

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning & Policy Committee

February 7, 2002

A meeting of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, February 7, 2002, at 9:45 a.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center.

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

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

Student Representatives present: Kyle Althoff and Nicholas Maxwell.

CONSENT REPORT

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following, as detailed in the docket materials:

New Academic Programs:

- College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences: Undergraduate Minor in Internet, Science, and Society
- Graduate School: Bioinformatics Minor
- Graduate School: Minor in Nanoparticle Science and Engineering
- Graduate School: M.A. in Health Journalism
- Graduate School: Doctor of Physical Therapy

Academic Program Changes:

- College of Continuing Education: Information Technology Infrastructure Major

Academic Program Name Changes:

- College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences: Major in Crop, Soil and Pest Management (CSPM)
- College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences: Minor in Food Systems and the Environment

- College of Education and Human Development: Career and Technology Education B.S.
- College of Education and Human Development: Technical Education Certificate
- Graduate School: Veterinary Medicine M.S. and Ph.D. in Comparative Medicine and Pathology
- University of Minnesota Crookston: Golf Facilities and Turf Systems

Academic Program Discontinuations:

- Graduate School: Anatomy Minor

UNIVERSITY PLAN, PERFORMANCE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks briefly reviewed key findings and implications of the University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report (Plan) and the Board's involvement in its development. He reminded the committee that the Plan will be prepared annually, but that it is not intended as a substitute for items that are normally a part of the agenda of this committee or the Board. Instead, the Plan is designed to bring together in one coherent document several independent reports, such as the Academic Priorities and Institutional Measures reports. He then referred the committee to a number of future policy, procedural, and communication issues yet to be resolved (as listed in the docket materials).

In response to questions from Regent Keffeler, Bruininks indicated that the Plan is both a plan and a report because it not only reflects planning by the Board and the University, but it focuses as well on gathering, analyzing, and synthesizing information related to the University's policies, goals, and aspirations. The Plan will not be a platform for setting new goals and policies, but if new policy issues emerge during its preparation, such issues would be brought to the Board for consideration.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the

resolution accepting the Plan, recognizing that it meets the goals established by the November 2000 Board of Regents Resolution.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS

A. Academic Priorities

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks led the discussion of the Academic Priorities report, citing components of the report and highlighting the following changes made in response to suggestions received during the Committee's review in December 2001:

- Undergraduate education priorities ? The report identifies academic priorities in an integrated, systematic way by grouping them in broader, more thematic areas (as listed in the docket materials).
- First generation students ? The report clearly indicates the importance of first generation students to the University's diversity goals, but it also explains that by regental policy and administrative practice students are not admitted on the basis of one criterion or characteristic.
- Graduation rates ? Additional emphasis has been given to the number of degrees granted annually and the share of undergraduate degrees awarded on the Twin Cities campus to transfer students.

In response to a concern expressed by Student Representative Maxwell, Bruininks emphasized that the University has a plan

for serving first generation students, but that plan is based on values and goals already in place to recruit a diverse student body. Reed agreed that the real issue is that a priority regarding first generation students should not be adopted when the Board has not thoughtfully considered this issue. The legislature's question is legitimate, as is the University's response in terms of policies and goals the Board already has set.

In response to suggestions from the committee, Bruininks agreed to (1) include in the report's methodological notes consideration of the needs of the economy and society of the state of Minnesota and (2) prepare a one-page bullet summary to accompany submission of the report to the legislature.

B. Post-Secondary Planning

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks introduced Trustee Jim Luoma and Associate Vice Provost Linda Mercer of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) System, commenting that the Post-Secondary Planning report represents a genuine cooperative effort between MnSCU and the University. The committee and the MnSCU representatives discussed the report and the process, highlighting the following:

- the fact that there is very little duplication of course offerings between the two systems;
- the need for an intensive examination of resource utilization and access issues between the two systems;
- the need for partnerships with the PreK-12 system to ensure access for students and improve access for those not now well prepared for post-secondary education; and
- the importance of the last two pages of the report, which demonstrate the ability of the two systems to work together to chart a course for metropolitan higher education.

Reed emphasized that when the report is submitted it will be important to show that we not only have responded to the legislature's request, but also that we have established a framework for ongoing cooperation that will lead students to say they could not have imagined a better educational experience.

C. University of Minnesota Extension Service

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks and Charles Casey, Dean, University of Minnesota Extension Service (Extension), led the discussion. Casey explained that the report responds to the legislature's questions in terms of Extension's mission, effectiveness, and efficiency; the scope of its programs; sources of funding; and the educational niche Extension occupies. He added that the plan aligns Extension's resources, making funds available for investments in technology and staff who will deliver high quality programs and increase access to University research.

Keffeler suggested that some misgivings about the future of Extension might be allayed once the details of the change plan emerge and the public is reassured of the University's commitment to greater Minnesota. Casey agreed, indicating that one goal is to enhance Extension's role in addressing increasingly complex problems. The new model will improve access to the University's resources and deliver programs that are relevant to Minnesotans statewide. He also reiterated Extension's commitment to 4-H in rural, suburban, and urban areas.

In response to a proposal by several committee members, the committee unanimously approved a resolution accepting the three reports for submission to the legislature.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION: SCHOLARSHIPS & FINANCIAL AID

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks, Vice Provost Craig Swan, and Director Zetterberg led the discussion of the University's student financial aid and scholarship policies and programs.

Swan and Zetterberg reviewed the types of financial assistance available to University students; how University students pay for their education; the financial aid profile of University students compared to other U.S. public institutions; and undergraduate financial aid trends on the Twin Cities campus (materials in the docket and on file in the Board Office).

Zetterberg cited the following significant characteristics of financial assistance for students:

- it represents a partnership between the University, federal and state government, numerous third parties, and students' families;
- it involves hundreds of decision makers who need effective management tools and an understanding of their role in the educational experience of students; and
- it most effectively serves undergraduate students who are the exclusive beneficiaries of federal and state grants.

In response to a question from Reed, Swan proposed that the burden of outstanding student loan debt could be reduced if students focused on graduation and the realization of higher earnings from their first post-graduation job.

MID-YEAR COMMITTEE WORKPLAN REVIEW

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks called to the committee's attention the draft workplan for the period March - July 2002. Regent Hogan asked that members of the committee submit any comments or suggestions to him or to the Board Office.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks introduced Vice President Maziar, who submitted an inventory of research and academic centers at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities campus. The inventory was compiled at the committee's request and reveals that 209 groupings of faculty and professional staff on the Twin Cities campus have organized as centers or institutes.

At Hogan's request, Maziar reported on the January 31, 2002 inaugural meeting of the Commission on University of Minnesota Excellence, indicating that commission members heard presentations on the University's finances and trends, rankings, and comparisons in higher education. She observed that commission members are enthusiastic about their participation and are in the process of developing a workplan.

Keffeler, a member of the commission, commented that the commission's late start has prompted consideration of a request to the legislature for extension of the July 15, 2002 deadline for submission of their report. Reed expressed her hope that the most important issues would be addressed by the July 15, 2002 deadline so that the University can consider the work of the commission in preparing its next biennial budget request.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 Noon.

ANN D. CIESLAK
Executive Director and
Corporate Secretary

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

Last modified on September 7, 2005