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**Agenda Item:** Board of Regents Policy: Openness in Research

- review
- review/action
- action
- discussion

**Presenters:** Vice President Timothy Mulcahy

**Purpose:**

- policy
- background/context
- oversight
- strategic positioning

Board of Regents Policy: *Openness in Research* is presented for action as part of the Board’s ongoing policy review process.

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

In an effort to better align Board of Regents Policy: *Openness in Research* with the University’s Mission Statement, the wording in Section III of the policy has been altered slightly.

**Background Information:**

Vice President Mulcahy was asked to review Board of Regents Policy: *Openness in Research* considering the following questions:

1) "Review language in Section III related to University’s mission"
2) “Review policy in light of recent federal regulatory requirements”

After careful consideration and consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, it was determined that only slight changes needed to be made to the language of Section III. These changes do not affect the substance of the current policy, as it already is consistent with the University’s Mission Statement.

**President’s Recommendation for Action:**

The President recommends adoption of proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: *Openness in Research*. 
OPENNESS IN RESEARCH

SECTION I. SCOPE.

This policy applies to research conducted at the University of Minnesota (University) by University faculty, staff, students, visiting researchers, and volunteers, except as provided in Section II.

SECTION II. EXCLUSIONS.

This policy shall not apply when:

(a) the research is performed by faculty members on leave from the University or serving as consultants; or

(b) the research involves services performed as an external sale, provided that the results of such services either may be published freely in the aggregate or may be used to guide the design of broader research activities.

SECTION III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

The mission of the University is to generate and disseminate knowledge. Essential to this mission are the fundamental principles of open scholarly exchange and academic freedom: In carrying out its mission of research and discovery, the University strives to sustain an open exchange of ideas in an environment that embodies the values of academic freedom and responsibility. Absent compelling reasons, the University shall not accept restrictions on participation in University research or on the dissemination of the results of University research. The University cooperates with research sponsors in the orderly publication of research results, subject to appropriate restrictions on the use of publications or of the University’s name for commercial purposes.

SECTION IV. ACCEPTANCE OF RESEARCH AGREEMENTS.

The following provisions shall govern the acceptance of research grants and contracts by the University:
Subd. 1. Disclosure of the Research Relationship. The University shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or grant that prohibits the disclosure of:

(a) the existence of the contract or grant;

(b) the identity of the sponsor or the grantor and, if a subcontract is involved, the identity of the prime contractor if the results of the research must be reported to the sponsor, grantor, or prime contractor; and

(c) the purpose and scope of the proposed research in sufficient detail (i) to permit informal discussion concerning the wisdom of such research within the University and (ii) to inform colleagues in immediate and related disciplines of the nature and importance of the potential contribution to the disciplines involved.

Subd. 2. Open Dissemination of Research Results. The University shall not accept support for any research under a contract or grant if the contract or grant limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results or specifically permits the retroactive classification of results as nonpublic, except for reasons found compelling through a review process specified in administrative procedures.

Subd. 3. Retroactive Restrictions on Research Results. If a sponsor imposes restrictions on the disclosure of research results after the research has begun, the University shall reevaluate whether to continue the work. In the reevaluation, the University shall apply the provisions of this policy and a review process specified in administrative procedures.

Subd. 4. Use of Facilities. University facilities shall not be available for research that violates this policy. Any exceptions shall be considered through a review process specified in administrative procedures.

SECTION V. PUBLICATION.

The following provisions shall govern the publication of research results:
Subd. 1. University’s Right to Publish. The University reserves the right to publish and present research results, individually and in collaboration with other researchers. When a research sponsor requests prior review, the University shall provide an opportunity for review of the manuscript or presentation materials and will consider suggested modifications prior to publication.

Subd. 2. Attribution. Publications by the University shall properly acknowledge the financial support and other contributions of research sponsors.

Subd. 3. Brand and Trade Names. Publication and presentation of research results by either the University or the sponsor shall not include commercial brands or trade names unless such brand or trade name is essential to the description of the research.

Subd. 4. Publicity. Research grants and contracts may provide that University researchers must obtain prior written approval from the sponsor for any prepublication publicity regarding the research results.

Subd. 5. Authorization for Research Sponsor to Publish. If the University elects not to publish research results, the research sponsor may publish them with the University’s consent, which shall not be unreasonably denied.

SECTION VI. USE OF UNIVERSITY NAME.

The name of the University shall not be used in any way by research sponsors for advertising purposes.

SECTION VII. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.

The president or delegate is authorized to adopt and amend administrative policy and procedures to ensure implementation of this policy.
Agenda Item: Board of Regents Policy: Student Financial Aid

☑ review   ☐ review/action   ☐ action   ☐ discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

☑ policy   ☐ background/context   ☐ oversight   ☐ strategic positioning

Board of Regents Policy: Student Financial Aid is being reviewed as part of the Board’s ongoing policy review process.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

In an effort to describe the broad principles that guide the distribution of financial aid, language has been added to Subd. 1 to indicate that the University awards financial aid on the basis of merit and/or need.

The Subd. 3 heading has been changed to more accurately describe the content of the subdivision and to clarify that the policy applies more broadly to all aid distributed by the University, regardless of source.

Background Information:

The Board last reviewed and amended this policy on December 10, 2004.

President’s Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends adoption of proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: Student Financial Aid.
STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

This policy governs financial aid provided to students of the University of Minnesota (University).

Subd. 1. Guiding Principles. In the conduct of its student financial aid programs, the University shall:

(a) award financial aid to students on the basis of merit and of need;
(b) assist as many students as possible in securing grants, scholarships, loans, and employment and provide counseling in the use of such resources to help finance their education;
(c) aggressively seek additional aid funds;
(d) comply with federal, state, and University regulations; and
(e) maintain straightforward application and disbursement processes that protect the individual’s right to privacy.

Subd. 2. Administration of State, Federal, and Other Non-University Financial Aid Funds. The University shall maintain the financial aid system(s) required by state and federal regulatory agencies to assess and validate need, determine aid eligibility, disburse funds, and provide loan counseling.

Subd. 3. University Funds Used for Financial Aid Delegation of Authority. The president or delegate shall determine eligibility, the amount of grants or loans that may be awarded to individual students, and associated terms and conditions.
Agenda Item: Board of Regents Policy: Academic Misconduct

☑ review ☐ review/action ☐ action ☐ discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

☑ policy ☐ background/context ☐ oversight ☐ strategic positioning

Board of Regents Policy: Academic Misconduct is presented for review as part of the Board’s ongoing policy review process.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

It is recommended that Subd. 7 be deleted as more operational in nature and unnecessary as a separate provision in a Board of Regents policy.

Background Information:

The Board last reviewed and amended this policy on December 10, 2004.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The president recommends adoption of proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: Academic Misconduct.
ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

The University of Minnesota (University) has a responsibility to foster a research environment that promotes the responsible conduct of research and research training and discourages academic misconduct.

Subd. 1. Definition. Academic misconduct, for the purpose of this policy, shall mean the fabrication or falsification of data, research procedures, or data analysis; destruction of data for fraudulent purposes; plagiarism; abuse of confidentiality; or other fraudulent actions in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting the results of research or other scholarly activity. It is particularly important to distinguish academic misconduct from honest error and the ambiguities of interpretation that are inherent in the scientific and scholarly process, but are normally corrected by further research.

Subd. 2. Application. This policy and the administrative procedures implementing it shall apply to all research, scholarly, and artistic activities of all University employees and others who are involved in such activities under the aegis of the University.

Subd. 3. Expectations. The University expects academic integrity from its employees at all times and in all circumstances. University employees may not engage in actions that constitute academic misconduct in research or other scholarly activity.

Subd. 4. Commitment. The University shall deal promptly with allegations or evidence of possible academic misconduct and shall carry out this responsibility fully to resolve questions regarding the integrity of the scholarly activity.

Subd. 5. Compliance with Federal Regulations. Where allegations of academic misconduct arise related to federally sponsored research, the University shall adhere to all applicable sponsor requirements as set forth in individual agency regulations and/or the Federal Policy on Research Misconduct.

Subd. 6. Delegation of Authority. The president or delegate shall administer this policy and is authorized to adopt and amend administrative procedures to ensure its implementation.

Subd. 7. Review. The administrative procedures implementing this policy shall be reviewed every five years or as necessary to comply with any changes to applicable federal regulations.
Agenda Item: Board of Regents Policy: College Constitutions

☑ review  ☑ review/action  ☐ action  ☐ discussion

Presenters: Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan

Purpose:

☑ policy  ☐ background/context  ☑ oversight  ☑ strategic positioning

Board of Regents Policy: College Constitutions is presented for review as part of the Board’s ongoing policy review process.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

The current policy does not define a college. A definition of college is proposed for addition to the policy (Subd. 2).

Background Information:

This policy was last reviewed and amended on July 12, 2006.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The president recommends adoption of proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: College Constitutions.
COLLEGE CONSTITUTIONS

This policy governs the creation and review of college constitutions, which, with other University policies, guide educational and administrative actions within a college.

Subd. 1. Guiding Principle. College constitutions establish the internal governance structure and embody the authority of colleges to govern their own educational and administrative affairs.

Subd. 2. Definition. For the purposes of this policy, college shall mean an academic unit that is:

(a) directly responsible for recruiting and hiring faculty and recommending them for promotion and tenure;

(b) regarded by its faculty as their primary academic appointment home, either in one of the college's departments or directly within the college itself;

(c) organized around a discipline or group of related disciplines; and

(d) directly responsible for providing instruction for students that leads to an undergraduate, graduate, or professional degree or certificate.

Subd. 3. Delegation of Authority. The president or delegate shall approve collegiate constitutions and any subsequent amendments.

Subd. 4. Consistency with Board of Regents Policies and Other University Policies. College constitutions must be consistent with all Board of Regents (Board) and other University policies and procedures. To the extent that any provision of a college constitution conflicts with a Board or other University policy or procedure, the Board or other University policy or procedure shall govern.

Subd. 5. Relationship to Employment Contracts. College constitutions are not intended to be and are not part of the contract terms or the conditions of employment for any University employee.
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Agenda Item:  Focus on Faculty Teaching

☐ review      ☐ review/action      ☐ action      ☒ discussion

Presenters:  Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan
             Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Arlene Carney

Purpose:

☐ policy        ☒ background/context      ☐ oversight      ☒ strategic positioning

To provide information regarding the University’s commitment to faculty teaching and learning. As part of strategic positioning, the University identified two pillars of the institution – excellent faculty and excellent students. The teaching and learning process and its continuous improvement are essential factors in addressing student success at the University and in defining an important part of our faculty and instructional culture.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

This presentation will review current conceptualizations of teaching and learning; the University’s Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes; who is teaching what at the University; mechanisms for evaluating teaching effectiveness; recognition of teaching excellence; and support for ongoing faculty development for teaching.

Background Information:

May 2006 report: Transforming the University: Report of the Task Force on Faculty Culture
Focus on Faculty Teaching

The focus of this presentation is on teaching and learning at the University of Minnesota. The two partners in these processes are faculty who teach and students who learn, as well as the reciprocal relationship of students who teach their instructors and instructors who learn from their students. As part of strategic positioning, the University identified two pillars of the institution – excellent faculty and excellent students. The teaching and learning process and its continuous improvement are essential factors in addressing student success at the University and in defining an important part of our faculty and instructional culture.

Past descriptions of teaching focused on what an instructor did or said in a particular setting. Although it was implied that there was a student audience for the teaching output by an instructor, the emphasis was the output and its improvement. It was assumed that students learned as a result of teaching. Faculty evaluated student performance with examinations and papers and the grade represented what the student learned. New models of teaching require that student learning be a necessary part of the equation. That is, what students understand and what they can do as a result of teaching is what is important and not just the grade they receive. The assessment of student learning takes on a new meaning that requires a dynamic and interactive process between the two partners – the teacher and the learner. That is, instructors change the direction, scope, or content of what they teach based on what they may assess in a classroom or learning environment or in an entire curriculum.

In 2007, The Twin Cities campus adopted seven student learning outcomes that are shown in Appendix A. They represent what the faculty believe that each undergraduate should know, understand, or be able to do upon completion of a baccalaureate degree. Each of the campuses is developing a set of learning outcomes that reflects the values of the faculty in each setting. Twin Cities faculty will design their teaching to address these learning outcomes in liberal education classes, new undergraduate classes, and freshman seminars. The focus on student learning outcomes is both national and international. The challenge now is to develop assessment strategies that are meaningful so that instructors can change classes and curricula to improve student learning.

What is teaching today?

The traditional view of university teaching is a faculty member in a lecture hall or classroom in front of a group of students. One might envision adding some technology such as using Power Point slides or video. One would also envision the faculty member teaching a certain number of classes per semester as part of a workload. The metric
would be how many hours a week the faculty member spends in a classroom. These are outdated views of teaching in today’s university.

The array of pedagogies for university teaching across the entire University of Minnesota system has expanded dramatically to include a range of e-learning experiences from completely online classes to hybrid classes that combine both in-class and online experiences. Faculty address problem-based learning and case studies, simulations of real-life situations, and cooperative learning in new, smart classrooms that encourage collaboration. Students may document their learning in e-portfolios as well as written work, videos, web sites, etc. Faculty conduct classes in person and in guided discussions on line. Large sections of entire curricula in fields such as the health sciences are online to meet the needs of students both in Minnesota and across the world.

Faculty teach undergraduates in freshman seminars, small specialty classes of students, or in larger classes with a lecture by the faculty member and discussion sections led by graduate teaching assistants who are mentored by faculty. Faculty also incorporate service learning as part of classes, extending the class into the community, regardless of topic area. Faculty teach in a wide range of one-on-one experiences from clinical settings, to laboratories, to discussions of written work, in which their undergraduate and graduate students acquire new skills. Finally, the structure of pedagogical experiences varies across campuses with different balances of face-to-face and e-learning and class sizes.

Teaching involves face time with students in person or on line, and preparation for classes as well as follow-up. Today faculty and instructors use systems of course management such as Moodle and Web Vista. Currently, faculty at the University of Minnesota have 1,249 Moodle sections (i.e., course websites) serving 29,493 unique students and 2,379 Web Vista sections with 52,858 unique students.

Who teaches what?

In fall 2008 on the Twin Cities campus, the snapshot of teaching showed that there were over 4,500 individual sections of lecture classes, discussion sections, and seminars at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Classes are taught by regular faculty (either tenured faculty or tenure-track faculty), contract faculty, academic professionals, or graduate teaching assistants. For lower division undergraduate classes classified as lectures, approximately 39% of classes were taught by faculty, 35% by academic professionals, and 26% by graduate assistants. In contrast, upper division undergraduate lecture classes were taught by 70% faculty, with academic professional teaching about 20%, and graduate assistants teaching 8% of the classes. Most discussion sections, which are typically part of larger lecture classes, were led by graduate students under the supervision of faculty. Seminars were taught more by faculty at all levels, especially at the upper division undergraduate and graduate levels. These proportions vary with campus, depending upon the structure of instruction.

The proportion of faculty teaching at any time is affected by the number of faculty on sabbatical or on semester leave; the number who have significant effort on grants; those who have assumed large administrative duties such as Director of Graduate Studies or
Department Chair with a reduction in teaching; and those who may be on some type of medical leave.

**Teaching as part of faculty work**

Untenured faculty are hired typically with a six-year probationary period. Teaching effectiveness is one of the criteria used for determining if a probationary faculty member is making progress toward tenure. It is also used to determine if a faculty member should be promoted to the rank of full professor. This effectiveness is determined primarily with two metrics – the Student Rating of Teaching and peer review of teaching.

The Student Rating of Teaching (SRT) replaced the old system for student evaluations in spring 2008 with six new questions that combined instructor-focused and student focused questions. Each instructor is required to administer this set of ratings for each course offered on the Twin Cities campus. Crookston and Rochester administer these questions via an online system. The current SRT questions are shown in Appendix B. Some of the questions are instructor centered while others address the student experience.

The responses from Twin Cities’ students in spring 2008, fall 2008, and spring 2009 were tallied recently to determine the averages of performance for three semesters. On a six-point scale, faculty scored 5.0 for teaching material clearly, 5.4 for being well-prepared for class, and over 5.4 for treating students with respect. The same pattern of high responses was observed for both academic professionals and graduate student. Regardless of instructional category (faculty, academic professional, or graduate teaching assistant), teachers on the Twin Cities campus receive high marks from the undergraduate, graduate, and professional students that they teach.

In order to determine teaching effectiveness with the metric of student rating of teaching, individual faculty member’s performance can be compared to the department benchmarks for each category. That is, a department can decide that each probationary faculty member must be in or very close to the category of “agree” (a score of 5 out of 6 for items such as preparedness, showing respect for students, etc.) by the time that the decision for tenure and promotion is made. Departments can also look at the progress that each faculty member has made over time in student ratings.

Peer review of teaching is the second teaching effectiveness metric. Peer review requires that more senior, experienced faculty and instructional peers provide input about many aspects of teaching from the design of the syllabus and assignments and examinations through actual observation of teaching in the classroom or in any setting in which teaching takes place. A distinguished faculty committee, made up largely of faculty from the Academy of Distinguished Teachers along with key staff, recently completed work on a set of best-practice recommendations for peer review. They have defined the peer review of teaching (see Appendix C), provided recommendations for the sequencing of peer review activities for both probationary and tenured faculty, and provided sample rubrics for the peer review of classroom performance, syllabi, student assignments and assessments, student performance, and professional development. Sample rubrics for classroom observation and review of syllabi can be found in Appendix D.
Both the student rating of teaching and peer review of teaching are part of University policy for all instructors. They also form the basis for the criteria for teaching effectiveness for tenure and promotion.

**Teaching Excellence**

Our most excellent teachers are recognized and rewarded through University-wide distinguished teaching awards. The Horace T. Morse – University of Minnesota Alumni Association Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education recognizes excellence in contributing directly and indirectly to student learning through teaching, research, creative activities, advising, academic program development, and educational leadership. Given each year since 1965, the award represents the highest recognition of contributions to undergraduate education by the University community of its most distinguished scholar-teachers. The award is named for the late Horace T. Morse, first dean of the General College (1934-60) and a national leader in the field of undergraduate education.

The Award for Outstanding Contributions to Postbaccalaureate, Graduate, and Professional Education was initiated in 1999 in recognition of faculty members for excellence in instruction, instructional program development, intellectual distinction, advising and mentoring, and involvement of students in research, scholarship, and professional development at the graduate and professional levels.

Candidates for both awards are nominated through their colleges on all four University of Minnesota campuses. Students, departments, or other administrative units, student organizations or associations, and individual faculty members may initiate nominations. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy selects the award recipients.

Regular faculty (tenure track and tenured) and term faculty (nonregular) salaried through the University and holding a 66 2/3% time or greater appointment, who have been at the University of Minnesota for at least five years, including the current year, may be nominated for either award. Previous nominees who did not receive the award may be renominated, but previous winners will be ineligible. Self nomination is not allowed.

Selection committees, appointed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), evaluate nominees for the Morse-Alumni Award in the areas of teaching, advising, research and artistic activities, academic program development, and educational leadership. Nominees for the Graduate and Professional Award are evaluated on outstanding performance in instruction, involvements of students in research, scholarship, and professional development, development of postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional instructional programs, and advising and mentoring of students.

Faculty selected to receive one of the distinguished teaching awards receive an annual salary augmentation, a five-year annual award for research and professional development, and are inducted into the Academy of Distinguished Teachers, which was established in the same year as the Award for Outstanding Contributions to Postbaccalaureate, Graduate, and Professional Education (1999) by President Mark Yudof. Induction into the Academy of Distinguished Teachers (ADT) takes place each year in April at an
awards ceremony, and one’s membership in the ADT is for the duration of employment at the University. Membership currently includes 208 faculty from the University’s five campuses.

The mission of the ADT is to recognize and celebrate teaching excellence, to foster the continued improvement of teaching and learning at the University of Minnesota, and to strengthen the resources necessary to do so. ADT members serve as advisers to University administrators and on committees, host a bi-annual, system-wide teaching and learning conference, hold an annual fall retreat, and coordinate their activities through a system-wide Executive Committee as well as an elected Twin Cities Steering Committee. The ADT members are eligible for small grants for the improvement of teaching and learning. A recent innovative project from ADT members at the University of Minnesota Duluth focuses on the development of teaching skills for undergraduates. Called UTOP for Undergraduate Teaching Opportunity Program, it parallels the long successful UROP (Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program). This model is now being expanded to include other campuses. ADT members have also initiated important discussions on graduate advising and mentorship. Their committee report has been used as important input to the reorganization committees of the Graduate School.

There are 208 members of the ADT. Of the 145 Morse awardees for undergraduate education, 106 come from the Twin Cities campus, 20 from Morris, 15 from Duluth, 3 from Crookston, and 1 from Rochester. There are 73 recipients of the Graduate Professional Teaching Award; 72 are from the Twin Cities and 1 from Duluth.

**Teaching Support**

The University’s Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) enriches the professional growth of faculty, instructional staff, and teaching assistants through programs, services, and resources that promote significant learning experiences for students. (CTL web site) CTL provides professional development opportunities for faculty through their careers. The staff of the Center get involved in major teaching and learning initiatives, including the development of the new Student Rating of Teaching, and recent work on the peer review of teaching, as well as being regularly involved in New Faculty Orientation and the Provost’s Department Chairs Leadership Program.

**Summary**

Teaching, and students’ learning, is a career-long endeavor and the University is committed to making key investments to continue to support excellence in teaching and learning. The nature of teaching continues to change dynamically across campuses, disciplines, and learning sites. The greatest focus continues to be on improving teaching and enhancing student learning to ensure student success.
Appendix A

Student Learning Outcomes

Faculty, collegiate and central administrators, and staff at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities developed a set of student learning outcomes that define what students will be able to do when they have completed any undergraduate degree, regardless of major, at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities.

At the time of receiving a bachelor’s degree, students:

- Can identify, define, and solve problems
- Can locate and critically evaluate information
- Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry
- Understand diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies
- Can communicate effectively
- Understand the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines
- Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning.
Appendix B

University of Minnesota Student Rating of Teaching (SRT)

Rating Scale:
6-Strongly Agree, 5-Agree, 4-Somewhat Agree, 3-Somewhat Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree

Core Items
1. The instructor was well prepared for class. (Instructor-centered)
2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly. (Instructor-centered)
3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance. (Instructor-centered)
4. The instructor treated me with respect. (Instructor-centered)
5. I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course. (Learner-centered)
6. My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course. (Learner-centered)

Written Comments
1. What did the instructor do that most helped your learning? (Instructor-centered)
2. What could you have done to be a better learner? (Learner-centered)
3. Additional comments.
Appendix C

Rubrics for Peer Review

Preamble

Peer review of instruction is a systematic process of examining and evaluating colleagues’ teaching for purposes including professional development, performance appraisal, and/or promotion and tenure. Peer review of teaching is required by Senate policy Policy and Protocol on the Student Rating and Peer Evaluation of Instruction (see http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/senate/documents/policy/instructionevalpolicy.htm) A committee was charged by the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic affairs at the University of Minnesota to recommend a set of best practices on peer review for use across campus. The committee recommends that peer review include review of syllabi, assignments and assessments, student performance, professional growth and development, and observation of teaching. A format has been designed for reviewing these five aspects of teaching and is included below.
Appendix D
Rubrics for Peer Review of Teaching

Peer Observation of Teaching Protocol

**Context or Background Information:** Describe the setting in which the lesson took place, relevant information about the makeup of the class, and any other descriptive characteristics that would provide appropriate context to the observation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation Area 1: Instructor Goals/Intentions for Class Session**

Focus your comments on whether the goals were: 1) clearly stated or portrayed in an obvious fashion, 2) appropriate to the focus of the course, 3) explicitly connected to the flow of previous or future classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation Area 2: Significance of the class activities, topics, or issues

Focus your comments on whether the tasks performed by students or the topics being discussed 1) are relevant to the focus of the course, 2) require an appropriate investment of student time or effort.

Comments:

Observation Area 3: Student engagement with the subject matter

Examine the degree to which student engagement occurred 1) over a substantial portion of the class meeting time, 2) by a broad segment of students attending the class, 3) in appropriate forms such as discussion, listening/processing, performing, reading, reflecting, speaking, or writing.

Comments:
Observation Area 4: Examination of student achievement of goals

Focus your comments on how the instructor developed an understanding of student achievement of goals by methods such as 1) questioning students on course material, 2) observing student performance(s), 3) student-student discussion, 4) informal assessment techniques, 5) quizzes, or 6) other methods.

Comments:
| **Course Information** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The objectives are appropriate to the course. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| Class materials are appropriate to the course. | | | | | |
| The syllabus provides clear roadmaps for the course. | | | | | |
| Course Policies are clearly stated (e.g., criteria for grading, makeup exams). | | | | | |
| Required university statements are present (e.g., academic misconduct). | | | | | |
| Criteria for grading are clearly delineated. | | | | | |

| **Instructor Information** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The percentage of the grade for course assignments and exams is clearly stated. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |

**Comments**
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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

- Graduate School – Create M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology

- Graduate School – Create M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Social and Administrative Pharmacy

- Graduate School – Create post-baccalaureate certificate in Fundamentals of Quantitative Finance

- Graduate School – Create post-baccalaureate certificate in Clinical Physiology and Movement Science with tracks in Clinical Physiology and Clinical Movement Science

- Graduate School – Create minor in Clinical Physiology and Movement Science with tracks in Clinical Physiology and Clinical Movement Science

- Graduate School – Create minor in Product Design

- Graduate School – Create minor in Moving Image Studies
II. Request for Approval of Changed Academic Programs

- College of Design (Twin Cities Campus) – Change name of B.E.D. degree in Environmental Design to Landscape Design and Planning
- College of Design (Twin Cities Campus) – Change name of minor in Environmental Design to Landscape Design and Planning
- Graduate School – Change name of minor and post-baccalaureate certificate in Complementary Therapies and Healing Practices to Integrative Therapies and Healing Practices
- Graduate School – Change name of minor in Feminist Studies to Feminist and Critical Sexuality Studies

III. Request for Discontinuation of Academic Programs

- College of Continuing Education (Twin Cities Campus) – Discontinue the B.A.Sc. degree in Respiratory Care
- Graduate School – Discontinue the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Social, Administrative, and Clinical Pharmacy

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.
I. Request for Approval of New Academic Programs

- **Graduate School—Create M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology**

The Graduate School requests approval to create Master of Science (M.S.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology, effective fall semester 2010. The program currently exists as a track within the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Social, Administrative, and Clinical Pharmacy, which is proposed for discontinuation. The proposed degree programs in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology will eliminate confusion within the current structure.

- **Graduate School—Create M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Social and Administrative Pharmacy**

The Graduate School requests approval to create Master of Science (M.S.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in Social and Administrative Pharmacy, effective fall semester 2010. The program currently exists as a track within the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Social, Administrative, and Clinical Pharmacy, which is proposed for discontinuation. The proposed degree programs in Social and Administrative Pharmacy will eliminate confusion within the current structure.

- **Graduate School—Create post-baccalaureate certificate in Fundamentals of Quantitative Finance**

The Graduate School requests approval to create a post-baccalaureate certificate in Fundamentals of Quantitative Finance, effective fall semester 2010. The program will provide students with skills for employment in quantitative finance and insurance. The proposed program is in response to student and market demand.

- **Graduate School—Create post-baccalaureate certificate in Clinical Physiology and Movement Science with tracks in Clinical Physiology and Clinical Movement Science**

The Graduate School requests approval to create a post-baccalaureate certificate in Clinical Physiology and Movement Science, effective spring semester 2011. The program will offer students alternative tracks in Clinical Physiology or Clinical Movement Science. The proposed certificate will provide students with
instruction in an emerging field of study that does not fit within the current boundaries of established disciplines and programs.

- **Graduate School—Create minor in Clinical Physiology and Movement Science with tracks in Clinical Physiology and Clinical Movement Science**

  The Graduate School requests approval to create a minor in Clinical Physiology and Movement Science, effective spring semester 2011. The proposed minor will offer students in master’s or doctoral (Ph.D.) programs alternative tracks in Clinical Physiology or Clinical Movement Science. The minor will provide students with instruction in an emerging field of study that does not fit within the current boundaries of established disciplines and programs.

- **Graduate School—Create minor in Product Design**

  The Graduate School requests approval to create an interdisciplinary minor in Product Design, effective fall semester 2010. The proposed minor will provide students in master’s or doctoral (Ph.D.) programs with the basic tenets of design thinking and problem solving and participation in a hands-on design project.

- **Graduate School—Create minor in Moving Image Studies**

  The Graduate School requests approval to create a minor in Moving Image Studies, effective fall semester 2010. The proposed minor will provide students in master’s or doctoral (Ph.D.) programs with the broad-based knowledge and analytical skills that address the history, aesthetics, criticism, production, and dissemination of film as principal discourses shaping modern and postmodern global societies.

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

- **College of Design (Twin Cities Campus)—Change name of B.E.D. degree in Environmental Design to Landscape Design and Planning**

  The College of Design on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to change the name of the Bachelor of Environmental Design (B.E.D.) in Environmental Design to Landscape Design and Planning, effective fall semester 2010. The name change better describes the program and will aid in student recruitment.

- **College of Design (Twin Cities Campus)—Change name of minor in Environmental Design to Landscape Design and Planning**

  The College of Design on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to change the name of the minor in Environmental Design to Landscape Design and Planning, effective fall semester 2010. The name change better describes the minor and will aid in student recruitment.
Graduate School—Change name of minor and post-baccalaureate certificate in Complementary Therapies and Healing Practices to Integrative Therapies and Healing Practices

The Graduate School requests approval to change the name of the minor and post-baccalaureate certificate in Complementary Therapies and Healing Practices to Integrative Therapies and Healing Practices, effective summer 2010. The name change reflects an evolution in the language and thinking within the field.

Graduate School—Change name of minor in Feminist Studies to Feminist and Critical Sexuality Studies

The Graduate School requests approval to change the name of the minor in Feminist Studies to Feminist and Critical Sexuality Studies, effective fall semester 2010. The name change better describes the minor and will aid in student recruitment.

III. Request for Discontinuation of Academic Programs

College of Continuing Education (Twin Cities Campus)—Discontinue the B.A.Sc. degree in Respiratory Care

The College of ContinuingEducation on the Twin Cities campus requests approval to discontinue the Bachelor of Applied Science (B.A.Sc.) degree in Respiratory Care, effective fall semester 2010. Respiratory care programs delivered on the Rochester campus address better the student and industry needs in this area.

Graduate School—Discontinue the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Social, Administrative, and Clinical Pharmacy

The Graduate School requests approval to discontinue the Master of Science (M.S.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in Social, Administrative, and Clinical Pharmacy, effective fall semester 2010. The program will be replaced by the proposed programs in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology and in Social and Administrative Pharmacy.
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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:

In December 2009, the University of Minnesota’s Frederick R. Weisman Art Museum was awarded accreditation by the American Association of Museums (AAM). Following an initial application, the accreditation process involves the completion of a self-study, a preliminary review, a site visit, a second review, and a final decision by the AAM. The Weisman Museum joins fewer than 800 museums of all types nationally in being accredited by the AAM.

Background Information:

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