

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning & Policy Committee

Thursday, September 6, 2007

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

600 McNamara Alumni Center, West Committee Room

Committee Members

David Larson, Chair
Anthony Baraga, Vice Chair
Maureen Cisneros
Linda Cohen
Steven Hunter
Patricia Simmons

Student Representatives

Meghan Keil
Nathan Olson

A G E N D A

1. Resolution Related to 2007 Minnesota-Wisconsin Tuition Reciprocity Agreement - Review/Action - T. Sullivan/C. Swan/P. Zetterberg (pp. 2-13)
2. Academic Program Changes Annual Report - T. Sullivan/G. Dubrow/J. Ziegenhagen (pp. 14-31)
3. Academic Issues Related to: *University Plan, Performance & Accountability Report* - T. Sullivan (p. 32)
4. Committee Workplan, 2007-08 - D. Larson/T. Sullivan (pp. 33-36)
5. Consent Report - Review/Action - T. Sullivan (pp. 37-40)
6. Information Items - T. Sullivan (p. 41)



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

September 6, 2007

Agenda Item: Resolution Related to 2007 Minnesota-Wisconsin Tuition Reciprocity Agreement

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Craig Swan
Peter Zetterberg, Office of Institutional Research

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

Minnesota statute requires that the Board of Regents must review and approve tuition reciprocity agreements before they become effective.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

The state's tuition reciprocity agreements are important to the University's enrollment management strategies for each campus since each campus draws a significant percentage of its enrollment from reciprocity states. The reciprocity agreement with Wisconsin is especially important since more than 6,000 of the University's undergraduate students are Wisconsin reciprocity students.

Minnesota and Wisconsin have had a tuition reciprocity agreement since 1968. Since 1983, undergraduate students have been assessed the tuition rate of a comparable campus in their home state. This arrangement means that Wisconsin undergraduate reciprocity students currently pay significantly less to attend a University of Minnesota campus than resident undergraduate students. Under the new agreement, beginning with new students matriculating in the fall of 2008, reciprocity students will be assessed the higher of the tuition rate of the campus attended or of a comparable campus in their home state. As a consequence, Wisconsin reciprocity students will be assessed tuition rates that are the same as or higher than the rates for Minnesota residents.

Under the terms of the new agreement and the annual memorandum of understanding, the University will also serve as agent for and administer a reciprocity supplement program funded by the state of Wisconsin. The supplement that Wisconsin reciprocity students receive, effective with new students matriculating in fall 2008, will reduce the cost of tuition to what students would pay if they attended a comparable campus in their home state.

Background Information:

Since 1968 Minnesota's reciprocity agreement with Wisconsin has been changed in significant ways several times. The agreement was last renegotiated in 1997.

During a tuition presentation at the Board's June 2007 meeting, the Board received a report regarding Wisconsin reciprocity and the changes being sought by the University. These changes are now reflected in the reciprocity agreement that is the subject of the attached resolution.

For undergraduate students, the new agreement with Wisconsin is based on the same principles as the state's tuition reciprocity agreements with Manitoba, North Dakota, and South Dakota. A copy of the Minnesota-Wisconsin agreement is attached.

The new agreement does not include any changes for graduate students or for first professional students in law and pharmacy. The old and new reciprocity agreements with Wisconsin do not include first professional students in dentistry, medicine, and veterinary medicine.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The president recommends approval of the resolution.

MINNESOTA–WISCONSIN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

General Provisions

I. Purpose and Nature of the Agreement

The purposes of this Agreement are to continue to improve the postsecondary education advantages of residents of Minnesota and Wisconsin through greater availability and accessibility of postsecondary education opportunities and to achieve improved effectiveness and economy in meeting the postsecondary education needs of Minnesota and Wisconsin residents through cooperative planning efforts. These purposes will be accomplished by granting students access to public postsecondary institutions in the neighboring state at a rate below that charged to other non-resident students. Under this Agreement, Minnesota residents are afforded the opportunity to attend public institutions in Wisconsin on the same academic basis that Wisconsin residents attend these institutions; and Wisconsin residents are afforded the opportunity to attend public institutions in Minnesota on the same academic basis that Minnesota residents attend these institutions.

With the exception of those programs identified within this Agreement for which specific quotas are established, the opportunity to enter a public institution in the neighboring state will be dependent upon the availability of space in the particular program which the student seeks to enter. A student whose reciprocity application is approved by the appropriate agency in his/her state of residence will be accommodated in a public institution in the neighboring state if he/she meets those admission requirements which are applied to residents of the neighboring state and if space is available in the program which the student seeks to enter.

II. Basic Principles of the Agreement

The basic principles underlying this Agreement are that the primary beneficiaries are to be the residents of Minnesota and Wisconsin through the broadening of educational opportunities and that neither state shall benefit at the expense of the other, either financially or through the

unintended, adverse effects on the missions of adjacent universities in the other state. To accomplish these objectives;

- A. The computation of the net interstate reimbursement obligation shall be based upon the variable cost of educating students eligible for the program as defined in this Agreement; and
- B. The states may agree on special measures to set and coordinate educational policies including tuition and financial aid policies under the Agreement as it affects the adjacent regional universities of the two states.

III. Duration of the Agreement

This Agreement is to be effective beginning on July 1, 2007, and shall continue from year to year unless modified or terminated as hereafter provided. The terms and conditions governing the agreement may be modified at any time upon mutual agreement of both parties. Should either state desire to make changes to the agreement or conditions contained in the annual administrative memorandum, that state must send to the other state's administrating agency, in writing and by certified mail, a detailed listing of proposed changes and a rationale for why these changes are being sought. Both parties must then meet within 60 days of receipt of this letter. This agreement may be canceled by either state with four years advance notice of intent to terminate. Such notice must be provided in writing, and by certified mail, to the head of the respective administrating agency by July 1 in order to initiate the four-year period for shut down activities. Should either state notify the other of an intent to terminate the agreement, the last annual administrative memorandum agreed to by both states will be the controlling policy document during the term of the shut down period, except for annual changes which may need to be made to accurately reflect prevailing tuition charges for the four year shut down period. The Agreement is continued subject to the provision of legislative appropriations.

IV. Scope of the Agreement—Students

All persons who qualify as residents of Minnesota and Wisconsin for purposes of postsecondary education under laws and regulations of the state of residency may be

eligible to attend a public postsecondary institution in the neighboring state under this Agreement with the following exceptions:

- A. Wisconsin students enrolled in extension or distance learning courses offered by Minnesota institutions in Wisconsin are not covered under this agreement. Minnesota students enrolled in extension or distance learning courses offered by Wisconsin institutions in Minnesota are also not covered under this Agreement.
- B. Professional students in a Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Dental Sciences, or Doctor of Veterinary Medicine Program in the public institutions of either state will be ineligible for reciprocity tuition under this Agreement.

V. Scope of the Agreement–Institutions

All public postsecondary education institutions in Minnesota and Wisconsin are included under this Agreement and are available to residents of the neighboring state in accordance with terms of this Agreement.

VI. Scope of the Agreement–Continuing Students

An eligible student who is enrolled in an eligible institution in either state during the initial year of the four-year shut down period described under ‘Duration of Agreement’ shall continue to receive reciprocity benefits during the four-year shut down period, provided the student continues to be enrolled each year at an eligible institution. A student who is not enrolled in an eligible institution during the initial year of the shut down period will no longer be eligible for reciprocity benefits under this Agreement.

Collegiate Education

I. Plan for Collegiate Students Under the Agreement

Under this Agreement, all Minnesota residents are eligible to attend public collegiate institutions in Wisconsin as undergraduate, and graduate, students on the same basis for admission and performance that Wisconsin residents attend the same institutions. Similarly, all Wisconsin residents are eligible to attend public collegiate institutions in

Minnesota as undergraduate, and graduate, students on the same basis for admission and performance purposes that Minnesota residents attend these institutions.

For purposes of this Agreement, each state shall establish a reciprocity tuition structure that will apply to its students enrolled in public institutions in the neighboring state. Effective with new students matriculating in 2008-2009, students will be charged the higher of the tuition rate of the campus attended or of a comparable campus in their home state. Details of the reciprocity tuition rates will be mutually agreed upon by both parties and described in the annual administrative memorandum. In the event the resident tuition rates charged in both states are not finalized by July 15, any adjustments made to the previous year's tuition rates shall be applied to the tuition rates for the new fiscal year, once finalized.

The reciprocity tuition charged to Wisconsin undergraduate students attending the U of M - Twin Cities prior to the 2008-2009 academic year will be equal to the U of W - Madison undergraduate resident rate plus 25% of the difference between the U of W - Madison undergraduate resident rate and the U of M - Twin Cities undergraduate resident rate.

There shall be no restrictions on the number of students from either state who may participate in this reciprocity program.

II. Administrative Agencies

The following state agencies shall be responsible for the administering of this Agreement in their respective states:

State of Minnesota Office of Higher Education
State of Wisconsin Higher Educational Aids Board

III. Application Procedures and Student Eligibility

- A. The application procedure, determination of eligibility, and effective reciprocity tuition schedules shall be specified in the annual administrative memorandum prepared by the administering agencies.
- B. Neither state agency will be financially liable for students enrolled under the

- reciprocity Agreement who have not received prior approval and certification by the responsible agency.
- C. The states agree to encourage the use of paperless applications and reporting between agencies to enhance service to students and families and to promote administrative efficiency.

Vocational–Technical Education

I. Plan for Vocational Students Under the Agreement

Wisconsin students enrolled in Minnesota technical colleges and Minnesota students enrolled in Wisconsin technical colleges shall not be counted in the interstate payment obligation. Both states agree to abide by the relevant application and reporting requirements for technical colleges, as mutually agreed upon by the Wisconsin Technical College System and the Minnesota Office of Higher Education. Tuition rates charged to technical college students are described in the annual administrative memorandum.

Procedure for Computation of Interstate Reimbursement

I. Definition of Terms

As used in this Agreement the terms listed below shall be defined as follows:

- A. Fixed Costs
That portion of total student costs which do not vary with changes in enrollment.
- B. Variable Costs
Variable costs are that portion of total student costs which vary with changes in enrollment. For purposes of this Agreement, the variable cost shall be mutually agreed upon by both states' examination of cost data. The agreed upon variable cost will be 64 percent of total student costs.
- C. Reciprocity Tuition
The tuition charged to reciprocity students attending in each state, as outlined annually in the Minnesota/Wisconsin Reciprocity Tuition rate confirmation memo.
- D. Segregated Fees

Campus fees charged for student activities, health services, and other auxiliary activities are not included under this Agreement and shall be assessed directly to the student.

E. Gross State Reimbursement Obligation

The gross state reimbursement obligation is the number of reciprocity student credit hours multiplied by the variable cost per credit for reciprocity students attending in each state.

F. Net State Reimbursement Obligation

The net state reimbursement obligation is the number of reciprocity student credit hours multiplied by the variable cost per credit minus reciprocity tuition (as defined by section I.C. above) for reciprocity students attending in each state.

G. State Reimbursement Obligation

The difference between the two state net reimbursement obligations. The state with the larger net state reimbursement obligation is obligated to the other state for the difference between the two net state reimbursement obligations.

H. Credits Carried

Credits carried are the credits actually paid for by the student and reflect any adjustments which may have occurred during the period of each term in which a student is eligible for a tuition refund. Each state's net reimbursement obligation is determined on the basis of credits carried and paid for as opposed to credits earned.

II. Student Categories

For purposes of this Agreement and the determination of the net state reimbursement obligation, categories of student enrollment, institutions, and associated instructional costs per student credit hour will be defined in the annual administrative memorandum.

III. Computational Methodology

A net state reimbursement obligation will be computed for each category of student enrollments, institutions, and associated instructional costs per student credit hour described in the annual administrative memorandum. The following formula will be used in computing the various net state reimbursement obligations.

Minnesota's Obligation to Wisconsin

Wisconsin's Obligation to Minnesota

Number of MN Student Credits Consumed in
WI

Number of WI Student Credits Consumed in
MN

x Variable Costs per Credit Hour

x Variable Costs per Credit Hour

= Gross Minnesota Reimbursement
Obligation

= Gross Wisconsin Reimbursement
Obligation

— MN Reciprocity Tuition*

— WI Reciprocity Tuition*

= Net Minnesota Reimbursement Obligation

= Net Wisconsin Reimbursement Obligation

* Net of refunds.

The sum of the various net state reimbursement obligations will determine each state's net state reimbursement obligation. The state with the larger net state reimbursement obligation is financially obligated to the other state for the difference between the two net state reimbursement obligations.

IV. Special Provisions

- A. Enrollment determinations under this Agreement shall begin with the fall session and include the next following spring and summer sessions.
- B. Any impasse that may arise regarding the interstate reimbursement obligation will be resolved by a third party mutually agreed to by both agencies. This information will be officially certified to each of the administering agencies and payment of the state reimbursement obligation amount will be made 30 days after the receipt of information necessary to compute the state reimbursement obligation or by December

1 following the end of the fiscal year, whichever is later.

- C. If the state with the net reimbursement obligation does not make the payment as specified in paragraph B, the amount will be increased by an amount equaling the product of:

The state reimbursement obligation
X The average rate of yield on 90-day Treasury bills sold during the first business day following the day the payment is due
÷ 365 days
X the number of days between the payment due date and the date of payment

Treatment of Other Forms of Direct and Indirect Student Aid

I. Nonpayment of Nonresident Tuition

A student who attends a public institution in the other state and who for any reason is not initially liable for payment of a nonresident tuition charge shall not be eligible, nor shall he or she be counted under this Agreement. This includes any student whose tuition has been waived or paid through indirect forms of aid or support such as governmental (federal/state/local) or stipends awarded to the institution.

II. Direct Financial Aid

In the case of direct forms of financial aid such as federal, state and institutional grants, scholarships, loans and work study, the student shall be considered eligible under this Agreement. The student's budget used to determine his/her financial need for direct forms of aid, however, should reflect the fact that he/she is paying reciprocity tuition rather than nonresident tuition.

Either state may establish a financial aid program for its reciprocity students attending in the other state as provided in Minnesota Statutes 136A.08, Subd. 5., and in Wisconsin Statutes Chapter 39. Terms for the financial aid program shall be included in the annual memorandum of understanding and will not affect the computation of the interstate reimbursement as specified in this agreement.

Auditing, Data Verification, and Institutional Reporting

I. Internal Accounting Systems

Both states agree to adopt and continually seek to refine a comprehensive internal accounting system for determination of net reciprocity payments. The purpose of such system will be to assure each state that appropriate audit and verification procedures are followed by the institutions in determining the costs of the tuition reciprocity program.

II. Audit Agencies

Both states agree to work closely with their appropriate audit agencies (legislative, state, educational system or institution) to establish those monitoring and audit procedures necessary to verify the accuracy of the data provided by the institutions.

Admissions, Promotions and Recruitment

The Minnesota Office of Higher Education and the State of Wisconsin Higher Educational Aids Board jointly urge that all Minnesota and Wisconsin institutions follow the Statement of Principles of Good Practices, which has been adopted by the National Association of Secondary Schools and College Admissions Officers, and the recommended guidelines for institutions adopted by the Minnesota Office of Higher Education which are attached to this Agreement as appropriate codes of conduct for representatives of public institutions involved in admissions, promotion and student recruitment in the neighboring state.

Susan Heegaard, Director
Minnesota Office of Higher Education

Connie Hutchison, Executive Secretary
Wisconsin Higher Educational Aids Board

Date

Date



REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION RELATED TO

2007 Minnesota-Wisconsin Tuition Reciprocity Agreement

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota values the long-standing tradition of tuition reciprocity between the state of Minnesota and the state of Wisconsin under agreements that have evolved and changed over time; and

WHEREAS, the state of Minnesota and the state of Wisconsin have renegotiated the agreement to address fully concerns raised by the University of Minnesota; and

WHEREAS, the state of Minnesota requires the Board of Regents to approve all reciprocity agreements before they become effective.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents hereby approves the 2007 Minnesota-Wisconsin Public Higher Education Reciprocity Agreement as provided in the docket materials.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

September 6, 2007

Agenda Item: Academic Program Changes Annual Report

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan
Vice Provost and Graduate School Dean Gail Dubrow
Director John Ziegenhagen

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

To review the academic program proposal review process, the principles and purposes of the policy guiding this process, and its intersection with delegation of authority policies; to provide a summary of academic program changes reviewed by the committee and approved by the Board of Regents in 2006-07; and to review the alignment of programs with strategic positioning efforts.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

- Do the new and changed academic programs for 2006-07 move the University closer to achieving its aspirational goal?
- Do these guidelines and procedures support achievement of the University's aspirational goal?

Background Information:

Since 2003, at the request of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee, the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost has provided an annual summary of new and changed programs approved by the Board of Regents in the previous year. At its July 2004 meeting, the committee requested information on the criteria used for approving such programs. The September 2007 report provides this information in the context of the University's strategic positioning efforts.

**University of Minnesota Board of Regents
Educational Planning and Policy Committee
September 6, 2007**

Academic Program Changes Annual Report

Policy Questions

- Do the new and changed academic programs for 2006-07 move the University closer to achieving its aspirational goal?
- Do these guidelines and procedures support achievement of the University's aspirational goal?

Introduction

Since 2003, at the request of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee, the Provost's Office has provided an annual summary of new and changed programs approved by the Board of Regents in the previous year. At its July 2004 meeting, the committee requested information on the criteria used for approving such programs. The September 2007 report continues this reporting in the context of the University's strategic positioning.

The University of Minnesota has one of the most comprehensive academic programs of any institution in the world. It offers over 150 undergraduate degree programs; more than 130 master's degree programs; over 100 doctoral degree programs; and professional programs in law, dentistry, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine. The University is one of only four campuses nationally that has agricultural programs as well as an academic health center with a major medical school. This breadth enables the University to undertake interdisciplinary research and create interdisciplinary academic programs that few of its peers can match.

Given this breadth and depth of excellence, the process by which the University evaluates current programs and reviews proposals for new programs that reflect new knowledge and address emerging societal needs becomes an essential ingredient in the University's future success.

Part I: Academic Program Change—The Process presents an overview of the administrative process and criteria used to review proposed academic program changes and prepare them for action by the Educational Planning and Policy Committee and the Board of Regents. Also included is a summary of program change actions taken by the Committee during the 2006-07 academic year.

Part II: Graduate Program Review provides background information on the Graduate School and its program review goals and processes

I. Academic Program Change – The Process

The University’s aspiration to become one of the top three public research universities in the world—by building on its core academic strengths and creating opportunities for cutting-edge interdisciplinary programs—serves to underscore the importance of the academic program review process.

This section describes the program proposal review process, the principles and purposes of the policy that guide it, the criteria used to assess proposals for new and changed programs, the policy’s intersection with delegation of authority policies, a listing of program changes approved by the Board of Regents in 2006-07, and a brief description of recent improvements in the program review and approval process.

Program Review Process

The process for establishing new academic programs or making changes to current ones offered by any college or campus of the University of Minnesota involves a series of steps. These steps—designed to provide careful review and oversight—lead to approval or endorsement by the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and, as appropriate, a recommendation for approval by the Board of Regents.

Procedures for program development, review, and approval are established within departments, colleges, the Academic Health Center, and the Graduate School (for most post-baccalaureate degrees), and by chancellors, the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost, and the Board of Regents.

Principles

The principles guiding this process include the following:

- Academic programs should be aligned with the missions, strategic plans, and compacts of their home unit and with the University’s broad institutional goals and strategic directions.
- Proposals for academic programs should reflect common criteria: quality; centrality; comparative advantage; need and demand (including accreditation or competitive requirements as well as Minnesota workforce needs); efficiency and effectiveness; and, growth and leveraging of resources. (See “Criteria for New Program Proposals” section below.)
- Decisions to offer, change, or drop academic programs, when they have the potential to affect or involve other units within the University, require consultation early in the program development stage.
- Consideration and approval of academic program proposals should be carried out by the Board of Regents or by an appropriate-level administrator with the delegated authority from the Board.

- Formal approval by the Board of Regents or its designee is required before new and changed programs may be publicized or initiated.

Purposes

These principles inform the University's policy governing the creation, change, and discontinuation of academic programs. The policy is intended to:

- Enhance quality, productivity, and efficiency in academic program development and implementation.
- Ensure that program development is aligned with institutional, campus, college, and unit mission, strategic directions, and compacts.
- Make explicit the criteria for academic programs and their connection to related policies.
- Foster shared consultation and, where appropriate, joint planning across academic units.
- Foster early consultation with the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.
- Enhance the availability, coordination, and consistency of information about the University's academic programs for student information systems; faculty and administrative planning and analysis; institutional accountability reporting; and departmental, collegiate unit, and institutional accreditation.
- Ensure thorough and timely review and consideration of proposals for approval at the appropriate level: Board of Regents, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost, coordinate campus vice chancellor, or collegiate dean.

Approval Level Requirements

The type of action requested dictates the approval level required.

Board of Regents approval is required for:

- Adding new programs: new degree program or major, new baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate credit certificate programs, new minor
- Changing current programs: add a formal track to an existing major; change a program or unit name or degree designation; discontinue a program; offer new distance delivery of an existing degree program

Senior vice president for academic affairs approval is required for:

- Adding a new site for the delivery of an existing program
- Formalizing a domestic or international credit-bearing agreement with another institution
- Changing or adding new course designators and program codes

Provost approval (Twin Cities), senior vice president for health sciences, or vice chancellor (Crookston, Duluth, or Morris) approval is required for:

- Adding an honors option to an existing undergraduate degree program
- Making other curricular changes, e.g., change number of credits or required courses in a major or minor, change definition of options in a major
- Adding “second tier” admissions requirements, i.e., entrance requirements to a major that go beyond admission to the collegiate unit

Vice chancellor (Crookston, Duluth, or Morris) or collegiate dean (Twin Cities) approval is required for:

- Changing curricular details such as course substitutions (one course is dropped and another replaces it), revised lists of electives approved for the program, and changes that result from realignment or adjustment of course content.

All changes approved at vice chancellor or collegiate dean levels must be reported to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost.

Criteria for New Program Proposals

The University uses a standard set of criteria to review proposals for new or changed academic programs. These criteria—re-affirmed most recently during the strategic positioning activities of 2005-06—parallel ones used in the University’s periodic review of collegiate and departmental academic and administrative units.

Mission, Priorities, and Interrelatedness

- In what specific ways is the proposed program consistent with the University’s and unit’s mission?
- How does the program support the unit’s strategic direction and compact?
- How will the program contribute to the priorities of the University, the campus, and the unit?
- How does the program relate to other University academic programs?
- What are the implications—including impact of prerequisites and related courses—on other units, colleges, or campuses? (Document your consultation by providing copies of correspondence with relevant units to establish collaborations on interdisciplinary programs, use courses from other units, etc.)

Need and Demand

- What is the need and demand for the program? Proposals for programs that reach very small numbers of students are discouraged. Use the following kinds of evidence, as appropriate:
 - Evidence that the program meets societal needs and expectations
 - Evidence of consultation with employers or professional organizations, if appropriate.
 - Employment data, if appropriate (availability of jobs for graduates).
 - Enrollment data for similar programs

- Data reflecting student interest or demand, both short- and long-term
- Projected number of applicants for the program
- Projected number of degrees to be conferred per year at full operation
- What are the intended geographic service area and the prospective student market?
- How will students benefit from the program?

Comparative Advantage

- What are the unique characteristics of the program that make it particularly appropriate to the University of Minnesota?
- Are there comparable academic programs in Minnesota, and, if applicable, elsewhere? (Document your consultation with other units within the University and/or research of other institutions with similar programs, if they exist, in the area.)

Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Use of Resources

- Is the program within the capacity of the unit's resources?
- Have resources been reallocated within the unit to support the proposed program? If so, how?
- If additional resources are needed, how will the program leverage existing resources to attract new resources?
- What steps will be taken to ensure the program is operated economically and effectively?

Program Quality and Assessment

- What are the learning outcomes for the program? How will the outcomes be measured? How often?
- How, when, and by whom will program quality be measured?
- How will the college, the department, and program instructors continue to improve the teaching and learning in this program?
- Is the program subject to review by a specialized accreditation agency? If yes, what agency and what is the review cycle?
- How, if at all, will the program address the University's diversity goals, e.g., student and faculty recruitment, curriculum, etc.?

Program Development

- What planning and development authorities generated the proposal?
- When was the proposal reviewed and approved (department, college or campus curriculum committees, dean/vice chancellors' offices, etc.)?

2006-07 Program Changes

This section lists the academic program changes approved by the Educational Planning and Policy Committee and the Board of Regents during the 2006-07 academic year.

It is important to note that most program changes have relatively small financial impacts. Most new programs or changes to current programs involve the packaging or repackaging

of existing courses, use faculty already working at the University, and increase the utilization rate of existing classrooms, labs, and other facilities. Programs are often discontinued due to repackaging, renaming, or merging of existing courses. These discontinuations typically do not result in a reduction in the number of faculty and often reflect low student enrollment over several years.

The program changes listed below for 2006-07 include: undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs; graduate degrees and certificate programs; first-professional degrees and certificate programs; and departmental or other academic unit name or location changes.

Trends: As suggested above, the 2006-07 year produced a typical volume of program changes. Particularly noteworthy, however, were trends in the following areas:

- New Academic Units: The creation of three newly configured collegiate units—College of Design; College of Education and Human Development; and College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences—on the Twin Cities campus at the beginning of the year, led to faculty initiated changes in a number of degree and certificate programs (mergers, discontinuations, streamlining, etc.) that will likely continue into 2007-08. The result has been updated curricula, better connections across programs, heightened faculty collaboration, and programs that are more responsive to student needs and interests.
- Health Sciences Programs: In response to the rapidly changing and increasingly complex world of health sciences education, the Academic Health Center's colleges, schools, and centers placed increasing emphasis during 2006-07 on establishing rigorous program review and approval processes. The results of these efforts are reflected in the review of existing programs in the Medical School, the establishment of new professional degrees in the School of Nursing, and the planned-for migration of several programs to the new Center for Allied Health Programs. This trend is expected to continue, if not accelerate, in 2007-08.
- Rochester Campus: Although the summary below shows only a few academic program changes involving the Rochester campus, there was a great deal of behind-the-scenes program planning in 2006-07 as UMR began moving to its next stage of development as a full-fledged coordinate campus. Planning has involved faculty from Twin Cities undergraduate colleges, Academic Health Center units, the University's Graduate School, and other coordinate campuses as well as with Mayo and the Minnesota State Colleges and University System.

Twin Cities Campus

Center for Allied Health Programs

- Change the Medical Technology degree name to B.S., Clinical Laboratory Sciences and add a performance site on the Rochester campus.
- Create a Master of Occupational Therapy (M.O.T.) degree.

College of Biological Sciences

- Add a track in Health Sciences within the B.S. degree in Biology.

College of Continuing Education

- Add a Multi-Disciplinary Studies track to the B.A. and B.S. degrees, InterCollege Program.
- Move the academic home of the B.S., Medical Technology degree to the Center for Allied Health Programs.
- Discontinue the B.A.Sc., Clinical Laboratory Science degree.

College of Design

- Change the name of the Department of Architecture to the School of Architecture.

College of Education and Human Development

- Change the name of the Certificate in Language Immersion Education to Certificate in Dual Language Immersion Education.
- Create a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health.
- Create a B.S. degree in Youth Studies.
- Create a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Community and Learning.
- Create a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Online Distance Learning.
- Offer the existing Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree in Human Resource Development and the existing certificate in Human Resource Development in Amman, Jordan.

College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences

- Discontinue the B.S., Urban and Community Forestry degree and re-create it as a track within the B.S., Forest Resources degree.
- Move the B.S. degree in Scientific and Technical Communication and minors in Technical Communication; Internet, Science, and Society; and Land, Nature, and Environmental Values from the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences to the College of Liberal Arts.
- Create a freestanding minor in Sustainability Studies.
- In the B.S. degree in Nutrition, discontinue the Coordinated Program in Dietetics track and change the name of the Nutrition option to Nutrition and Dietetics.

College of Liberal Arts

- Discontinue the B.A., Microbiology degree.
- Create a free-standing minor in Comparative U.S. Race and Ethnicity.
- Discontinue the B.A. and B.S. degrees and Minor in Sociology of Law, Criminology, and Deviance.
- Add a concentration in the Sociology of Law, Criminology, and Deviance in the B.A., Sociology degree.
- Add a concentration in the Sociology of Law, Criminology, and Deviance in the B.S., Sociology degree.
- In the B.A. degree in African American and African Studies, create concentrations in history; literature and the arts; social and behavioral sciences, public policy/development; Africa; and African Diaspora.
- In the psychology minor, discontinue tracks in general psychology, natural/biological science, and social science.
- Change the name of the B.A. degree and minor in Women's Studies to B.A. degree and minor in Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies.

Twin Cities Campus (cont.)

Graduate School

- Merge the M.A. degree programs in Hispanic Literatures, Luso-Brazilian Literatures, and Hispanic Linguistics into one M.A. degree in Hispanic and Lusophone Literatures, Cultures, and Linguistics, with three formal tracks—Hispanic Literatures and Cultures, Lusophone Literatures and Cultures, and Hispanic Linguistics.
- Create an Ed.D. degree in Teaching and Learning on the Duluth campus.
- Create a Master of Financial Mathematics (M.F.M.) degree.
- Merge the Ph.D. program in Geological Engineering with the Ph.D. program in Civil Engineering.
- Change the names of the graduate degrees in Work, Community, and Family Education to Work and Human Resource Education for the Ph.D., Ed.D., and M.A. degrees.
- Add a track in Culture and Teaching to the Ph.D. degree in Education, Curriculum and Instruction.
- Create a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Technical Communication.

Institute of Technology

- Create a Bachelor of Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering (B.B.B.E.) degree from a merger of the Bachelor of Bio-based Products Engineering (B.B.P.E.) degree and the Bachelor of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering (B.B.A.E.) degree.

Medical School

- Approve Graduate Medical Education programs:
 1. Advanced Catheterization Research Fellowship Program
 2. Advanced Fourth Year ERCP/EUS Fellowship Program
 3. Advanced Laparoscopic Surgery Program
 4. Advanced Neonatal-Perinatal Medicine Program
 5. Breast Radiology Fellowship Program
 6. Cytopathology Fellowship Program
 7. Endovascular Surgical Neuroradiology Program
 8. Family Medicine – St. Cloud Residency Program
 9. Hematology Research Training Program
 10. Hepatology Transplant Medicine Fellowship Program
 11. Internal Medicine and Dermatology Combined Residency Program
 12. Internal Medicine/Pediatrics Residency Program
 13. Lung Transplant Medicine Program
 14. Maternal Fetal Medicine Fellowship Program
 15. Minimally Invasive Urologic Surgery Fellowship Program
 16. Molecular Genetics Pathology Fellowship Program
 17. Pediatric Orthopaedic Surgery Fellowship Program
 18. Pediatric Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Fellowship Program
 19. Primary Care Fellowship in General Pediatrics Program
 20. Psychosomatic Medicine Fellowship Program
 21. Renal Transplant Fellowship Program
 22. Urologic Oncology Fellowship Program
 23. Vascular Neurology Fellowship Program

School of Nursing

- Create a Master of Nursing (M.N.) professional degree.
- Create a Doctor of Nursing Practice (D.N.P.) professional degree.

School of Public Health

- Offer the existing Master of Health Administration (M.H.A.) degree in Rochester, Minnesota.

University of Minnesota Extension Service

- Change the unit's name to University of Minnesota Extension.

Duluth Campus

College of Education and Human Service Professions

- In the B.A.Sc. degree in Physical Education, add a concentration in Outdoor Education.
- Create a B.A.Sc. degree in Ojibwe Elementary/Middle School Education.
- Offer the existing M.Ed. degree in an online format.

College of Liberal Arts

- In the B.A. degree in American Indian Studies, change the name of the Social Studies emphasis to Social Science and Humanities emphasis.
- In the American Indian Studies minor, change the name of the Social Studies emphasis to Social Science and Humanities emphasis.
- Discontinue the Minor in Tribal Law and Government.
- Within the Master of Advocacy and Political Leadership (M.A.P.L.) degree, change the name of two concentrations: 1) from rural community leadership to community leadership and 2) from labor organizing and management to labor organizing and leadership.

College of Science and Engineering

- Change the name of the concentration from Automated Systems to Industrial and Systems Engineering within the B.S.I.E. program.
- Change name of the B.S., Cell Biology degree to B.S., Cell and Molecular Biology.
- Discontinue five areas of emphasis in the B.S., Mathematics degree.
- Create a minor in Astronomy.
- Create a B.S. degree in Environmental Science.
- Create a minor in Environmental Science.

School of Fine Arts

- Discontinue the Musical Theatre emphasis in the Bachelor of Music in Performance (Performance B.Mus.) degree.
- Reorganize the B.F.A. degree, including discontinuation of the B.F.A, Pre-graduate Art degree; changing the name of the B.F.A., Studio Art-General degree to B.F.A., Studio Art degree; and creating four areas of emphasis within the B.F.A. degree: general studio; digital arts and photography; painting, drawing, and printmaking; and sculpture and ceramics.

Crookston Campus

- Revise the campus mission statement.
- Change the name of the B.S. degree in Equine Industries Management to B.S. degree in Equine Science, with two areas of emphasis—Equine Science and Pre-Veterinary Medicine.
- Change the name of the B.S. degree in Animal Industries Management to B.S. degree in Animal Science, with two areas of emphasis—Animal Science and Pre-Veterinary Medicine.
- Create a B.S. degree in Biology.
- Create a minor in Biology.
- Add a pre-veterinary track to the B.S. degrees in Animal Industries Management and in Equine Industries Management.

Morris Campus

- Create a B.A., American Indian Studies degree.

Undergraduate, Graduate, and First-Professional Degree Production

Listed below are the largest degree programs on the University's four campuses over the past three years. There is typically very little variation in the rankings of these programs in terms of number of degrees conferred:

<u>Twin Cities Campus</u>				<u>Crookston Campus</u>			
<u>Degree</u>	<u>05-06</u>	<u>04-05</u>	<u>03-04</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>05-06</u>	<u>04-05</u>	<u>03-04</u>
M.B.A., Business Administration	584	520	538	B.S., Natural Resources	35	31	18
B.A., Psychology	336	321	310	B.S., Business Management	35	31	31
J.D., Law	262	261	227	B.M.M., Manuf. Mgmnt.	20	18	13
B.A., Journalism	252	258	275	B.S., Hot./Rstrnt/Inst. Mgmnt.	16	9	8
M.Ed., Teaching	250	212	203	A.A.S., Agriculture	15	7	9
M.D., Medicine	224	222	206	B.S., Plant Industries Mgmnt.	14	11	5
B.A., English	217	197	247	B.S., Info. Tech. Mgmnt.	14	19	21
B.A., Communications Studies	212	179	177	B.S., Equine Indust. Mgmnt.	13	10	5
B.S., Biology	193	152	128	B.S., Golf Facil./Turf Mgmnt.	11	6	6
B.A., Political Science	188	179	194	B.S., Early Childhood Educ.	10	13	6

<u>Duluth Campus</u>				<u>Morris Campus</u>			
<u>Degree</u>	<u>05-06</u>	<u>04-05</u>	<u>03-04</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>05-06</u>	<u>04-05</u>	<u>03-04</u>
B.A.Sc., Psychology	117	110	127	B.A., Biology	41	36	36
B.B.A., Marketing	106	113	106	B.A., Psychology	40	15	17
B.B.A., Management	89	96	84	B.A., English	34	35	21
B.S., Biology	88	78	85	B.A., Elementary Education	28	34	35
B.B.A., Finance	82	56	76	B.A., Political Science	26	20	27
B.A., Communication	78	93	83	B.A., Management	19	25	20
B.A.Sc., Elem/Mid School Ed.	72	84	79	B.A., Speech Communication	16	n.a.	12
B.A., Criminology	71	75	86	B.A., Computer Science	16	20	16
B.Acc., Accounting	53	57	61	B.A., History	16	21	17
B.F.A., Graphic Design	45	49	60	B.A., Chemistry	14	11	12

Process Improvement for 2006-07

The administrative policies and procedures governing proposals for new and changed academic programs are under continual review for improvement. Of special note during the year were:

1. Full implementation of the online Program and Curriculum Approval System (PCAS). PCAS is designed to do three things:
 - PCAS is a comprehensive database of all the requirements needed to complete each undergraduate degree program offered on all University of Minnesota campuses.
 - PCAS is a web-based approval system that automatically routes all new undergraduate programs, and any changes to existing programs, to the

correct approvers and approval levels. It replaces the old paper-based program approval process at the undergraduate level.

- PCAS also is a resource for the Graduation Planner, the University's program that supports students' timely progress toward graduation. PCAS includes information about timing of course-taking (i.e., when students must/should take each course in order to graduate in four years). This information is used in Grad Planner to help students plan degree programs.

All University catalogs, both print and online, use data from PCAS. Degree requirements for University undergraduate majors and minors are automatically generated from PCAS for display in the online catalog and this same information is downloaded as needed for print catalogs. Plans to expand PCAS to graduate education are under way.

2. Creation of the Academic Health Center's Academic Council. The Council, composed of faculty from each AHC academic unit and the Health Science Libraries, as well as the University's Graduate School, advises the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences on academic oversight issues including new health sciences program proposals prior to their submission to the Office of the Provost and the Board of Regents for final review and approval. The establishment of the Academic Council responds to the increasing complexity, change, and opportunities associated with academic programs in the health sciences and the need for increased coordination and collaboration between and among the rest of the University's undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs on all campuses.
3. Launching of the University's first comprehensive online catalog of courses and programs offered through distance education.
<http://onestop2.umn.edu/courses/idpid/designators.jsp>

II. Case Study—The Graduate School

Introduction

This introduction provides a brief overview of the size and scope of graduate education at the University of Minnesota and clearly locates the Graduate School's program review processes within the wider context of strategic positioning.

More than 59,000 students were enrolled across the University campuses in 2006, of which 14,665 or nearly 25% were graduate students and another 3,942, or nearly 7%, were professional students. Unlike undergraduate education, which principally draws on a regional population, graduate education draws on a national and international population, with students coming from 115 countries and all 50 states.

As a result of the large number of graduate degrees we award each year, for example 750 doctoral degrees and 1,903 master's degrees in 2006, we rank in the top tier of research

universities nationally. Beyond our size, the breadth of the University's graduate offerings—135 majors in all—suggests an unparalleled range of educational and research opportunities for our students.

The enormous size and scope of the University's graduate education program demands careful oversight to ensure that our offerings meet consistently high standards of quality and that the future directions we take clearly match our distinctive strengths to pressing needs and opportunities. So, too, the wide range of offerings presents a serious challenge in terms of making decisions about the distribution of scarce resources for graduate education. Systematic and iterative processes of assessment help us to know which of our programs are truly excellent, and which ones are within reach of that goal, to effectively make decisions about investment. Review also helps us to understand the problems or concerns that need to be addressed for academic programs to reach their highest potential.

The processes of academic program review, managed by The Graduate School, play a critical role in assessing the quality of graduate offerings across the University of Minnesota system, and ensuring that they are closely aligned with the principles and priorities established through the strategic positioning process. The processes of academic program review, described below, uphold quality through the systematic assessment of proposals for new and changed academic programs, which is conducted by University of Minnesota faculty in academic fields related to the proposal, as well as through the periodic review of existing programs by experts from peer institutions.

Review of New and Changed Graduate Programs

The Graduate School is responsible for reviewing new and changed graduate programs and conducting external reviews of departments and graduate programs. It has recently been assigned to coordinate the review of centers as well. In all of its reviews—of whatever kind of program and at whatever stage of review—The Graduate School insists on creating, maintaining, and fostering academic quality. We look to see whether the goals and objectives of a program or department align with the mission of the University, whether there are the academic and financial resources necessary to create and maintain excellence, and whether students who enter one of The Graduate School's programs receive the educational experience they expect.

We believe that bringing colleagues from the University's peer and aspirational institutions to perform this assessment is essential in making this determination. We invite a panel of reviewers including as much diversity as possible: diversity of academic interests within a discipline, different kinds of academic institutions (public and private), variation of geographical location, generational range, and diversity of gender and ethnicity. The Graduate School has had great success in bringing the finest scholars in the nation to review its programs and departments.

The Graduate School is responsible for reviewing new and changed graduate programs at several stages:

1. all proposals for new and changed graduate programs before they are formally proposed to one or more of The Graduate School's six Policy and Review Councils (composed of the Directors of Graduate Studies and student representatives from disciplinary areas) or before they are proposed directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost when it is unnecessary for them to receive approval by a council;
2. all proposals after they are formally submitted and are to be referred to subcommittees of the Policy and Review Councils for their review before they are submitted to Policy and Review Councils as a whole;
3. all proposals for new and changed graduate programs after they have been approved or rejected by one or more Councils, at which time The Graduate School's Executive Committee (composed of the Graduate School's Deans, Chairs of the six Policy and Review Councils and several standing committees, two staff member of The Graduate School, and four graduate students, including the President of the Council of Graduate Students) reviews and votes to approve or disapprove a program;
4. all newly approved graduate programs after the first two years of their implementation by an internal review committee; and
5. all newly approved graduate programs after the first five years of their implementation by an external review committee.

In 2006–07, we had about 15-20 conversations with faculty members considering their intention to propose a new or changed program. These have culminated in faculty members understanding fully the steps necessary to take before proposing a new or changed program formally; their moving forward efficiently and effectively to propose a new or changed program; their deciding to postpone proposing a new or changed program until they could better align the proposal with the requirements of the Graduate School or with participating faculty members, chairs or heads, deans, and other units; their discovering that they could accomplish their aims within existing programs and that there was no need to propose a new or changed program; or their deciding not to go forward with a proposal because it would not be likely to meet Graduate School requirements, including enhancing the University's mission and goals.

Examples of the kinds of success this process has fostered are the following. In one instance, The Graduate School was able to merge three M. A. programs, which individually were overly specialized in our view and undersubscribed, into one M. A. program with three tracks. This means that graduate students will have a more substantial cohort of colleagues and that there will be some compression of administrative duties and saving of time for faculty members. The merger was the Graduate School's suggestion. Initially, this change was not congenial to the faculty's perceived interests, but gradually, they began to perceive the benefits of this idea. Not only was there no untoward fallout from the merger, but this change may now lead the department to make some advantageous changes in their Ph. D. program.

In another instance, the creation of a new program took advantage of the restructuring of colleges that resulted from the University's strategic positioning efforts. The addition of new faculty to a college allowed a department within it to add a track and thereby respond to many and continuing inquiries of prospective students interested in teacher development and urban education. The new program offers the potential for excellence in an area for which the University is particularly suited.

External Reviews of Departments and Programs

The Graduate School directs and coordinates reviews of departments, graduate programs within departments, and interdisciplinary graduate programs. When a department is also reviewed by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), as are several departments on the St. Paul campus, we partner with them in the external review. Though the Medical School plans and conducts its own external reviews, when a Graduate School program is located in the Medical School, The Graduate School participates in the review.

External reviewers make a difference. For example, in a department with three specialties, to everyone's surprise, reviewers suggested that faculty in one of those specialties should be located in another department in the college. At first, the department's administrators were shocked and suspicious. Was this something the deans had intended all along? Did the reviewers have the authority to make such a suggestion? The Graduate School assured the department that no one had anticipated this recommendation, much less instigated it. We confirmed that we always ask reviewers to recommend anything that would make a department stronger; so yes, they did have the authority to make this recommendation. As it turned out, everyone is happy with this realignment. Another department in the college was pleased to encompass the specialty recommended for movement to a new home, and the strengths of the faculty members who moved from the reviewed department have found new appreciation.

In another instance, reviewers noted that a department described five emphases and cautioned that this faculty had sufficient numbers and strengths for no more than three. Only if it moved to reduce its emphases would it be able to prosper, maintain its reputation, and continue to secure federal grants. In still another instance, newly hired, excellent faculty were invisible to the outside because their specialty was not part of the department name. Observing this and knowing that in this case it might be difficult to change the name of the department, reviewers recommended such easily accomplished actions as giving the specialty its own graduate director and creating its own letterhead and website. This cost essentially nothing and helped to give the specialty some of the visibility it lacked.

During 2006-07, The Graduate School reviewed the following departments and programs:

<u>College</u>	<u>Department or Program</u>	<u>Semester</u>
Education and Human Development (with CSREES)	Family Social Science	Spring '07
Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences	Graduate Program in Applied Plant Sciences	Spring '07
Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (with CSREES)	Horticultural Science	Fall '06
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs	Graduate Program in Public Policy	Fall '06
Liberal Arts	Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies	Spring '07
Liberal Arts	Geography	Fall '06

The Graduate School held final meetings to consider reviewers' reports and units' responses to them and to decide with college deans and the Provost's Office how to implement the recommendations regarding the following departments:

<u>College</u>	<u>Department or Program</u>	<u>Semester</u>
Education and Human Development	Kinesiology	Spring '07
Education and Human Development	Educational Psychology	Spring '07
Institute of Technology	Mathematics	Fall '06
Liberal Arts	History	Fall '06

Process Improvement

New and Changed Graduate Programs. Two important ways we have improved this process are, first, by encouraging an initial meeting between proposers of new and changed programs and The Graduate School personnel who are in charge of administering this area of our responsibility; and second, by assuring that proposers have consulted with deans, department chairs and heads, and participating faculty to ascertain whether they support the proposed program and are willing to contribute their time or financial resources, as needed, to seed and sustain the program. These improvements save everyone involved considerable time and effort.

External Reviews. Between 2001 and the present, when reviews resumed after a two-year hiatus, The Graduate School has made a number of improvements that have strengthened external reviews:

- The Graduate School has involved deans of colleges and the Provost's Office fully in external reviews. We regard this practice as essential.

- Although we pay attention to the calendar and how long it has been since a department has been reviewed, we now ask departments and deans to consider how external reviewers can be helpful. They can be especially useful in helping us consider how a discipline may have changed and how the University can best position itself within those changes, whether to hire replacements in the positions of retiring professors or to look for new faculty members in different fields, how to use best the strengths of new hires, or whether departments should be looking to link with departments in disciplines different from the ones with which they currently work.
- The Graduate School insists that reviewers leave us with a written set of recommendations at the time of the exit interview. In the past, reviewers' reports might come in six weeks, six months, a year, or occasionally never. By receiving the recommendations at the conclusion of the review, momentum is continued or gained; and everyone involved can begin to plan and implement changes at once.
- Finally, the outcomes of reviews play a part in the compact process so that we assure that something happens as a result of a review. The most common complaint about reviews has been that nothing happens as a result of them. Departments and programs without exception think that the self-study that they prepare in conjunction with external reviews is very useful. We want to be sure the usefulness of reviews does not stop there, but has a continuing effect.

Goals for 2007-08

New and Changed Graduate Programs. The Graduate School has three main goals for 2007-08 for administering new and changed graduate programs, all of which we have begun to work toward:

1. Since technological resources do not make it feasible at this time to bring online a PCAS for graduate programs, as there is for undergraduate programs (see p. 10 above), we have designed a PCAS-like instrument for proposers of graduate programs to use. We expect to make this resource available by the end of spring 2008. It will make clearer exactly what information proposers of new and changed programs must provide, will save time for both faculty and Graduate School administration, and will ensure that similar information is provided to the Provost's Office for graduate programs as is currently provided for undergraduate programs.
2. The Graduate School will increase the number of internal reviews of new programs. During the University's conversion to PeopleSoft and to semesters from quarters, The Graduate School Dean found it necessary to suspend reviews almost entirely for two years because the administration and faculty were engaged in so many activities. Consequently, we need to catch up with this process and are working to do that.
3. We are encouraging the development of new interdisciplinary programs that will align graduate education with University strategic planning and new

interdisciplinary initiatives. The Graduate School is concurrently pursuing with faculty, unit heads, and deans the discontinuation of graduate programs for which there is low demand or that might easily be merged with a program with similar interests.

External Reviews. The Graduate School can hold between four and six external reviews a year in addition to reviews it participates in that are conducted by the Medical School. We have found that in order to assure that we have a full complement of reviews in the fall, we need to schedule orientation meetings much earlier than we have in the past. This year we intend to do that.

Policy Questions

- Do the new and changed academic programs for 2006-07 move the University closer to achieving its aspirational goal?
- Do these guidelines and procedures support achievement of the University's aspirational goal?



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

September 6, 2007

Agenda Item: Academic Issues Related to: University Plan, Performance & Accountability Report

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

To inform the committee about the University's academic-related performance during the previous year relative to its competitors, past results, and current goals as reported in the *2007 Accountable to U: University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report* (see pages 86-231 of the Board of Regents docket).

To provide the committee an opportunity to discuss the major academic-related trends and implications for the University of the findings and conclusions in the report.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Does the report provide the committee with adequate and timely information on academic-related matters to fulfill its oversight role?

Does the report accurately reflect the University's aspirational goal, strategic positioning efforts, and measurements of progress regarding academic matters?

Background Information:

In 2000, the Board approved the creation of the *University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*. In its resolution, the Board noted that it "...holds itself accountable to the public for accomplishing the mission of the University" and that the report was to become the principal annual documentation of that accountability. The first report was published in 2001.

In December 2005, the Educational Planning and Policy Committee reviewed a revised outline and format for the report, which was designed to align with the University's strategic positioning efforts. In May 2006, the Board revised the timetable for production of the report to annually in September. The 2007 edition is the sixth produced for the Board of Regents.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

September 6, 2007

Agenda Item: Committee Workplan, 2007-08

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Regent David Larson
Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

To review and discuss the committee's workplan for 2007-08.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Do the proposed monthly themes and reports reflect the major educational and related issues facing the University?

Background Information:

At the beginning of each new academic year the committee develops a workplan containing a schedule of issues and business for the year.

BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

Work Plan 2007-08

September

Theme: Academic Accountability

- Academic highlights and challenges as illustrated by the annual University Plan, Performance and Accountability Report
- Annual report on academic program changes

Work plan discussion

Wisconsin Tuition Reciprocity Agreement – review/action

October: no meeting

November

Theme (1): Coordinate Campus Strategic Positioning Updates, continued

- Crookston
- Morris

Theme (2): Intellectual Property

- Copyright policy – Review
- Commercialization of Intellectual Property policy – Review

December

Theme: Undergraduate Education: Progress Report, Highlights, Challenges

- Student Recruitment
 - In-coming class profile trends and peer comparisons
 - New goals
 - Strategies

- Undergraduate Education Initiatives Update
- Student Support Initiatives Update
- Outcomes Update
 - Retention and graduation
 - Incorporating learning outcomes and developmental outcomes

Copyright Policy – Action

Commercialization of Intellectual Property – Action

February

Theme: Graduate and Professional Education

- Post-doc initiative
- NRC rankings
- Student recruitment, support, degree completion
- Carnegie study: What does it tell us?
- Center for Allied Health

March

Theme: Focus on Faculty

May

Theme: Internationalization

- Report from the new Associate Vice President: goals and strategies
- International Programs Policy – Review

June

Theme: Interdisciplinarity: Progress and Plans

- Institutes
- Conference/Best Practices Project

International Programs Policy – Action

July

Theme: Academic Communications

- Role of communication in meeting strategic positioning goal and in success of strategic positioning initiatives
- Communications progress and plans



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

September 6, 2007

Agenda Item: Consent Report

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

To seek Board approval of new academic programs and program additions, program deletions and discontinuations, and/or program changes, as outlined below.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

I. New Academic Programs

- Graduate School – Create free-standing Minor in Risk Analysis for Introduced Species and Genotypes

II. Changed Academic Programs

- College of Education and Human Development (Twin Cities Campus) – Discontinue Therapeutic Recreation area of emphasis in the M.A., Recreation, Park, and Leisure Studies degree
- College of Liberal Arts and College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (Twin Cities Campus) – Move academic home of writing-related programs from the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences to the College of Liberal Arts:
 - Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in Scientific and Technical Communication
 - Minor in Internet, Science and Society
 - Minor in Land, Nature and Environmental Values
 - Minor in Technical Communication
 - Minor in Designing Documents with New and Emerging Technologies
- Crookston Campus – Add Urban Forestry emphasis in the B.S., Horticulture degree
- School of Public Health (Twin Cities Campus) – Add interdisciplinary concentration in Health Disparities in the M.P.H. degree

Background Information:

This report appears as a regular item on the Educational Planning and Policy Committee agenda. Academic program proposal review and approval is governed by University of Minnesota Policy 2.2.4: Review of Proposals for New, Changed, and Discontinued Academic Programs. Approval by the Board of Regents is required for the establishment of new academic programs; addition of formal tracks and of new sites for existing academic programs; discontinuance/merger of existing programs; and changes in program titles/degree designation.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends approval of the academic program proposals detailed in the Consent Report.

**University of Minnesota Board of Regents
Educational Planning and Policy Committee
September 6, 2007**

Consent Report

I. Request for Approval of New Academic Programs

▪ **Graduate School—Create free-standing Minor in Risk Analysis for Introduced Species and Genotypes**

The Graduate School requests approval to offer a free-standing minor in Risk Analysis for Introduced Species and Genotypes for Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) and Master of Science (M.S.) programs, effective fall semester 2007. The minor is a component of a National Science Foundation IGERT (Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship) grant recently awarded to the University. Six semester credits will be required for the master's minor and 12 semester credits for the Ph.D. minor.

II. Request for Approval of Changed Academic Programs

▪ **College of Education and Human Development (Twin Cities Campus)—Discontinue Therapeutic Recreation area of emphasis in the M.A., Recreation, Park, and Leisure Studies degree**

The College of Education and Human Development on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to discontinue the Therapeutic Recreation area of emphasis in the Master of Arts (M.A.) degree in Recreation, Park, and Leisure Studies, effective spring semester 2008. This discontinuation is consistent with the previously approved discontinuation of the similarly named track in the undergraduate and other graduate programs in Recreation, Park and Leisure Studies. Currently enrolled students will be permitted to complete their programs.

▪ **College of Liberal Arts and College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (Twin Cities Campus)—Move academic home of writing-related programs**

The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (CFANS) on the Twin Cities campus request approval to move the following programs from CFANS to CLA, effective fall semester 2007:

- **Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in Scientific and Technical Communication**
- **Minor in Internet, Science and Society**
- **Minor in Land, Nature and Environmental Values**
- **Minor in Technical Communication**
- **Minor in Designing Documents with New and Emerging Technologies**

All of these programs were housed formerly in the Rhetoric Department of CFANS and will now be housed in CLA's new Department of Writing Studies. The new department consolidates writing-related programs on the Twin Cities campus and provides a comprehensive, integrated first-year writing program for undergraduates, houses an expanded center for writing, and will lead the transformation of the University's writing-intensive requirement into a new writing-enriched curriculum program.

- **Crookston Campus—Add Urban Forestry emphasis in the B.S., Horticulture degree**

The Crookston campus requests approval to establish an Urban Forestry area of emphasis in the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in Horticulture, effective fall semester 2007. The major's two other emphasis areas are Production Horticulture and Environmental Landscaping.

- **School of Public Health (Twin Cities Campus)—Add interdisciplinary concentration in Health Disparities in the M.P.H. degree**

The School of Public Health on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to add an interdisciplinary concentration in Health Disparities in the Master of Public Health (M.P.H.) degree, effective fall semester 2007. The concentration responds to student and faculty interest and the continuing need for research and documentation of the role of health disparities in the United States.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

September 6, 2007

Agenda Item: Information Items

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

To inform members of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of noteworthy items and policy-related issues affecting University units and departments.

To provide the committee with background information related to issues of regional, national, and international policy affecting higher education.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

There are no information items to report.

Background Information:

This report appears as a regular item on the Educational Planning and Policy Committee agenda.