieving a higher level of board performance. Strategic governance is about the board as a “thought partner” with the chief executive.

Many presidents, however overwhelmed by the nature of today’s expectations, express concerns that their board is less a partner and more a hindrance. Yet, policy makers and an increasingly skeptical public are demanding that presidents be inclusive in addressing today’s difficult challenges. I go back to my opening comments: Successful institutional leaders are those who meaningfully involve their governing body so that it is in the best position to offer full support, help frame bold decisions, and then advocate on the institution’s behalf with the public.

That said, boards that are most effective understand the scope and the limits of their responsibilities. Thomas Jefferson referred to board members of his beloved University of Virginia as “visitors.” His was a healthy reminder that board members must be smart in balancing their interest, engagement, and authority—their role in oversight and policy setting—with a clear understanding that the actual management of the institution should be left to its top administrators.

Effective boards, while strategically engaged, will look to the CEO to set a course and establish a vision. Ultimately the objective of strategic governance is to achieve a level of mutual objectives, but effective boards must put a high degree of trust in the leadership they selected with the expectation that strategic goals will be achieved.

It is a balancing act: Boards should enhance engagement in the areas where they must participate and be accountable for overall outcomes, while also supporting strong presidential leadership.

### **4. SELECT AN EFFECTIVE BOARD CHAIR**

Board chairs are selected for a variety of reasons: stature, trust, leadership skills, external connections, length of service, gubernatorial influence, personal philanthropy, and others. But such criteria may not be what’s needed in this era of constant change. A high-performing board requires a leader who can support and facilitate a model of strategic governance, develop an essential and candid relationship with the chief executive officer, have the respect of his or her board colleagues, understand and respect academic culture, and ensure that the full board is focused on issues that matter.

The board chair and president must have a relationship that allows for candor yet is also mutually supportive. The specific traits of a board chair of a highly effective board include:

- A sense of partnership with the chief executive;
- Experience leading voluntary boards of complex organizations;
- An understanding of the challenges and opportunities facing the institution;
- A willingness to focus the board and its members on issues that matter rather than those that are neither the province of the board nor necessarily the most important strategic challenges;
- A familiarity with the interests of the institution's internal and external stakeholders, and the ability to represent the board to those groups; and
- A readiness to be the voice of the board as both an advocate and a storyteller to key external constituents, in coordination with institutional leadership.

## **5. ESTABLISH A STRONG GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

As state and federal policy makers, accreditors, and external critics shine a spotlight on board governance and accountability, it is essential that boards own the oversight of their own performance. Today's board committee structures require an active governance committee that oversees effective board governance, whether at a private institution, public institution, or system.

While boards of public institutions are likely to have less direct influence on new board appointments, they, like their private-institution peers, should delegate oversight of board effectiveness to a governance committee. No other board committee is as essential to overall board structure and accountability as this one. And, the selection of the governance committee's chair should be no less important than the selection of the chair of the board. Done correctly, the governance committee can have an enormous impact on strategic governance and improve board performance significantly.

Boards must monitor their own overall performance and take seriously the behavior and ethics of their members. High-performing boards ensure that institutional policies about trustee responsibilities, ethical behavior, and conflicts of interest are current and enforced. An active governance committee should monitor and act upon any lapses.

Related to the work of the governance committee is a focus on building the board that is needed to meet an institution's current priorities. Boards that can influence board appointments (mostly those at independent institutions) should focus on breadth of expertise and commitment among the people being considered to serve on the board. Carefully and intentionally building a board profile with a mix of skills and expertise, and developing future board leadership from among respected and knowledgeable board members, can make a significant difference to a board's ability to achieve a higher level of performance.

Public and private boards should be sure that their makeup addresses the full breadth of expertise necessary to contribute to the strategic issues confronting institutions. Including men and women on the board who understand the business of the academy should be a priority.

## **6. DELEGATE APPROPRIATE DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEES**

Boards that engage in strategic governance allocate a span of policy-making authority to standing committees while enabling the full board to focus on more strategic issues. Boards should trust that committees will do important work and have a substantial ability to present action decisions and recommendations that are fully vetted.

Committee agendas should focus on issues that matter to the strategic direction of the institution; committee meetings that are repetitive and committees with overly restricted authority invite limited engagement and interest. Rather than structure committee meetings merely to receive staff reports, administrators and committee chairs should work together to frame strategic agendas.

How often should the full board meet? Enough meetings should be scheduled to adequately address the business of the institution and the board, and to meet public expectations. Boards of independent institutions that meet fewer than four times each year plus a periodic retreat are likely going to underperform. Boards of public institutions that meet almost monthly may be overdoing their oversight responsibility and ultimately diminishing their effectiveness, while limiting the capacity of the administration to lead with confidence. It should also be noted that substituting executive committee meetings for full board meetings as a pro forma process, while perhaps facilitating decision making, will send signals that will lead to limited interest and engagement among board members. It is also less likely to lead to the level of performance and collaboration that is essential for today's expectations for board accountability.

## **7. CONSIDER STRATEGIC RISK FACTORS**

Effective boards should look at key challenges through the prism of "risk." Enterprise risk management (ERM), a common business practice used by many board members in their day jobs, facilitates a smart model of decision making for boards. The process of assessing risk factors and making policy decisions based upon them allows boards to ask questions and make choices in collaboration with senior administrators in line with the level of risk tolerance that the institution might have concerning a specific initiative. That can include anything from investing in change by accepting the upside of a bold initiative to mitigating threats or avoiding some initiatives that might run too high a risk to the business model.

## **8. PROVIDE APPROPRIATE OVERSIGHT OF ACADEMIC QUALITY**

In *Making the Grade: How Boards Can Ensure Academic Quality* (AGB Press, 2nd Edition, 2012), Peter T. Ewell says that a board's oversight of the academic quality and outcomes of an institution is as important as oversight of its fiscal conditions. AGB board chair Jim Geringer often reminds boards that they are responsible for ensuring that their students have learned what they were promised they'd learn upon admission. Their statements highlight the fact that, as colleges and universities face challenges and questions about how best to deliver upon the promise of higher education, boards must recognize their ultimate responsibility for ensuring a high-quality learning experience for students.

As a result, boards must become as aware of issues that define quality and educational outcomes as they are about fiscal concerns. Strategic academic affairs committees that call for and analyze metrics about quality and outcomes will help boards engage in an area that they have avoided too often.

The quality of our academic programs also mandates that boards understand and engage with academic administrators and faculty members in more meaningful discussions. This isn't about boards substituting their authority for that of faculty members in designing academic programs or courses. Rather, it is a recognition that boards need to understand the essential purpose of the institutions that they oversee.

## **9. DEVELOP A RENEWED COMMITMENT TO SHARED GOVERNANCE**

Bold change requires a sense of teamwork and collaboration, and high-performing boards need to recognize that their authority for strategic decision making is a multi-stakeholder process. Boards that choose to act precipitously or presume a top-down management style in making decisions will likely reap only counterproductive results.

AGB's advocacy of "integral leadership" as a means for collaborative decision making emphasizes the basic tenets of shared governance. There is a long and often contentious history about how best to engage all parties in institutional strategies, especially boards and faculty members. Today, those challenges of collaboration are compounded by a changing faculty makeup (for instance, the growing number of adjuncts) and that faculty's commitment to institutional governance.

The need for an inclusive process to factor in all the implications of fiscal, academic, and human-resource challenges is apparent. Effective boards will, along with senior administrators, seek to establish

meaningful methods of engagement and recognize the importance of collaboration with each other and the faculty.

## 10. FOCUS ON ACCOUNTABILITY

Ultimately, highly effective boards recognize that they are accountable for higher education's most fundamental principles: institutional autonomy and independence, the protection of academic freedom, and service to a public purpose. Governmental efforts to increase oversight through institutional ratings and major changes to accreditation, while designed to address essential concerns about cost and value, must not infringe upon these most essential values of higher education. How well boards meet their own responsibility to be accountable will significantly influence American higher education's future. Ours is a unique model of institutional policy setting; it depends upon boards and their individual members being fully aware of the stakes associated with being accountable and demonstrating a strong commitment to protecting the inherent principles that define their work.

These are uncertain times for higher education. While we in the United States have the world's most outstanding and varied higher education system, calls for significant change abound. Responding to those calls will require a new level of collaboration, inclusive of presidential vision, faculty participation, and focused board engagement. Whether a board moves to a higher level of strategic governance will require new understandings, with presidents who are open and willing to partner with their boards, and with boards that demonstrate they comprehend the task ahead.

How we do governance is getting a lot of attention. We need to work together to get it right.

---

*About the Author:*

Richard D. Legon is president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. He serves as a trustee of Spelman College.

# 10 Habits of Highly Effective Boards

1. **Create a culture of inclusion**—commitment to inquiry; all key issues on the table and all Board members aware of those issues; a structure of smart engagement based on meaningful data that inform decisions; transparency, especially between Board and administration
2. **Uphold basic fiduciary principles**—duties of care, loyalty, and obedience; decisions support interests of institution above any other interests; Board acts as a whole to make final decisions
3. **Cultivate a healthy relationship with the president**—“thought partner” with president; balance between accountability for overall outcomes and supporting strong executive leadership
4. **Select an effective board chair**—model of strategic governance; candid relationship with president; respect from board colleagues; full Board focused on issues that matter
5. **Establish an effective governance committee**—ownership of oversight of Board’s own performance
6. **Delegate appropriate decision-making authority to committees**—policy-making authority to standing committees; substantial ability to present action decisions and fully vetted recommendations; agendas focused on issues that matter to strategic direction of institution
7. **Consider strategic risk factors**—key challenges framed through enterprise risk management lens
8. **Provide appropriate oversight of academic quality**—board as aware of quality issues and educational outcomes as of fiscal concerns; committees that call for and analyze quality and outcome metrics
9. **Develop a renewed commitment to shared governance**—an inclusive process that factors in all implications of fiscal, academic, and human resource challenges
10. **Focus on accountability**—accountable to higher ed’s fundamental principles: institutional autonomy and independence, protection of academic freedom, and service to a public purpose





# BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

---

**Governance & Policy**

**October 8, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM:** Board Policy Review Process

Review                       Review + Action                       Action                       Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

**PRESENTERS:** Jason Langworthy, Board Associate, Policy & Committees, Office of the Board of Regents

## **PURPOSE & KEY POINTS**

The purpose of this discussion is to provide Regents with an overview of the current Board policy review process. The presentation will include a review of the process and examples of policy review from the current work plan.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Board of Regents Policy: *Board Operations and Agenda Guidelines* Article II. Subd. 8. states that the executive director & corporate secretary manages the Board’s policy library and ongoing policy review process. Board of Regents Policy: *Board Policy Development* defines the policies of the Board, distinguishes them from other University policies, and describes the process through which Board policies are developed and adopted.

## **Types of Review**

Board policies undergo three main types of review and change:

### 1. Comprehensive Review

The purpose of the comprehensive review is to determine:

- Whether the fundamental principles established in the policy still align with the strategic direction and mission of the University.
- If the policy is still needed.
- Whether the policy aligns with current practice.

The comprehensive review also ensures that policies are monitored and reviewed in a timely manner. Each of the 92 Board policies is comprehensively reviewed every six years. Policies are divided into “classes,” which seek to balance review load across policy owners and Board

committees. Comprehensive review does not automatically lead to changes in a given policy; policies not requiring amendments are noted as current and placed back into the review cycle.

## 2. Off-Cycle Change

Off-cycle changes to Board policies focus on specific, essential, and time-sensitive changes and are outside of the comprehensive review cycle. When opened for an off-cycle change, the policy is not comprehensively reviewed and remains in its regular review cycle. Off-cycle changes follow the policy review process.

## 3. Technical Change

Board of Regents Policy: *Board Policy Development* Section III. allows for minor corrections that do not alter the substance of the policy to be made by the executive director & corporate secretary, with review by the Board chair. Examples of past technical corrections include updating Board of Regents Policy: *Foundations at the University* to reflect the merger between the Minnesota Medical Foundation and UMF and revising Board of Regents Policy: *Student Representatives to the Board of Regents* to reflect changes in the Board's committee structure. Technical changes are noted on the policy and updated in the Board's policy index. OBR archives a previous version of the policy.

## Policy Review Process

The policy review process has the following steps:

1. OBR develops a policy work plan annually to identify which policies will be comprehensively reviewed in the coming year. The Board receives this work plan at its July meeting. The 2015-16 policy work plan is included in the docket.
2. After a policy is identified for comprehensive review or for an off-cycle change, OBR coordinates the review process with the policy owner. Policy owners are the senior leader offices that oversee the implementation of a Board policy. A list of Board policies by policy owner is included in the docket.
3. The policy owner reviews the policy and determines if changes are needed. Policies not requiring changes are noted as being current by OBR and placed back into the review cycle.
4. The policy owner drafts proposed language to the policy, consulting with key stakeholders. Stakeholders vary by policy. The amount of time needed to complete this step fluctuates based on the scope and potential impact of the changes being considered.
5. The policy owner submits an initial revision draft to OBR. OBR reviews proposed language for content, compliance with other Board policies, and format.
6. After initial review of the draft, the majority of Board policies are consulted with the University Senate. Depending on the content of the policy, a committee(s) or one of the senates reviews the policy.
7. OBR coordinates a Board Policy Group with representatives from OBR, the Office of the President, the Office of the General Counsel, and the Office of Internal Audits. This group makes a final review of proposed language before the Board considers the policy.

8. The appropriate Board committee reviews the policy. If changes are needed, OBR works with the policy owner to make those revisions before the policy returns for action.
9. The appropriate Board committee and the full Board take action. If the policy is approved, OBR updates the policy and posts the new version to the Board's online policy index. OBR also maintains an archive of all past policy versions.





## Office of the Board of Regents 2015-16 Policy Work Plan

---

### OBJECTIVES

Each year, the Office of the Board of Regents builds an annual policy work plan that includes policies selected based on the period of time since the policy was last formally reviewed or because a request for inclusion was made by the Board or the President. After the Board reviews this work plan at the July meeting, policies may only be added upon request of the Board or the President.

Policies for Review in 2015-16	Last Reviewed/ Amended	Policy Owner
1. Academic Misconduct	March 2010	Academic Affairs
2. American Indian Advisory Boards	January 1994	Equity and Diversity
3. Board Authority	March 2009	Office of the Board of Regents
4. Board Policy Development	March 2009	Office of the Board of Regents
5. Code of Conduct <sup>^</sup>	December 2006	Office of the President
6. College Constitutions	March 2010	Academic Affairs
7. Eminent Domain	July 2009	General Counsel
8. Equity, Diversity, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action	July 2009	Equity and Diversity
9. Foundations at the University	March 1994	General Counsel
10. Gift Solicitation and Acceptance <sup>^</sup>	March 1994	General Counsel
11. Individual Conflicts of Interest	March 2010	Office of the President
12. Institutional Conflict of Interest	July 2012	Office of the President
13. Purchasing <sup>^</sup>	July 2008	Budget and Finance
14. Research Involving Human Subjects	September 2012	Research
15. Student Services Fee <sup>^</sup>	June 2005	Academic Affairs
16. Tuition and Fees	June 2013	Academic Affairs

<sup>^</sup> - Indicates polices carried over from the 2014-15 Policy Work Plan.



## Office of the Board of Regents Board of Regents Policy Owners

Policy assignments are subject to change at the discretion of the Board Chair based on the nature of proposed amendments or other factors. There are 92 Board policies.

Policy	Committee
<b>Policy Owner: Office of the Board of Regents</b>	
1. Appointments to Organizations and Boards	GOV
2. Awards, Honors, and Recognition	GOV
3. Board Authority	GOV
4. Board Operations and Agenda Guidelines	GOV
5. Board Policy Development	GOV
6. Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Regents	GOV
7. Founding Date, Corporate Name and Seal, And University Marks	GOV
8. Mission Statement	GOV
9. Namings	GOV
10. Reservation and Delegation of Authority	GOV
11. Responsibilities of the Board and Individual Regents	GOV
12. Student Representatives to the Board of Regents	GOV
<b>Policy Owner: Office of the President</b>	
1. Alcoholic Beverages on Campus	GOV
2. Appearances Before the Legislature and Other Public Bodies	FSA
3. Awards, Honors, and Recognition	GOV
4. Code of Conduct	GOV
5. Intercollegiate Athletics – Twin Cities Campus	ASA
6. Individual Conflicts of Interest	GOV
7. Institutional Conflicts of Interest	GOV
8. Namings	GOV
<b>Policy Owner: Academic Affairs &amp; Provost</b>	
1. Academic Freedom and Responsibility	ASA
2. Academic Misconduct	ASA
3. Accessioning and Deaccessioning of Museum Collections	ASA
4. College Constitutions	ASA
5. Conflict Resolution Process for Student Academic Complaints	ASA
6. Copyright	ASA
7. Disability Services	ASA
8. Faculty Tenure	FSA
9. International Education and Engagement	ASA
10. Libraries and Archives	ASA
11. Outside Consulting and Other Commitments	FSA
12. Reserve Officer Training Corps	ASA
13. Student Conduct Code	ASA
14. Student Education Records	ASA
15. Student Financial Aid	ASA
16. Student Services Fee	ASA
17. Tuition and Fees	ASA

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Committee</b>
<b>Policy Owner: Office of Equity and Diversity</b>	
1. American Indian Advisory Boards	GOV
2. Equity, Diversity, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action	ASA
<b>Policy Owner: Office of the General Counsel</b>	
1. Associated Organizations	GOV
2. Attorneys and Related Services	GOV
3. Eminent Domain	FAC
4. Foundations at the University	GOV
5. Gifts Received and Given by Regents and University Officials	GOV
6. Gift Solicitation and Acceptance	GOV
7. Legal Claims and Settlements	GOV
8. Legal Defense and Indemnification of Employees	GOV
9. Legal Review of Contracts and Transactions	GOV
10. Possession and Carry of Weapons	GOV
11. Protection of Individual Health Information	GOV
12. Safety of Minors	FSA
<b>Policy Owner: Health Sciences</b>	
1. Private Practice Plan - University of Minnesota School of Dentistry	FSA
2. Private Practice Plan - University of Minnesota Medical School Twin Cities	FSA
3. Private Practice Plan - University of Minnesota School of Nursing	FSA
4. Private Professional Practice - University of Minnesota Medical School Duluth	FSA
5. Professional Service Plan - University of Minnesota College of Pharmacy	FSA
<b>Policy Owner: Office of Human Resources</b>	
1. Conflict Resolution Process for Employees	FSA
2. Employee Compensation and Recognition	FSA
3. Employee Development, Education, and Training	FSA
4. Employee Group Definitions	FSA
5. Employee Health Benefits	FSA
6. Employee Performance Evaluation and Development	FSA
7. Employee Recruitment and Retention	FSA
8. Employee Work-Life and Personal Leaves	FSA
9. Employees Campaigning For or Holding Public Office	FSA
10. Faculty and Staff Retirement	FSA
11. Faculty Emeriti	FSA
12. Faculty Tenure	FSA
13. Nepotism and Personal Relationships	FSA
14. Postemployment	FSA
15. Sexual Harassment	FSA
<b>Policy Owner: Office of Internal Audits</b>	
1. Audit Committee Charter	AUD
2. Internal Control	AUD

Policy	Committee
<b>Policy Owner: Office of the Vice President for Research</b>	
1. Activities Involving Recombinant DNA or Other Potentially Hazardous Biological Agents	ASA
2. Animal Care and Use	ASA
3. Commercialization of Intellectual Property	ASA
4. Openness in Research	ASA
5. Research Involving Human Subjects	ASA
6. Submitting and Accepting Sponsored Projects	ASA
7. University of Minnesota Press	ASA
<b>Policy Owner: University Finance</b>	
1. Central Reserve Fund	FIN
2. Debt Transactions	FIN
3. Direct Sales of Goods and Services	FIN
4. Endowment Fund	FIN
5. Investment Functions	FIN
6. Investment of Reserves	FIN
7. Purchasing	FIN
8. Targeted Business, Urban Community Economic Development, and Small Business Programs	FIN
9. Tuition and Fees	ASA
<b>Policy Owner: University Services</b>	
1. Campus Public Art	FAC
2. Health and Safety	FAC
3. Historic Preservation	FAC
4. Property and Facility Use	FAC
5. Selection of Design Professionals	FAC
6. Sustainability and Energy Efficiency	FAC
7. Wage Rates for Contractors	FAC

# Board Policy Review Process

Jason Langworthy  
Board Associate, Policy & Committees  
Office of the Board of Regents



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

**Driven to Discover**<sup>SM</sup>

# Policy Work Plan

- 92 Board policies
- Comprehensively reviewed every six years
- Policies are divided into six “classes”
- 15-16 policies make up each work plan



# Technical Change

- Changes such as University names, structure, or academic titles
- Minor errors such as typos



# Comprehensive Review

- Do the principles established in the policy still align with University's strategic direction and mission?
- Does the policy align with current practice?
- Is the policy is still needed?





# Comprehensive Review

## Outcomes:

- No revisions needed
  - *College Constitutions*
- Held over
  - *Student Services Fee*
- Action
  - *American Indian Advisory Boards*



# Off-Cycle Change

Specific, essential, and time-sensitive changes that fall outside of the comprehensive review cycle.

- *Commercialization of Intellectual Property Rights*





# BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

---

**Governance & Policy**

**October 8, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM:** Board of Regents Policy: *American Indian Advisory Boards*

**Review**                       **Review + Action**                       **Action**                       **Discussion**

*This is a report required by Board policy.*

**PRESENTERS:**     Katrice A. Albert, Vice President for Equity and Diversity  
                             Tadd Johnson, Director, Master of Tribal Administration and Governance  
                             Program, University of Minnesota Duluth

## **PURPOSE & KEY POINTS**

The Office for Equity and Diversity (OED) will provide an overview of the proposed changes to Board of Regents Policy: *American Indian Advisory Boards*. Over the past year, OED discerned an increased need to revive the American Indian Advisory Board (Advisory Board) and increase its membership and scope. Proposed amendments to the policy will enable the new Advisory Board to make broader recommendations for the entire University system regarding contemporary issues of importance to Minnesota's 11 tribal nations.

The major hallmarks of the revised policy include the:

- Inclusion of representatives from each of the 11 Minnesota tribal nations on the Advisory Board.
- Inclusion of a representative from each of the University's campuses appointed by the individual campus chancellors.
- Expanded scope of identifying resources for American Indian undergraduate scholarships and graduate and professional school fellowships.
- Role of assisting in the development of strategies for recruitment, retention, and talent development of American Indian faculty and staff.

Because of the number and breadth of the proposed revisions to the policy, the docket includes the current and revised policies as separate documents.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The University has had a long-standing policy regarding American Indian Advisory Boards across the system campuses. The Board of Regents adopted the current policy in January 1994.

The draft policy was shared with each of the tribal nations, and OED has been in conversation and consultation with several other groups and individuals, including:

- University senior leaders
- Department of American Indian Studies, Twin Cities campus
- Faculty, staff, and students at a Circle of Indigenous Nations event.
- Chancellors from the system campuses, as well as their faculty and staff who work most closely with American Indian communities and issues
- Tadd Johnson, director of the Master of Tribal Administration and Governance program on the Duluth campus
- American Indian Education Committee
- Social Concerns Committee of the University Senate

Included in the docket materials for the Board's reference is an article about American Indian-focused resources at the University. The article appeared in the July/August 2015 issue of *Insight Into Diversity* magazine, the oldest and largest diversity-focused publication in higher education.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

# BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 1 of 3

Academic

## AMERICAN INDIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Adopted: January 14, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

Draft for Review

## AMERICAN INDIAN ADVISORY BOARD

### **SECTION I. SCOPE.**

This policy governs the establishment and duties of the American Indian Advisory Board (Advisory Board) for the University of Minnesota (University).

### **SECTION II. DEFINITIONS.**

**Subd. 1. Tribal Nations.** *Tribal Nations* refers to Minnesota's seven Anishinaabe (Chippewa, Ojibwe) reservations and four Dakota (Sioux) communities. As defined by the State of Minnesota's Indian Affairs Council, a reservation or community is a segment of land that belongs to one more groups of American Indians. Those reservations or communities are:

- Anishinaabe reservations:
  - Grand Portage
  - Bois Forte
  - Red Lake
  - White Earth
  - Leech Lake
  - Fond du Lac
  - Mille Lacs
- Dakota communities:
  - Shakopee Mdewakanton
  - Prairie Island
  - Lower Sioux
  - Upper Sioux

### **SECTION III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES.**

**Subd. 1. Commitment.** The University is committed to advancing excellence through the transformative power of equity and diversity. As such, creating an accessible and inclusive environment where everyone has the opportunity to thrive is a core value. As a land-grant institution, the University is committed to serving all citizens of the state. This advisory board will ensure that the University and community work together to strengthen the full and inclusive participation of American Indians at the University.

**Section 2. Establishment of Advisory Board.** The Board of Regents (Board) directs that the University administration establish and maintain an Advisory Board that convenes on the Twin Cities campus, reviews issues as defined in Section V., subd. 1. of this policy, and makes recommendations for the University. The Advisory Board is advisory to the president and overall responsibility for the Advisory Board resides with the Office for Equity & Diversity (OED).



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

# BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 2 of 3

Academic

## AMERICAN INDIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Adopted: January 14, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

Draft for Review

### SECTION IV. MEMBERSHIP.

**Subd. 1. Advisory Board Membership.** The Advisory Board will be comprised of members representing each of the eleven Tribal Nations of Minnesota and a representative from the State of Minnesota's Urban Indian Advisory Council. The Advisory Board will also include eight University representatives, including representation from the following:

- (a) chair of the Department of American Indian Studies;
- (b) president of the American Indian Faculty & Staff Association;
- (c) president of the American Indian Student Cultural Center;
- (d) a representative from the Circle of Indigenous Nations (COIN);
- (e) a representative from each of the system campuses recommended by the respective chancellor.

Positions a-c shall rotate between similar positions from each of the system campuses. A member may represent both a Tribal Nation and the University.

The Advisory Board shall not exceed 21 members and will be co-chaired by the vice president for Equity & Diversity (vice president) and a Tribal leader appointed by the president.

**Subd. 2. Appointment.** Each Tribal Nation chairperson will recommend a representative, and identify an alternate, to serve on the Advisory Board. OED senior staff will review all names received for both Tribal Nation and University representatives and make recommendations to the vice president. The vice president shall appoint members to serve a three-year term, unless their appointment is because of specific leadership appointment and shall rotate with the election cycle.

### SECTION V. DUTIES

**Subd. 1. Responsibilities.** The Advisory Board will serve as liaison between the American Indian communities and the University. The Advisory Board will offer meaningful consultation with the Advisory Board co-chairs on:

- (a) matters related to university programs and services on behalf of American Indian students;
- (b) strategies and promising practices to encourage and foster the recruitment, retention, and graduation of American Indian students;
- (c) strategies and promising practices to encourage and foster recruitment, retention, talent development, and promotion of American Indian faculty and staff;
- (d) strategies to identify resources for undergraduate scholarships and graduate and professional school fellowships and strategies to identify resources to support tuition waivers that are supported in federal mandates and state statutes ;
- (e) efforts to develop and increase support for American Indian educational advancement through public relations efforts at the community, state, and federal levels;
- (f) matters related to promoting American Indian culture in the research enterprise; and
- (g) strategies to promote actively the utilization of businesses owned and operated by members of Minnesota's tribal nations and the state's urban American Indian communities;

**Subd. 2. Policy Recommendations.** The co-chairs will review the recommendations of the Advisory Board and make policy recommendations to the vice president. The vice president will work with



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
**BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 3 of 3

Academic

**AMERICAN INDIAN ADVISORY  
BOARD**

**Adopted:** January 14, 1994

**Supersedes:** (see end of policy)

Draft for Review

appropriate administrative and/or collegiate units across the University to consider the recommendations and appropriate action to these recommendations. The co-chairs will update the Advisory Board on the status of their recommendations and to seek their feedback and meaningful consultation.

**Subd. 3. Annual Report.** The co-chairs will submit an annual report to the president in meaningful consultation with the Advisory Board.

**Subd. 4. Meetings.** The Advisory Board will meet at least two times a year.

**Supersedes:** American Indian Advisory Boards dated March 13, 1981.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

# BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 1 of 1

Academic

## AMERICAN INDIAN ADVISORY BOARDS

Adopted: January 14, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

### AMERICAN INDIAN ADVISORY BOARDS

**Subd. 1. Establishment of Advisory Board.** The Board of Regents has directed that the University administration establish an American Indian Advisory Board on each campus enrolling American Indian students. The boards are to be advisory to the chief executive officer of each campus and are to be constituted to broadly reflect the relevant American Indian communities.

**Subd. 2. Advisory Board Responsibilities.** The advisory boards will serve as liaisons between the American Indian communities and the University of Minnesota. The advisory boards will consult with the chief executive officer of each campus on matters related to campus programs and services on behalf of American Indian students; interests and concerns of the immediate American Indian community; methods to encourage and foster the educational advancement of American Indian students in admissions, retention, and achievement of educational objectives; and efforts to develop and increase support for American Indian educational advancement through public relations efforts at the community, state, and federal levels.

**Subd. 3. Presidential Responsibilities.** The president will meet with representatives of the American Indian Advisory Boards to seek their input, guidance, and advice concerning the educational advancement of American Indian students University-wide and the achievement of the University's diversity goals. The president will review the recommendations of the advisory boards and instruct appropriate administrative units to address them. The president will meet with the advisory boards again to update them on the status of their recommendations and to seek their feedback and further advice. The president will submit an annual report to the Board of Regents after consultation with the advisory board chairs.

**Supersedes:** American Indian Advisory Boards dated March 13, 1981.



# Office for **Equity and Diversity**

## American Indian Advisory Board Policy

Katrice A. Albert, Ph.D.  
Vice President for Equity and Diversity

Professor Tadd Johnson, Esq.  
Director, Master of Tribal Administration and Governance  
Program,  
University of Minnesota Duluth

October 8, 2015

“We must fully leverage the special opportunities of our location and the full range of our state and regional assets—communities, businesses, government and nonprofit partners, and cultural assets from performance groups to museums and libraries. Moreover, we must do this with a spirit of reciprocity, guided by a commitment to engagement that insures mutual benefit.”

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA-TWIN CITIES  
STRATEGIC PLAN  
OCTOBER 2014

# Questions for Consideration

- How might the University leverage its relationship with the American Indian Advisory Board to support it in navigating complex issues?
- How does the revised policy enhance the relationship between the University of Minnesota leadership and the state's 11 tribal nations?

# Policy History

- Created in 1981
- Current version adopted in 1994
- The boards are to be advisory to the chief executive officer of each campus and are to be constituted to broadly reflect the relevant American Indian communities.

# Proposed Policy Revisions

- One board which is consistent with a systems approach and aligned with the “One University” model.
- More nimble and definitive of duties and responsibilities.
- The inclusion of representatives from each of the 11 Minnesota tribal nations on the Board.
- An expanded scope that includes identifying financial resources for American Indian students and assisting in the development of recruitment and retention strategies for American Indian faculty and staff.
- The inclusion of a representative from each of the University’s campuses appointed by the individual campus Chancellors.

# Consultative Partners

The draft policy was shared with each of the tribal nations, as well as several other groups and individuals, including:

- Tadd Johnson, director of the Master of Tribal Administration and Governance program on the Duluth campus
- University of Minnesota senior leaders, including system chancellors and those they consulted
- Department of American Indian Studies, Twin Cities campus
- Department of American Indian Studies, Duluth campus
- Students, faculty, and staff at a Circle of Indigenous Nations Policy revision feedback session
- Social Concerns Committee of the University Senate
- American Indian Education Committee, Minnesota Department of Education

# Sovereignty Matters

- The Minnesota Indian Affairs Council signed a resolution to support the establishment of a Tribal Sovereignty Institute at the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD), which:
  - Represents the shared goal of promoting the understanding of tribal sovereignty through education and research.
  - Builds upon work already happening at UMD, where more than 1,000 state employees have recently received training about American Indian history, the unique status of tribes as sovereign nations, and how to engage with tribal governments.
  - The Tribal Sovereignty Institute also fulfills Governor Mark Dayton’s executive order (13-10) to strengthen tribal relationships with state government agencies, as well as UMD’s mission of serving the educational needs of indigenous people.

# Discussion

- How might the University leverage its relationship with the American Indian Advisory Board to support it in navigating complex issues?
- How does the revised policy enhance the relationship between the University of Minnesota leadership and the state's 11 tribal nations?





# BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

---

**Governance & Policy**

**October 8, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM:** Board of Regents Policy: *Namings*

**Review**                       **Review + Action**                       **Action**                       **Discussion**

*This is a report required by Board policy.*

**PRESENTERS:** Amy Phenix, Chief of Staff

## **PURPOSE & KEY POINTS**

To review amendments to Board of Regents Policy: *Namings*. The proposed amendments include:

- Inserting a new section (Section II. (f)) to clarify that Significant University Assets may not be named in honor of current or former members of the Board of Regents (Board) except as provided in Section V of this policy. Such gift related namings may not include the title "Regent" or "Regent Emeritus."
- Narrowing Section III. Subd. 1. to remove lectureships, fellowships, professorships, and chairs from the definition of "Significant University Assets," as the namings for these academic assets are managed by a process that differs from the assets included in the definition.
- Clarifying in Section V. Subd. 2. (b) that the naming committee is not a standing committee with set membership, but is instead a group, with participation from the University Honors Committee, recognized University foundation officials, and academic and administrative officers dependent on the specific asset to be named, assembled to recommend namings to the president.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Board of Regents Policy: *Namings* was adopted on June 11, 2010.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
**BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 1 of 5

Administrative

**NAMINGS**

Adopted: June 11, 2010

Draft for Review

**NAMINGS**

**SECTION I. SCOPE.**

The policy governs the namings of significant University of Minnesota (University) assets, including (1) honorary namings (Section IV); (2) namings associated with gifts or sponsorships (Section V); and (3) other namings (Section VI).

**SECTION II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES.**

- (a) Naming for an individual or organization is an honor that forges a close link between the individual or organization and the University. As such, it is critically important that the integrity, history, behavior, and reputation of the named individual or organization be consistent with the academic mission and values of the University.
- (b) The University shall ensure that namings preserve the long-standing traditions, values, culture, and prestige of the University.
- (c) Namings as part of sponsorship agreements shall be consistent with the University's reputation and core values and the highest standards for business and financial integrity.
- (d) The University shall maintain a consistent, coordinated, and transparent approach to naming that reflects the University's consultative and collaborative decision-making process, ensures the proper review and approval of all naming proposals, and preserves confidentiality consistent with applicable law.
- (e) The University shall ensure coordination between: (1) the institution and recognized University foundations; and (2) fund-raising and academic units in order to maintain alignment of institutional and development priorities and compliance with University policies and procedures.
- (f) Significant University assets may not be named in honor of current or former members of the Board of Regents (Board) except as provided in Section V of this policy. Such gift related namings may not include the title "Regent" or "Regent Emeritus."

**SECTION III. DEFINITIONS.**

**Subd. 1. Significant University Assets.** *Significant University assets* shall mean tangible or intangible resources of the University that are of significant prominence or visibility. Assets include but are not limited to the following: colleges and schools; University-level academic programs, centers, and institutes; ~~lectureships, fellowships, professorships, and chairs~~; and buildings, significant portions of buildings, grounds, physical structures, streets, and areas.

**Subd. 2. Donor.** *Donor* shall mean a person or entity transferring money or other property to the University or one of its recognized foundations in connection with a naming, whether or not the donor is the subject of the naming.



**NAMINGS**

**Adopted:** June 11, 2010

Draft for Review

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 2 of 5

**Subd. 3. Gift.** *Gift* shall mean a transfer of, or promise to transfer, money or other property to the University without reciprocal benefit to the donor.

**Subd. 4. Sponsor.** *Sponsor* shall mean a person or entity entering into a sponsorship.

**Subd. 5. Sponsorship.** *Sponsorship* shall mean a contract involving the provision of funds or other support with the expectation of public acknowledgement or promotional opportunity.

**Subd. 6. Street.** *Street* shall mean any private road or driveway as defined in the *Regents of the University of Minnesota Traffic Regulations Ordinances*.

**SECTION IV. HONORARY NAMINGS.**

Significant University assets may be named in honor of an individual or a non-University entity to recognize service, dedication, or meritorious contributions to the institution when the naming is not associated with a gift or sponsorship.

**Subd. 1. Naming of Colleges, Schools, and University-Level Academic Programs.** These assets may be named in honor of an individual or non-University entity.

- (a) **Approval.** The Board of Regents (Board) reserves to itself authority to name, rename, or revoke the honorary naming of these assets.
- (b) **Management.** The Senate All-University Honors Committee (Honors Committee) manages the process and submits recommendations to the president, who recommends namings to the Board.

**Subd. 2. Naming of Departmental Chairs** A departmental chair may be named in honor of an individual.

- (a) **Approval.** The president or delegate approves this naming, with concurrence of departmental chairs.
- (b) **Management.** The relevant unit manages this naming process.

**Subd. 3. Naming of Buildings and Other Significant University Assets.** Buildings and other significant University assets may be named in honor of an individual or non-University entity. A building may be named for a person still living who has left the service of the University.

- (a) **Approval.** The Board of Regents (Board) reserves to itself authority to name, rename, or revoke the honorary naming of buildings and other significant University assets.
- (b) **Management.** The Honors Committee manages the process and submits recommendations to the president, who recommends namings to the Board.

**Subd. 4. Namings of Buildings for Past Presidents.** The University may name buildings for past presidents. Consideration of a naming shall take place after a president's association with the University has ended, usually between one and five years following service.

- (a) **Approval.** The Board of Regents (Board) reserves to itself authority to name, rename, or revoke the naming of buildings for past presidents.



**NAMINGS**

**Adopted:** June 11, 2010

Draft for Review

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 3 of 5

- (b) **Management.** The chair of the Board convenes a committee with representatives from the Board, the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the Honors Committee to develop a recommendation. This recommendation shall be forwarded to the Honors Committee for information prior to submission to the Board for final action.

**Subd. 5. Naming of Separate Building Parts.** Separate building parts that are not significant University assets may be named in honor of an individual or a non-University entity. An independent committee of the relevant academic or administrative leadership and building occupants shall manage and approve the namings.

**SECTION V. NAMINGS ASSOCIATED WITH GIFTS OR SPONSORSHIPS.**

**Significant** University assets may be named for individuals or non-University entities to recognize significant gifts or as part of a sponsorship. Colleges, schools, academic programs, centers, or institutes are not usually named for commercial entities; if the name of a commercial entity is to be considered, Board approval is required.

**Subd. 1. Naming of Endowed Lectureships, Fellowships, Professorships, and Chairs.** The University seeks and welcomes private financial support for endowed lectureships, fellowships, professorships, and chairs, which provide scholars a continuous and reliable source of support to pursue their research and teaching. Awards established in these categories shall typically carry the name of the donor, of a person or institution designated by the donor, or of a person in whose name the University seeks funds to endow the award.

- (a) **Approval.** The president or delegate approves the naming of a lectureship, fellowship, professorship, or chair.
- (b) **Management.** The relevant department or college establishes and manages the process for lectureships, fellowships, professorships, and chairs. Proposals to establish one of these institutional awards shall specify the conditions of the naming, the activities to be supported by the gift or sponsorship, and the amount of the endowment or the annual level of funding.
- (c) **Candidates.** The University shall have sole authority to appoint the holders of lectureships, fellowships, and chairs.
- (d) **Provisions.**
  - (1) **Restrictions on the Use of Title.** Lectureships, fellowships, professorships, and chairs shall not include such terms as *University*, *distinguished*, or the title *Regents Professor*. These titles are conferred only by the Board.
  - (2) **Level of Endowment.**
    - (i) **Endowment for Chairs.** A permanent chair may be established when \$2,000,000 or more has been placed in an endowment that provides in perpetuity the annual funds needed for support. Alternatively, a chair also may be established if a minimum of \$200,000 per year of expendable funds is made available for at least ten years.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
**BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 4 of 5

Administrative

**NAMINGS**

**Adopted:** June 11, 2010

Draft for Review

(ii) **Endowment for Professorships.** The combination of salary and endowment shall be sufficient to provide salary and fringe benefits for the recipient, staff support, travel, and other expenses. Professorships require a minimum of \$1,000,000 in permanent endowment or a minimum of \$100,000 per year of expendable funds for ten years.

(iii) **Endowment for Faculty Fellows.** Faculty fellows require a minimum of \$500,000 in permanent endowment or a minimum of \$50,000 per year of expendable funds for ten years.

(iv) **Other Named Endowments and Awards.** The titles of lectureships, scholarships, or other named awards may be used for gifts of less than \$500,000 in permanent endowment or \$50,000 a year for ten years. A minimum award in this category would provide at least \$1,000 per year for ten years.

**Subd. 2. Naming of Colleges, Schools, Buildings, and Other Significant University Assets.** These assets may be named to recognize gifts or as part of a sponsorship. No commitment regarding namings associated with gifts or sponsorships shall be made to the donor or sponsor prior to the applicable University review and approval.

- (a) **Consultation.** Prior to entering into substantive discussions or making an oral or written commitment regarding a naming to a donor or sponsor, any individual acting on behalf of the University or a recognized University foundation shall (1) inform the donor or sponsor of this policy; (2) consult with the president to determine whether the naming opportunity requires the review and approval process outlined below; and (3) consult with the recognized University foundations as appropriate to determine whether the proposed naming meets the guidelines of the recognized University foundations.
- (b) **Review.** A **standing** naming committee, with two representatives from the Honors Committee, representatives from the recognized University foundations, and relevant academic and administrative officers, shall review naming proposals and submit recommendations to the president. The president recommends namings to the Board.
- (c) **Approval.** The Board reserves to itself authority to name, rename, or revoke the naming of colleges, schools, buildings, and other significant University assets.
- (d) **Management.** For gifts, the recognized University foundations shall maintain guidelines to implement this policy in order to ensure consistency in the size of gifts relative to the significance of the asset being named. For sponsorships, the president or delegate shall ensure the consistency of the size of the sponsorship agreement relative to the overall significance of the asset to be named.

**Subd. 3. Other Namings Associated with Gifts or Sponsorships.** University assets not covered by the definition in Section III., Subd. 1., may be named to recognize gifts or as part of a sponsorship.

- (a) **Approval.** The president or delegate shall approve the naming of these assets.
- (b) **Management.** Recognized University foundations shall manage the process for the naming of these assets and maintain guidelines and criteria for these namings.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
**BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 5 of 5

Administrative

**NAMINGS**

**Adopted:** June 11, 2010

Draft for Review

**SECTION VI. OTHER NAMINGS.**

This section shall govern the naming of significant University assets when the name is not in honor of an individual or non-University entity and the naming is not associated with a gift or sponsorship.

**Subd. 1. Naming of Colleges and Schools.** A college or school may be named to reflect the relevant academic discipline.

- (a) **Approval.** The Board reserves to itself authority to name, rename, or revoke the naming of colleges and schools.
- (b) **Management.** The president or delegate recommends namings of colleges and schools to the Board.

**Subd. 2. Naming of Buildings, Significant Portions of Buildings, Grounds, Physical Structures, Areas, or Streets.** These assets may be named to describe the academic or administrative purpose of the asset or to reflect a symbolic meaning appropriate for the asset.

- (a) **Approval.** The Board reserves to itself authority to name, rename, or revoke the naming of buildings, significant portions of buildings, grounds, physical structures, areas, or streets.
- (b) **Management.** The Honors Committee manages the process for the naming of buildings, significant portions of buildings, grounds, physical structures, areas, or streets and submits recommendations to the president. The president recommends namings to the Board.
- (c) **Working Titles.** The president or delegate may provide a working title for buildings, significant portions of buildings, grounds, physical structures, areas, or streets during planning and construction and prior to official naming by the Board.

**SECTION VII. RENAMINGS AND REVOCATION.**

**Subd. 1. Renamings.** The University reserves the right to rename any named asset of the University. Renamings shall be consistent with the review and approval process for namings.

**Subd. 2. Revocation.** The University reserves the right to revoke a naming if for any reason it presents risk or harm to the reputation of the University, or if the intent of a gift or the terms of a sponsorship associated with the naming cannot be fulfilled. For all namings requiring Board approval, the Board reserves the right to revoke them. Other namings may be revoked by the president or delegate.

**SECTION VIII. IMPLEMENTATION.**

**Subd. 1. Legal Review.** All gift agreements or contracts involving a naming must be reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel prior to approval.

**Subd. 2. Administration.** The president or delegate shall establish and maintain administrative policies and procedures to implement this policy.