

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Educational Planning & Policy Committee**

**Thursday, March 10, 2011**

**10:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.**

**600 McNamara Alumni Center, East Committee Room**

**Committee Members**

Patricia Simmons, Chair  
Maureen Ramirez, Vice Chair  
Richard Beeson  
Laura Brod  
Linda Cohen  
David Larson

**Student Representatives**

Matt McGeachy  
Paul Strain

**A G E N D A**

1. Board of Regents Policy: *Academic Freedom and Responsibility* - Review - T. Sullivan (pp. 2-3)
2. Update on Findings of Blue Ribbon Committees System-wide - T. Sullivan/R. Jones (pp. 4-7)
3. Consent Report - Review/Action - T. Sullivan (pp. 8-10)
4. Information Items - T. Sullivan (p. 11)



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Educational Planning and Policy Committee**

**March 10, 2011**

**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 a proposed amendment to the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Policy. The amendment initially was proposed by the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and has been endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

**Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:**

The proposed amendment moves the phrase “without institutional discipline or restraint” from the end of the sentence in Section II that defines academic freedom to earlier in the sentence. The purpose of the proposed change is to clarify, consistent with the original intent of a 2009 amendment to the policy, that academic freedom applies to all of the activities listed in Section II.

**Background Information:**

The Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy was last amended in June, 2009.

**President's Recommendation for Action:**

The President recommends that the Board adopt the proposed amendment to the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Policy.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 1 of 1

Academic  
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY  
Adopted: September 8, 1995  
Amended: June 12, 2009  
Supersedes: (see end of policy)

**DRAFT** for review March 10, 2011

**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 without institutional discipline or restraint to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write ~~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 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 is not speaking for the institution.

**SUPERSEDES:** ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY DATED JANUARY 28, 1938; ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY DATED DECEMBER 14, 1963; ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY DATED JANUARY 8, 1971.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Educational Planning and Policy Committee**

**March 10, 2011**

**Agenda Item:** Update on Findings of Blue Ribbon Committees System-Wide

review       review/action       action       discussion

**Presenters:** Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan  
Senior Vice President/System Academic Administration Robert Jones

**Purpose:**

policy       background/context       oversight       strategic positioning

This presentation will highlight the Blue Ribbon Committee Reports, a critical part of Phase III of the University of Minnesota's strategic positioning process. This phase reexamines the initial recommendations and implementation in the context of current financial challenges and declining resources. In September 2009, the three senior vice presidents asked the deans and chancellors to launch a Blue Ribbon Committee or equivalent to analyze and recommend priorities for continued and new investments, as well as cost saving strategies. The resulting collegiate and campus Blue Ribbon Committee Reports will be summarized, as these recommendations focus particular attention on sustaining the momentum created by the strategic positioning effort.

**Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:**

The presentation will include:

1. A brief history of the strategic positioning process.
2. Description of the Blue Ribbon Committee effort.
3. Summary of ideas generated by the collegiate and campus Blue Ribbon Committee Reports, and trends across colleges and campuses.

**Background Information:**

On March 11, 2005, the Board of Regents endorsed the University's strategic goal to become one of the top three public research universities in the world. On June 10, 2005, the Board endorsed the President's plan for working toward that goal. Since then, the Board and this Committee have received a wide range of reports pertinent to the University's ongoing strategic positioning effort and progress.

**BOARD OF REGENTS**  
**Educational Planning and Policy Committee**  
**March 10, 2011**

**Update on Findings of Blue Ribbon Committees System-Wide**

**Background**

In September 2009, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences Frank Cerra, and Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration Robert Jones charged each dean of the Twin Cities campus colleges and the chancellors of the coordinate campuses to launch a “Blue Ribbon Committee.” The launch of this effort was commensurate with the start of Phase III of the University of Minnesota’s strategic positioning process.

Phase I of strategic positioning began in 2004, and established the concepts, vision, and strategic direction for the University of Minnesota. The stated goal, unanimously endorsed by the Board of Regents in March 2005, is to become one of the top three public research universities in the world. Over 500 University faculty, staff, students, alumni, and other stakeholders engaged in a deliberative, thoughtful process initiated by a series of town hall meetings and followed by task forces organized around colleges or themes.

Phase II of strategic positioning was defined by the implementation of the recommendations provided by the 35 task force reports. This phase lasted from 2005 through 2009.

Phase III of strategic positioning reexamines the initial recommendations and implementation in the context of current financial challenges and declining resources. Examples of Phase III work includes the effort on enrollment management (update presented to the Board of Regents Educational Planning and Policy Committee in December 2010), the President’s “Advancing Excellence Steering Committee,” and the Blue Ribbon Committee initiative in each college and campus. This presentation is focused on the Blue Ribbon effort.

While many aspects of strategic positioning focus on metrics and opportunities to improve the University in a quantitative manner, it is important to recall that strategic positioning, at its core, has been a values-driven process. At its heart, strategic positioning raised expectations and aspirations of the University’s excellence.

The on-going strategic positioning process reflects that achieving excellence is a continuous, multi-phase, long-term effort. Minnesota’s economy and quality of life are linked directly to the quality of the state’s only research university. This research includes the entire suite of intellectual and creative activities promoting and preserving discovery, learning, and innovation.

To accomplish the goal of becoming one of the top three public research universities in the world, the University of Minnesota must aim high and act with strategic resolve, setting new expectations for students, faculty, and staff. The University must make wise, but sometimes difficult, choices in the face of declining state funding support. Finally, the University must be a talent magnet, attracting new students and faculty from across the country and around the world, to develop the next generation of leaders for the state, nation, and beyond.

The financial circumstances in 2011 are different than when strategic positioning began in 2004. It is imperative, however, that the University of Minnesota continue the momentum achieved during Phases I and II of strategic positioning, and sustain the momentum for the full ten years.

## **Process**

Each dean and chancellor was instructed in September 2009 to establish a collegiate or campus “Blue Ribbon Committee,” composed of faculty, staff, students, and outside stakeholders, to analyze and recommend priorities for continued and new investment, as well as cost saving strategies. Deans and chancellors were permitted to utilize an existing collegiate or campus committee that could serve the same purpose.

In order to continue the momentum started in 2004 in the context of current financial challenges, these guiding questions are framing Phase III of strategic positioning and the Blue Ribbon process. In September 2009, the colleges and campuses were asked to focus on these questions:

- What programs and areas must be strengthened or expanded?
- What programs should be maintained at current levels of support or reduced levels of support?
- What programs and areas should continue, but be substantially reduced or consolidated?
- What programs should be discontinued or eliminated?
- How can academic programs and areas better leverage existing human capital resources, including: rationalizing teaching loads; sharing new, more energetic curriculum; consolidation; better use of classrooms and laboratories; and the development of new academic programs?

The goal was for each committee to prioritize current collegiate or campus strengths and weaknesses, and then make recommendations to the dean as to where continued and new investments should be made. In addition, committees were asked to identify areas of new revenue generation, opportunities to leverage multiple sources of revenue, and areas of cost reduction. These specific guidelines were provided to the deans and chancellors in the charge letter from the senior vice presidents:

- Do the decisions that you make promote quality and excellence of your academic program?

- Do the decisions advance academic synergies among teaching, learning, and scholarship?
- Do the decisions provide the leveraging of resources from numerous sources such as central administration, alumni, donors, foundations, and other philanthropic contributors?
- Do the decisions advance the collegiate unit's or campus' comparative advantage and academic reputation? (Will the decisions differentiate the school to create a uniqueness that will permit the collegiate unit to academically stand out?)
- Do your identified priorities promote the collegiate unit's or campus' academic strengths and reputation with a full and informal discussion of appropriate "tradeoffs"? (As we know, 'reputation' is directly linked to quality and status of the institution, and, in turn, is related to the recruitment of outstanding faculty and students.)

Deans and chancellors shared the Blue Ribbon instructions with the committees as part of this transparent and comprehensive process. As a result, collegiate or campus communities understand the importance of continually evaluating academic and strategic directions in the context of the University's mission and scope.

The Blue Ribbon Committee Reports are part of the discussion this year during the annual compact process, which aligns broad University goals with the directions, investments, and actions of the college or campus. Specifically, the compact instructions this year ask colleges and campuses to:

- Comment on the status of their Blue Ribbon Committee or equivalent effort.
- Identify recommendations and actions being taken as a result of the Blue Ribbon effort.
- Discuss how the Blue Ribbon recommendations inform a three-year strategic and budget plan.

### **Ideas Generated by the Blue Ribbon Committee Reports**

Recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Reports can be organized into these four categories: (1) size and scope, (2) revenue generation, (3) cost containment, and (4) investments. The presentation to the Committee will summarize recommendations in each of these broad categories.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Educational Planning and Policy Committee**

**March 10, 2011**

**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 Programs**
  - College of Biological Sciences (Twin Cities campus)—Create minor in Microbiology
- II. **Request for Approval of Discontinued Academic Programs**
  - College of Liberal Arts (Twin Cities campus)—Discontinue minor in Land, Nature and Environmental Values

**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  
March 10, 2011**

**Consent Report**

**I. Request for Approval of New Academic Programs**

▪ **College of Biological Sciences (Twin Cities campus)—Create minor in Microbiology**

The College of Biological Sciences on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to create a minor in Microbiology, effective fall semester 2011. Students in the proposed minor will study the structure, function, and interaction of microbes, such as bacteria, fungi, and viruses. The proposed minor will leverage existing resources aligned with the B.S. (Bachelor of Science) degree in Microbiology.

**II. Request for Approval of Discontinued Academic Programs**

▪ **College of Liberal Arts (Twin Cities campus)—Discontinue minor in Land, Nature and Environmental Values**

The College of Liberal Arts on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to discontinue the minor in Land, Nature and Environmental Values, effective spring semester 2011. The proposed discontinuation results from the College's assessment of its strategy and academic programs. In addition, key faculty associated with the minor are no longer with the College.



**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Educational Planning and Policy Committee**

**March 10, 2011**

**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:**

An update on academic initiatives and progress to date related to the University's strategic positioning effort will be available at the March meeting.

**Background Information:**

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