

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning & Policy Committee

Thursday, May 7, 2009

9:45 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.

600 McNamara Alumni Center, West Committee Room

Committee Members

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

Student Representatives

Jennifer McCabe
Dustin Norman

A G E N D A

1. Board of Regents Policy: *Academic Freedom and Responsibility* - Review - T. Sullivan (pp. 2-6)
2. Update: Professional Education - T. Sullivan/C. Delaney/J. Ziegenhagen (pp. 7-13)
3. Consent Report - Review/Action - T. Sullivan (pp. 14-15)
4. Information Items - T. Sullivan (p. 16)



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

May 7, 2009

Agenda Item: Board of Regents Policy: Academic Freedom and Responsibility

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

To review proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*. Proposed amendments were endorsed unanimously by the University Faculty Senate.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Changes are intended to clarify the definitions of academic freedom and responsibility for faculty and staff and to address faculty concerns arising out of the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision *Garcetti et al. v. Ceballos* (2006). The plain text of the amended policy provides that academic freedom is rooted together with responsibilities incumbent upon all University faculty and staff. These include adherence to all federal and state laws, as well as University policies, procedures, and contractual obligations, including specifically those pertaining to employee, patient, and student privacy and confidentiality rights; intellectual property and trade secrets; and conditions accompanying grants and other research agreements.

Background Information:

Board of Regents Policy: *Academic Freedom and Responsibility* was adopted on January 28, 1938 and revised on December 14, 1963; January 8, 1971; and September 8, 1995.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends adoption of proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*.

**University of Minnesota Board of Regents
Educational Planning and Policy Committee
May 7, 2009**

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure provided the following background information to the Faculty Senate prior to the Senate vote endorsing the proposed amendments on April 2, 2009:

COMMENT:

1. Introduction

The amendment the Committee has proposed to Section II is designed to protect faculty and staff members who participate in the governance system and who may express views critical of institutional proposals or actions. Nothing in the amendment or the policy exempts or excuses those covered by it from faithful performance of their professional duties and obligations, as reflected in Section III.

The Committee recognizes that freedom to speak about the affairs of the University without institutional discipline or restraint does not extend to those who hold senior administrative positions. The Committee understands that the Board of Regents and the President have the right to expect that senior officers and others in key administrative positions (for example, at the level of dean or above) and their immediate staff will support the University's mission and the policies, procedures, goals, and programs established and announced by the Board of Regents and the President, and will not publicly undermine them. This includes, for example, statements before the legislature, to the media, etc.

2. Background

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure has taken note of what it considers to be an ominous development in case law in the United States and recommends an amendment to the Regents policy, Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The Committee wishes to make it clear that the amendment it has proposed is intended to preserve the status quo, in response to a trend in federal court cases that may restrict the subjects of discourse in the University. The amendment does not abridge any authority or freedom of action that is already the prerogative of the Board of Regents or of members of the University administration.

In the case of *Garcetti et al. v. Ceballos* (2006), the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that an employee (in this case, a district attorney) who wrote a memo about his employer is not protected by the First Amendment. The Court wrote that "the First Amendment does not prohibit managerial discipline based on an employee's expressions made pursuant to official responsibilities. . . . [T]he controlling factor is that Ceballos' expressions were made pursuant to his official duties. That consideration distinguishes this case from those in which the First Amendment provides protection against discipline. Ceballos wrote his disposition memo because that is part of what he was employed to do. He did not act as a citizen by writing it. The fact that his duties sometimes required him to speak or write does not mean that his supervisors were prohibited from evaluating his performance. Restricting speech that owes its existence to a public employee's professional responsibilities does not infringe any liberties the employee might have enjoyed as a private citizen." The Court went on to note that "[t]here is some argument that expression related to academic scholarship or classroom instruction implicates additional constitutional interests that are not fully accounted for by this Court's customary employee-

speech jurisprudence. We need not, and for that reason do not, decide whether the analysis we conduct today would apply in the same manner to a case involving speech related to scholarship or teaching."

Justice Souter dissented in the *Garcetti* case and wrote that "I have to hope that today's majority does not mean to imperil First Amendment protection of academic freedom in public colleges and universities, whose teachers necessarily speak and write "pursuant to official duties." See *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U. S. 306, 329 (2003) ("We have long recognized that, given the important purpose of public education and the expansive freedoms of speech and thought associated with the university environment, universities occupy a special niche in our constitutional tradition"); *Keyishian v. Board of Regents of Univ. of State of N. Y.*, 385 U. S. 589, 603 (1967) ("Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom. 'The vigilant protection of constitutional freedoms is nowhere more vital than in the community of American schools'" (quoting *Shelton v. Tucker*, 364 U. S. 479, 487 (1960))); *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, 354 U. S. 234, 250 (1957) (a governmental enquiry into the contents of a scholar's lectures at a state university "unquestionably was an invasion of [his] liberties in the areas of academic freedom and political expression—areas in which government should be extremely reticent to tread").

Public-employee First-Amendment law, up until the *Garcetti* case, was governed by the Court's decision in *Pickering v. Board of Education* (1968), which held that a school board could not dismiss a teacher who wrote a letter to a newspaper complaining about the board's decisions on several matters, including the allocation of funds. The Court held that the teacher was speaking on a matter of public concern, so her speech was protected by the First Amendment.

Although the Supreme Court did not decide how the *Garcetti* ruling applies to colleges and universities, one federal district court in California and one federal appeals court have applied the *Garcetti* rule in academic settings. In *Hong v. Grant* (2007), a faculty member at the University of California-Irvine criticized several hiring and promotion decisions within his department and voiced concern about the department's reliance on part-time lecturers to teach lower-division classes. He was subsequently denied a merit salary increase, placed on a remediation plan, and assigned extra teaching duties. He sued, claiming the actions were taken in retaliation for his criticisms. The District Court cited the *Garcetti* case in dismissing the faculty member's lawsuit. (The *Hong* case is on appeal.)

In *Renken v. Gregory* (2008), a professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee complained about the way the University was using, and proposing to use, University matching funds in a project to enhance the education of engineering undergraduates by adding laboratory components to classes, and he refused to sign a letter detailing use of matching funds that he said would be improper under NSF regulations. The University decided to return the grant to NSF. Renken sued, claiming that the University had reduced his pay and terminated the NSF grant in retaliation for his criticisms. The District Court granted the University's motion for summary judgment, concluding that Renken's complaints about the grant funding were made as part of his official duties, rather than as a citizen, and therefore were not protected by the First Amendment. The Court of Appeals affirmed the ruling, concurring that administration of an educational grant fell within the scope of Renken's duties of "teaching, researching, and public service" and his speech was therefore not protected by the First Amendment. Neither *Hong* nor *Renken* considered the merits of the faculty member's claim, since they found there were no substantive rights to be protected.

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is concerned about the implications of these cases. While the caveat in the *Garcetti* opinion ("We need not, and for that reason do not, decide

whether the analysis we conduct today would apply in the same manner to a case involving speech related to scholarship or teaching") might be reassuring, we are concerned that it refers only to scholarship and teaching. What of a faculty or staff member who speaks up at a meeting of a Senate committee, at a department meeting, or at a meeting of the Faculty or University Senate, to object to actions by a department, a college, or the University? If such speech is "made pursuant to official responsibilities," as the *Garcetti* case provides, then it is NOT protected by the courts as coming under the First Amendment; whether it would be protected in the courts by the traditions of academic freedom to which Justice Souter referred is an open question. Moreover, the *Renken* case applied the *Garcetti* analysis to a matter that *was* related to scholarship and teaching.

As Professor Neil Hamilton from St. Thomas University pointed out in a visit with the Committee, the *Garcetti* case, if it were applied to higher education, would present a paradox for faculty. On the one hand, the faculty and staff believe in and are committed to the consultative processes of the governance system in the University (as are the senior officers and the members of the Board of Regents, as they have assured the faculty repeatedly in the past decade). On the other hand, if consultation is part of their "official duties" as understood by the courts, then speech uttered in the course of consultation could put someone at risk of discipline if an administrator took issue with it.

The importance of the issue has been recognized by the AAUP, which has filed a friend-of-the-court brief in the appeal of *Hong v. Grant* and has established a panel of prominent First Amendment scholars to seek new ways to defend academic freedom at public colleges. The concerns of the AAUP, of constitutional scholars, and of faculty leaders were discussed in a recent article by Peter Schmidt in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (*Professors' Freedoms Under Assault in the Courts*, February 27, 2009).

The Committee is thus recommending to the Faculty Senate, the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators, and the Board of Regents that the University preclude the possibility that internal discussions and debates about institutional policy and decisions could subject an employee to discipline. If everyone who participates in a committee or Senate discussion must worry about facing sanctions as a result of what he or she said, the consultative governance system that has served the University well could wither away. The proposed amendment would put the institution on record as protecting speech made about the functioning of the University. As noted by Provost Sullivan in the *Chronicle* article cited above, a "very important part of our universities—particularly our public universities—should be transparency,' which is lacking where employees do not feel free to speak their minds."



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 1 of 1

Academic
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY
Adopted: September 8, 1995
Supersedes: (see end of policy)

DRAFT for review May 7, 2009

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

SECTION I. GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

The Board of Regents (Board) of the University of Minnesota (University) reaffirms the principles of academic freedom and responsibility. These are rooted in the belief that the mind is ennobled by the pursuit of understanding and the search for truth, and the state well served when instruction is available to all at an institution dedicated to the advancement of learning. These principles are also refreshed by the recollection that there is *commune vinculum omnibus artibus*, a common bond through all the arts.

SECTION II. ACADEMIC FREEDOM.

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write ~~as a public citizen~~ without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the University.

SECTION III. ACADEMIC RESPONSIBILITY.

Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of ~~academic~~ professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest, one ~~the individual~~ is not speaking for the institution ~~in matters of public interest.~~



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

May 7, 2009

Agenda Item: Update: Professional Education

review review/action action discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan
Connie White Delaney, Dean, School of Nursing
John Ziegenhagen, Director

Purpose:

policy background/context oversight strategic positioning

Overview and case study of professional education at the University and its role in fulfilling the University's mission and strategic goals.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Professional education at the University of Minnesota comprises a broad range of programs, including traditional "first-professional degree" programs, such as dentistry, medicine, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and law, but also programs geared to other professions. These include architecture, business, education, engineering, and nursing.

Professional education programs play an important role in preparing future Minnesota leaders in critical workforce fields. Curricular, research, and public engagement decisions by deans and faculty are informed by workforce issues and changes in specialized accreditation standards. One such field, nursing, is the subject of a case study of the School of Nursing.

Background Information:

This presentation is included in the Committee's 2008-09 work plan of examining all aspects of the University's academic enterprise: undergraduate, graduate, and professional education; research; and public engagement initiatives at the University's campuses.

**University of Minnesota Board of Regents
Educational Planning and Policy Committee
May 7, 2009**

Update: Professional Education

Professional education comprises a broad range of academic programs that prepare students for highly skilled occupations through a combination of theory and practice. These programs include traditional “first-professional degree” programs such as dentistry, medicine, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and law as well as programs geared to other professions. These include such varied fields as accounting, architecture, audiology, business, education, engineering, nursing, occupational therapy, psychology, public policy, and social work.

Most of these professional education programs are accredited by specialized accrediting agencies or other entities, e.g., American Bar Association, American Medical Association, National Architectural Accrediting Board, Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, etc. Increasingly, specialized accrediting agencies are requiring professional education programs to be created at the master’s and doctoral levels in order to meet workforce standards.

In addition, most of these professions are regulated by agencies of local, state, and/or national governments. Graduates of professional education programs frequently must pass licensure or certification examinations in order to practice.

At the University of Minnesota, professional education programs play an important role in preparing future Minnesota leaders in critical workforce fields. Curricular, research, and public engagement decisions by deans and faculty are informed by workforce issues and changes in specialized accreditation standards.

Examples of professional education degrees offered at the University of Minnesota include:

- Accounting—Master of Accountancy (M.Acc.)
- Architecture—Master of Architecture (M.Arch.)
- Business—Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.)
- Dentistry—Doctor of Dental Surgery (D.D.S.)
- Law—Juris Doctor (J.D.)
- Medicine—Doctor of Medicine (M.D.)
- Nursing—Master of Nursing (M.N.), Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)
- Pharmacy—Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.)
- Social Work—Master of Social Work (M.S.W.)
- Veterinary Medicine—Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.)

Professional Education Degrees Conferred

The table below provides examples of professional degrees conferred for the 2007-2008 academic year at the University of Minnesota:

<u>Degree Name</u>	<u>Number Conferred</u>
Master of Business Administration (UMTC and UMD)	669
Master of Education in Teaching	297
Juris Doctor	236
Doctor of Medicine	208
Doctor of Pharmacy	160
Master of Public Health	139
Master of Social Work (UMTC and UMD)	149
Doctor of Dental Surgery	98
Doctor of Veterinary Medicine	86
Master of Architecture	61
Master of Urban and Regional Planning	34
Master of Accountancy	26
Doctor of Audiology	4

Excellence in Professional Education

Case Study: University of Minnesota School of Nursing

The changing landscape of health care and health systems, the evolution and import of technologies, and the local, State, and global challenges of ensuring quality professional providers clearly demand the full strength, energy and creativity of professional education programs and universities. As the largest group of health care professionals (2.5 million), the power of this perfect storm could not be more acute than in nursing. The following synopsis provides the context for the Board of Regents presentation engaging the University of Minnesota's School of Nursing as a case study in professional education excellence.

Snapshot of the School of Nursing

The School of Nursing celebrates its centennial this year. The circumstances of the birth of this school pervade its evolution to date. Richard Olding Beard, founder of the University of Minnesota Medical School in 1888 and head of the Department of Physiology was often described as "A Physician With a Calling for Nursing." He argued passionately for nurses to be educated in the University, rather than the hospital-based programs of the day; he emerged as a founder of the School of Nursing during the 1880s to 1910 when U.S. nursing was undergoing a major revolution that involved lively debates with Mayo leaders, the popular press campaigns to hire "100,000 girls for Sub-Nurses", the exploitation of nursing students for hospital needs, and the University's intense legislative campaign to build the first University hospital. Dr. Beard joined

nursing leaders of the day in spearheading the founding of the School of Nursing. With Board of Regents authorization on October 1, 1908, and official establishment on March 1, 1909, the School of Nursing at the University of Minnesota was launched. The School became the first school of nursing in the U.S. to be founded within a university and today is the longest continuously operated university-based school of nursing in the world.

The School of Nursing is one of 751 baccalaureate and higher degree programs and among the top 5% of schools of nursing in the nation; one of 41 programs in Carnegie Classification Doctoral/Research Universities; the only school that offers the Ph.D. in nursing in Minnesota; and responsible for educating the majority (>55%) of researchers, educators and advanced practice nurses in the state.

The School of Nursing has 79 faculty members; the approval and subsequent implementation of the clinical track in 2007 created a faculty composition of 40 tenured/tenure-track and 37 clinical track faculty. We celebrate the exemplary credentialing of 100% of tenured/tenure-track faculty and 56% of our clinical track faculty holding doctoral degrees. Forty-two percent of tenured/tenure-track faculty members are fellows in the American Academy of Nursing. Staff total 189. The School of Nursing maintains a staff-to-faculty ratio of 0.68. The School has an 11% gender and 9% persons-of-color diversity within our faculty/staff.

The School of Nursing has grown from a single curriculum focused on the practice of nursing and dietetics to providing five degree programs, including the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (B.S.N.), an expedited 16-month professional master's degree for persons already holding bachelor's, master's, and/or Ph.D.s in other fields (second degree option), advanced specialty Master of Science (M.S.) and Doctor of Nursing Practice (D.N.P.) degree programs, and the Ph.D. in Nursing—complemented with post-doctoral training programs. We offer 14 areas of study and focus in the preparation of nurses for advanced practice as Clinical Nurse Specialists, Nurse Practitioners, Midwives, Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists, organizational/generative leaders, informatics experts, and those with expertise in integrative health and healing. We are the first nursing program in the United States to:

- transition specialty preparation from master's degree preparation to the D.N.P. (2008);
- offer D.N.P. preparation for midwives;
- offer D.N.P. preparation for Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists;
- offer D.N.P. preparation for nursing informatics;
- offer D.N.P. preparation for integrative health and healing; and
- offer D.N.P. preparation for generative leadership (administration).

E-learning is a priority. One-hundred percent of courses in the School of Nursing have an on-line presence. The post-master's degree D.N.P. program utilizes the executive model of education, which includes all on-line courses and 2-3 in-person sessions per semester.

The School of Nursing offers the most comprehensive academic programming of U.S. schools of nursing within research-intensive universities. Clinical practice sites now total

248, with 772 practice placements per year. Today nursing practice represents the evolution of the profession into all settings, including corporate and industry. The School of Nursing's global engagements have expanded from an initial partnership with Seoul National University in Korea, established post-WWII, to eight partnerships in the last three years.

The School of Nursing's enrollment is more than 800 in the five degree programs, spanning the Twin Cities and Rochester campuses. Gender diversity is up to 21% and persons of color have increased to 25% of students admitted to the academic programs. More than 12,400 nursing degrees have been granted since the School's founding.

The School's National Institutes of Health ranking is currently 24th nationally (2004); analysis of current data among the top 10 schools of nursing indicates that \$1.3M separates the School from a top 10 ranking. Research funding has doubled in the last three years and is clearly aligned with University of Minnesota and Academic Health Center (AHC) research priorities. Faculty research is noticeably focused on discovery and translation of integrated biological and behavioral knowledge for effective prevention, treatment, and end-of-life care. In 2008 the School celebrated its first inductee in the AHC's Academy for Excellence in Nursing Research, and its first designated McKnight Presidential Fellow. Endowed chairs have doubled in the last three years to four chairs, with an additional three chairs/professorships before year end.

The School of Nursing has several centers of national and international import:

- Center for Child and Family Health Promotion Research
- Center for Children with Special Health Care Needs—*one of only five U.S. programs receiving Maternal/Child Health Bureau funding*
- Center for Adolescent Nursing—*one of only five U.S. programs receiving Maternal/Child Health Bureau funding*
- The Minnesota Hartford Center of Geriatric Nursing Excellence—*one of nine in the U.S.*
- Center for Gerontological Nursing—*grants have exceeded \$10M to support age-related research*
- Center for Health Trajectory Research—*grant submissions increased by 25% over prior year*
- Katharine J. Densford International Center for Nursing Leadership—*first university-based leadership center*
- International Council for Nurses (ICN) Center for Nursing Minimum Data Set Knowledge Discovery—*one of two in the U.S. and only five in the world fostering informatics research*

Budget

The total annual budget for the School is \$23.4 M. The University of Minnesota School of Nursing Foundation balances are \$18.5M.

National Trends of Import

Registered Nurse Shortage: AACN – Washington, DC, April, 2008 - The Bureau of Labor Statistics is projecting the need for more than a million new and replacement registered nurses by the year 2016. The challenge inherent in these efforts is to quickly produce competent nurses while maintaining the integrity and quality of the nursing education provided. Registered nurses are projected to generate about 587,000 new jobs over the 2006-2016 period, one of the largest numbers among all occupations. To meet the more complex demands of today's health care environment, the National Advisory Council on Nurse Education and Practice has recommended that at least two-thirds of the basic nurse workforce hold baccalaureate or higher degrees in nursing by 2010. Aware of the need, RNs are seeking the BSN degree in increasing numbers. In 1980, almost 55 percent of employed registered nurses held a hospital diploma as their highest educational credential, 22 percent held the bachelor's degree, and 18 percent an associate degree. By 2004, a diploma was the highest educational credential for only 17.5 percent of RNs, while the number with bachelor's degrees as their highest education had climbed to 34.2 percent, with 33.7 percent holding an associate degree as their top academic preparation. In 2007, 14,946 RNs with diplomas or associate degrees graduated from BSN programs.

Unmet Need for Qualified Nurses: AACN - WASHINGTON, DC, February 26, 2009 - According to new survey data released by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN), less than half of all qualified applicants to entry-level baccalaureate nursing programs were enrolled last year despite calls to increase the number of well-educated registered nurses (RNs) in the U.S. workforce. Though interest in nursing careers is high, the latest data show that almost 50,000 qualified applications to professional nursing programs were turned away in 2008, including nearly 7,000 applicants to master's and doctoral degree programs.

Accelerated Programs (Fast-Track to Careers in Nursing): Accelerated programs have proliferated over the past 15 years. In 1990, 31 accelerated baccalaureate programs (BSN) and 12 generic master's programs (MSN) were offered around the country. Today, 205 accelerated BSN programs are operating and the number of generic master's programs has increased to 56. According to AACN's database on enrollment and graduations which is based on responses from 645 of 751 institutions (85.9%), 37 new accelerated BSN programs are now in the planning stages. This number far outpaces all other types of entry-level nursing programs currently being considered at four-year nursing schools. Thirteen new generic master's programs are also taking shape. (AACN, 2008) Graduates of accelerated programs are prized by nurse employers who value the many layers of skill and education these graduates bring to the workplace. Employers report that these graduates are more mature, possess strong clinical skills, and are quick studies on the job. Many practice settings are partnering with schools and offering tuition repayment to graduates as a mechanism to recruit highly qualified nurses.

Advanced Preparation Requirements: On October 25, 2004, the member schools affiliated with the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) voted to endorse the [*Position Statement on the Practice Doctorate in Nursing*](#). This decision

called for moving the current level of preparation necessary for advanced nursing practice from the master's degree to the doctorate-level by the year 2015. This endorsement was preceded by almost three years of research and consensus-building by an AACN task force charged with examining the need for the practice doctorate with a variety of stakeholder groups.

Nursing Faculty Shortage: As of July 2008, 62.8% of AACN member schools had nursing faculty vacancies, 66.6% of which were tenure-track positions, and 31% of these schools with vacancies were part of an academic health center. The Midwest region experiences the highest percentage of vacancies.

Transformation of the Health Care System: Provides unprecedented opportunities for interprofessional partnerships.

E-learning: The opportunities to maximize e-learning and simulation provide unprecedented opportunities as well as challenges.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

May 7, 2009

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. **Request for Approval of New Academic Program**
 - College of Education and Human Development (Twin Cities Campus)—Create postbaccalaureate certificate in Innovations in Undergraduate Multicultural Teaching and Learning

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
May 7, 2009**

Consent Report

I. Request for Approval of New Academic Program

- **College of Education and Human Development (Twin Cities Campus)—
Create postbaccalaureate certificate in Innovations in Undergraduate
Multicultural Teaching and Learning**

The College of Education and Human Development on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to create a postbaccalaureate certificate in Innovations in Undergraduate Multicultural Teaching and Learning, effective fall 2009. The certificate program will serve current and future faculty at undergraduate institutions who are interested in developing innovative teaching and learning strategies with an emphasis on access and success for traditionally under-served students.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS**

Educational Planning and Policy Committee

May 7, 2009

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.