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Agenda Item:  Board of Regents Policy: Protection of Individual Health Information

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☒ action  ☐ discussion

Presenters:  General Counsel Mark Rotenberg

Purpose:

☒ policy  ☐ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To review proposed changes to Board of Regents Policy: Protection of Individual Health Information.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

A review of the Board of Regents Policy: Protection of Individual Health Information is being petitioned as part of the Board Office’s ongoing policy review process. The only proposed amendment to the existing Policy is the deletion of Subd. 4. This section calls for the review of administrative policies and procedures every five years. Because this policy is continually reviewed in keeping with periodic developments in federal law, Subd. 4 is not necessary.

Background Information:

The Board of Regents Policy: Protection of Individual Health Information was adopted in February 2003 as requested by federal law (HIPAA).

The policy amendment was reviewed by the Faculty, Staff, & Student Affairs Committee on February 12, 2009.

President’s Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends adoption of the proposed amendment to the Board of Regents Policy: Protection of Individual Health Information.
PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INFORMATION

Subd. 1. Policy Statement. It is the policy and practice of the University of Minnesota (University) that individually identifiable health information gathered:

(a) in the course of research conducted at the University; or
(b) through the provision of health care by the University; or
(c) in the course of health plan administration at the University

shall be protected in accordance with applicable state and federal law, including, but not limited to, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 and its implementing regulations.

Subd. 2. Delegation of Authority. The president or delegate shall administer and implement this policy, including the adoption and amendment of appropriate administrative policies and procedures.

Subd. 3. Application. The administrative policies and procedures implementing this policy shall apply to all University faculty members, employees, trainees, students, and volunteers who handle, transmit, receive, or have access to protected health information in the course of research conducted at the University, through provision of health care at the University, and in the course of health plan administration at the University.

Subd. 4. Review. The administrative policies and procedures implementing this policy shall be reviewed every 5 years pursuant to provisions established in those procedures and as necessary to comply with changes to the applicable state and federal laws.
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Agenda Item:  Board of Regents Policy: Employee Development, Education, and Training

☑ review  □ review/action  □ action  □ discussion

Presenters:  Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☑ policy  □ background/context  □ oversight  □ strategic positioning

To review an amendment to Board of Regents Policy: Employee Development, Education, and Training.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Amendment specifies that there will be an employee contribution toward University credit-bearing courses taken under the Regents Scholarship Program.

Background Information:


President's Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends that the Board adopt the amendment to Board of Regents Policy: Employee Development, Education, and Training.
EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING

SECTION I. SCOPE.

This policy governs the professional development, education, and training of eligible employees of the University of Minnesota (University).

SECTION II. DEFINITIONS.

Subd. 1. Eligible Employees. Eligible employees shall mean:

(a) Faculty Development Leaves - Faculty members holding a regular (tenured or tenure-track) or a contract faculty appointment;
(b) Professional Development Leaves for Academic Professional and Administrative (P&A) Employees - P&A employees whose primary employment at the University is classified within the 93xx, 96xx, or 97xx series;
(c) Administrative Transitional Leaves - Senior administrators as defined in administrative policy;
(d) University-Provided and Other Education, Training, and Development Opportunities - Individuals in the faculty, P&A, civil service, and union-represented staff employee groups.


Subd. 3. Salary. Salary shall mean the regular University salary of a faculty or P&A employee at the time a leave is initiated.

SECTION III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

The following principles shall guide the University's employee development, education, and training programs:

(a) In support of a culture of excellence, the University is committed to providing its employees opportunities to participate in professional development, education, and training activities, consistent with managing the responsibilities and needs of the unit.
(b) The University and its employees share responsibility for continued learning and development appropriate to work duties and for the pursuit of individual, unit, and institutional success.

(c) The University is committed to providing a regular program of relevant, accessible, and affordable opportunities for employees to develop knowledge, skills, and abilities to support position competencies, management responsibilities, and leadership roles.

(d) The University seeks to maintain development leave programs comparable to peer institutions.

SECTION IV. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT LEAVES.

Subd. 1. Faculty Development Leaves. Faculty development leaves provide time away from the workplace to enhance the knowledge, teaching, and research productivity of eligible employees.

(a) The following faculty development leaves are offered under this policy:

(1) Single Semester Leave - A one-semester leave at full salary and full benefits.
(2) Sabbatical Leave - A leave of up to one year at one-half salary and full benefits.

Subd. 2. Professional Development Leaves for P&A Employees. Professional development leaves for P&A employees provide time away from the workplace to develop or enhance the knowledge, skills, and performance of eligible employees.

(a) The following professional development leaves are offered under this policy:

(1) Mini-Leave - A development leave of up to six weeks at full salary and full benefits.
(2) Short-Term Leave - A development leave of seven to 20 consecutive weeks at one-half salary to full salary and full benefits, with salary to be determined by the unit.
(3) Extended Leave - A development leave of 21 to 48 consecutive weeks at one-half salary and full benefits.
Subd. 3. Administrative Transitional Leaves. Administrative transitional leaves provide eligible employees a transitional leave prior to assumption or resumption of a faculty or professional role following a significant period of administrative service. The leave shall normally not exceed twelve months, with salary and benefits typically paid at the level of the eligible employee's assumed or resumed faculty or professional position, rather than the administrative salary.

SECTION V. UNIVERSITY-OFFERED EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

Subd. 1. Training and Development. The University shall provide eligible employees with an ongoing program of training and development opportunities to address existing and projected competency needs, improve job performance, and enhance management and leadership talents.

Subd. 2. Tuition Benefits. The University shall offer eligible employees access to University credit-bearing educational opportunities at a reduced tuition cost through the Regents Scholarship Program.

SECTION VI. OTHER EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

Time away from the workplace with pay may be granted to eligible employees to attend professional meetings or education, training, or professional development offerings outside the University.

SECTION VII. IMPLEMENTATION.

Employee eligibility for and participation in education, training, and professional development opportunities is administered according to applicable administrative policies, rules, and contracts.

SUPERSEDES: Administrative Transitional Leaves dated January 12, 1990; Faculty Development Leaves dated June 7, 2001; Professional and Administrative Staff Development Leaves dated October 11, 1985; and Regents' Scholarship Program dated April 15, 1966.
Agenda Item: Metrics & Measures for the Undergraduate Student Experience

Presenters: Jerry Rinehart, Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Rich Howard, Director, Institutional Research,
Ron Huesman, Assistant Director, Institutional Research

Purpose:

The University has a long history of using survey data to assess student experiences and inform decision making in undergraduate education. With increasing calls for accountability and our own desire to create an outstanding living and learning environment for our students consistent with our strategic aspirations, we are now developing a unified strategy for coordinating and correlating these assessment efforts. This discussion will highlight recent improvements in survey administration, describe new surveys which provide national comparative data, identify key outcomes we are seeking to assess, and propose policy and program areas that are likely to be subjects of these assessment efforts.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

The presentation will consist of four sections as follows:

1. The University’s use of survey data for institutional decision making (including examples of changes made based upon student feedback)

2. The relationship between surveys and responding to increasing accountability demands (e.g. graduation and retention rates, learning outcomes, and student engagement)

3. How survey results can be used to improve the student experience

4. The University’s recently developed unified strategy for coordinating and correlating assessment efforts.
In addition we will highlight the following policy issues:

1. What is the correct balance between concern for external/peer group comparisons (and “rankings”) versus internal/college specific analyses?

2. What are the best ways to address the communication issues regarding the distribution of survey information, particularly if the data suggest “bad news” for the institution or a part of it?

3. What areas of post-graduation experience should we explore as we develop five- and ten-year follow up studies of alumni?

4. What additional efforts can be taken to achieve strong response rates on surveys of critical importance to the University?

**Background Information:**

From time to time this committee receives presentations regarding the results of various surveys administered to students regarding their experiences at the University of Minnesota. This presentation will provide an update on some of the information shared during a presentation delivered to this committee in February 2006.
Overview: The University has a long history of using survey data to assess student experiences and inform decision making in undergraduate education. With increasing calls for accountability and our own desire to create an outstanding living and learning environment for our students, we are now developing a unified strategy for coordinating and correlating these assessment efforts. This discussion will highlight recent improvements in survey administration, describe new surveys which provide national comparative data, identify key outcomes we are seeking to assess, and propose policy and program areas that are likely to be subjects of these assessment efforts.

Calls for institutional accountability in undergraduate education have resulted in a number of efforts to provide useful and relevant information to various constituents. Our Office of Institutional Research played a leadership role in the creation of the national College Portrait, a web based program sponsored by the National Association of Land Grant Universities and Colleges (NASULGC). The College Portrait (http://www.collegeportraits.org/) provides summary of institutional information that allows “apples-to-apples” comparison of colleges and universities for prospective students and their parents. Data included on the site include:

- admission statistics
- demographic profile of students
- retention / graduation rates
- student satisfaction and engagement
- costs and financial aid
- student learning outcomes

(Identifying appropriate means of measuring student learning remains a complex and controversial pursuit in higher education and will not be required until 2013.)

While it is necessary and important for us to gather data that responds to calls for accountability, our most important survey activity will continue to focus on gathering information that helps us improve the educational and personal experiences of our students. The Office for Institutional Research has developed an integrated and coordinated survey program that will help us gather the evidence necessary to develop and assess policies aimed at enhancing student success and improving retention / graduation rates. This “Student-Based Management Information System” program will support assessment of a number of critical success goals including:

- Improving student satisfaction with advising and student life
- Increasing the percentage of students who feel we provide a supportive campus environment and who report feeling a strong sense of community
- Increasing the percentage of students and alumni who would recommend the Twin Cities campus to others
An integral part of this new approach is the need to better coordinate current survey efforts and to develop a comprehensive data collection process that generates information throughout a student’s career. The model (see Appendix I) is based on the designs of Alexander Astin and his colleagues at the University of California at Los Angeles which foster longitudinal database development to service a multitude of institutional evaluation efforts. By merging and comparing survey data throughout the undergraduate years, we will be able to identify and isolate important early undergraduate factors focused on the undergraduate experiences, inside and outside the classroom, that either promote or inhibit student and institutional education, career, and personal goals. The survey plan is both cross-sectional (obtaining annual data on different classes of undergraduates) and longitudinal (collecting data at different times for the same group of students). The combination of surveys will allow assessment of whether educational and social goals are being met and what experiences and programs are most beneficial in achieving goals.

This evaluation plan includes a review of all major student experience surveys administered at the UMNTC with the goal of further reducing administrative costs by consolidating efforts and items and ultimately reducing the number of surveys administered to students. In addition, we will increase our participation in national survey projects that allow comparison to peer and aspirant peer institutions. We believe this program will place Minnesota at the forefront of student outcomes analysis at major research universities.

As part of this strategy, in Spring 2008 the University of Minnesota joined over 700 institutions nation-wide who administer the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). This survey focuses on the quality of undergraduate learning and will provide a longitudinal database for evaluating the effectiveness of undergraduate programs and other aspects of the undergraduate experience. In assessing the learning experience, the NSSE includes items which fall into five “benchmark” areas:

- Level of Academic Challenge
- Active and collaborative learning
- Student-faculty interactions
- Enriching educational experiences
- Supportive campus environment

In addition to comparative data from other institutions participating in the survey, we share data with peer institutions in the Association of American Universities (AAU) consortium. Summaries of the 2008 NSSE results are available on the Office for Institutional Research website at: http://www.irr.umn.edu/surveyreports/nsse/

We are repeating the NSSE in Spring 2009, and we will be including a sample of second year students as part of the effort to assess the impact of Welcome Week. Welcome Week was not available to current second year students, and we will analyze their responses in
comparison to first year students who did participate in Welcome Week (introduced in Fall 2008).

This spring (and for the next two years) we will also be participating in a newly developed survey initiative: Student Experiences at Research Universities (SERU). While the SERU covers some areas contained in the NSSE, it is specifically designed to reflect the types of experiences and opportunities available to students at large research institutions. Also, while the NSSE is based on a sample of freshmen and seniors, the SERU will be administered to all undergraduates at all levels (excluding those included in the samples for the NSSE). Because it is a “census” rather than a sample, the SERU will provide information relevant at the collegiate, department, or program level. Looking at these data in comparison, for example, to individual unit retention and graduation rates, may help us identify “best practices” across the campus. Through the AAU Consortium, we will also be able to compare information at the college or department level with those at peer institutions—something we have not been able to do previously.

Critical to the success of any survey plan, of course, is sustaining strong response rates from our students. While our response rates were better than most of our peers (42% for freshmen; 37% for seniors; compared to 29% for both populations at other AAU schools), we remain concerned about “survey fatigue.” We have initiated an effort to share the results of survey data with our student populations both to help them gain a larger perspective on their experiences and to allow them to see that their survey responses are important and (as indicated below) do contribute to decision making that impacts their experience.

The list below highlights some of the significant changes that have occurred based at least in part on information gained from student surveys.

- UMD has used the data to evaluate and revise its registration process.
- UMM has used the information to support the work of its Assessment of Student Learning Committee and Retention Working Group.
- The College of Education and Human Development has used the senior survey to provide feedback to advising staff, to the undergraduate program faculty group, and to deans and department chairs; the survey has influenced a variety of program decisions.
- The College of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Sciences has used the Senior Survey in meetings held 3-4 times per year with department heads. Results include creation of Student Learning Communities (SLC) to help build community in the college, and creating and supporting the SMART Commons. A major initiative focused on increasing student engagement and experiential learning is being launched this spring to address lingering issues raised in exit and other surveys.
- The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and the Institute of Technology have used senior exit and other survey responses to significantly restructure undergraduate advising. Open-ended responses on Senior Exit surveys were also critical in CLA’s decision to abolish its second language Graduation Proficiency Exam.
• The responses of transfer students to various survey instruments have led to the creation of a Transfer Student Center within the Office of Admissions, a “Commuter Connection” initiative in Student Unions and Activities, and a new transfer student orientation program that allows students the option of completing orientation through the web.

There are a number of policy questions which stem from our efforts to use survey data to help enhance the undergraduate student experience. These questions include the following:

1. What is the correct balance between concern for external/peer group comparisons (and “rankings”) versus internal/college specific analyses?

2. What are the best ways to address the communication issues regarding the distribution of survey information, particularly if the data suggest “bad news” for the institution or a part of it?

3. What areas of post-graduation experience should we explore as we develop five- and ten-year follow up studies of alumni?

4. What additional efforts can be taken to achieve strong response rates on surveys of critical importance to the University?

---

1 AAU members include: Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Iowa State, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Michigan State, North Carolina, Nebraska, Ohio State, Pittsburgh, Purdue, Rutgers, SUNY-Buffalo, SUNY-Stony Brook, Texas, Texas A&M, UC Berkeley, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin. There were 34,093 NSSE respondents from this group: 16,484 Freshmen and 17,609 Seniors
Assessing Student Progress & Development

Student Flow Model: Undergraduates

Phase 1: Institutional Choice

- Apply to UMNTC
- Enroll at UMNTC
- Do Not Apply to UMNTC
- Do Not Enroll at UMNTC

Phase 2: Process & Outcomes

- Social Engagement
- Academic Engagement
- Student Aspirations, Values, Goals, Background Characteristics
- Institutional Environment (Major, Programs, etc.)

Outcomes
- (Retention, Graduation, Satisfaction, GPA, etc.)

Data Collection and Analysis

Prospect Data
- Application Form Data
- Admitted Student Survey
- CIRP Freshmen Survey

UMNTC Student Experiences Survey
UMNTC Alumni Surveys
NSSE Undergraduate Survey
SERU Cenbus Experience Survey
Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership

Student ID Link Produces Longitudinal/Comprehensive Files

Link Information From "Secondary" Data Files (Admissions, Registrar, Financial Aid)
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Agenda Item: Supporting Employees through Challenging Economic Times

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☒ discussion

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier
Rosie Barry, Assistant Director Organizational Effectiveness

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☒ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To update the Board of Regents on resources available and the activities planned to support staff and work groups affected by budget challenges.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

- Services for Supervisors and Managers
- Services for all Staff
- Services for Staff informed of Layoff or Non-Renewal

Background Information:

Among the Human Resources principles adopted by the Board is “Structure HR policies, system, and practices to increase the overall effectiveness and productivity of faculty and staff.” Our efforts in support of this principle will become more crucial as the current budget situation fully unfolds, and this presentation will allow the Board to become more familiar with the support structures and programs we have in place to meet these challenges.
Supporting Employees through Challenging Economic Times

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues

The University of Minnesota’s strategic position action strategy calls for the University to promote a health working environment that enhances productivity, supports individual and group success, is responsibly managed and fosters inclusiveness, employee well being and the assurance of safety.

While it can be challenging to meet this goal during times of budget challenge, the Office of Human Resources is preparing a variety of approaches to meet the needs of both those directly affected and those indirectly affected. This is important not only to help those directly affected, but to minimize such reactions such as “survivor guilt” among those not directly affected. A study completed in 2003 by the Center for Organizational Research and Drake Beam Morin found that companies that provided outplacement to displaced staff were twice as likely to experience increased productivity and 50 percent more likely to increase profits than those organizations that did not. Common benefits from this approach included improved more among retained employees (59%), reduced stress on managers (69%), reduced litigation (72%), and improved organization image (78%).

The presentation will cover the approaches that will be provided, such as

Services for Supervisors/Managers: consulting on work reorganization and handling team dynamics during challenging times, web resources and emails on topics of interest and brown bag networking groups on related topics and discussion of best practices.

Services for All Staff: a professional development fair to outline free and low-cost development opportunities for faculty and staff at the University as well as a keynote and breakout sessions on development topics. Web resources will also be available as will workshops on career development topics.

Services for Staff Informed of Layoff or Non-Renewal: outplacement services using internal resources, creation of a talent bank, which is a on-line service where staff affected can post information and HR Directors will access for possible fit, job search group, web resources and dislocated worker meetings to provide information about services from the University and the State of MN.
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Agenda Item:  Consent Report

☐ review  ☒ review/action  ☐ action  ☐ discussion

Presenters:  Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☐ background/context  ☒ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To seek approval of senior administrative appointments and institutional appointments to other boards, agencies, or organizations as required by Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

No Consent Report is anticipated this month for the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee.

Background Information:

Board of Regents Policy: Board Operations and Agenda Guidelines calls for items, such as senior administrative appointments, bargaining unit contract approvals, and appointments of certain trustees and board members, to be brought before the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee for action.
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Agenda Item:  Information Items

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☑ discussion

Presenters:  Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☐ background/context  ☑ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To inform committee members of noteworthy items, administrative actions, and local, regional, and national policy-related issues affecting University units and departments.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

- Personnel highlights
- University highlights
- Faculty and staff activities and awards
- Student activities and awards

Background Information:

This report appears as a regular item on the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee agenda.
University of Minnesota
Board of Regents
March 12, 2009
Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee
Information Report

This report does not capture and record a complete listing of the significant awards and activities of the University community, but makes note of unit reported items in these areas. It also highlights reports and activities at the local, regional, and national level in the area of faculty, staff, and student affairs.

Personnel
None

University Highlights
The University of Minnesota Libraries has received the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) 2009 Excellence in Academic Libraries Award. Sponsored by ACRL and Blackwell’s Book Services, the award recognizes the staff of a college, university, and community college library for programs that deliver exemplary services and resources to further the educational mission of the institution. The University of Minnesota Libraries, winner of the university category, was praised for developing excellent strategies to successfully transform and rebrand the libraries to secure a highly valued position on campus.

The University of Minnesota St. Paul campus placed in the top 15 in The Scientist’s annual “Best Places to Work for Postdocs” survey.

The Weber Stream Restoration Initiative was presented with the Milton Pelletier Environmental Stewardship Award by the St. Louis River Alliance. The award was given for the initiative’s efforts to enhance habitat and biodiversity in Lake Superior tributary streams by protecting and restoring watersheds along the North Shore.

Faculty and Staff Activities and Awards
The National Association of Conservation Districts presented the Friend of Conservation award to Extension educators Kim Boyce and Lisa Hinz and the University of Minnesota Extension. Boyce and Hinz are leadership and civic engagement educators serving the east and west metro areas, as well as east central Minnesota.

Betty Cooke, lecturer in curriculum and instruction, received the Evelyn House Award from the Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children (MnAEYC) in recognition of her outstanding contribution to the field of early childhood and family education and to MnAEYC.
An article published in 1984 by Stan Deno, educational psychology, and two of his students at the time, is the most frequently cited article in the field of educational research as reported by the American Educational Research Association.

Stephanie Duggan, veterinary medical center, was elected vice president of the Minnesota Association of Veterinary Technicians.

*Design Intelligence* recognized College of Design Dean Tom Fisher and Denise Guerin, interior design, as most admired educators of 2009. The journal also ranked the University’s School of Architecture with high distinction as one of the world-class architecture schools in the U.S.

Megan R. Gunnar and L. Alan Sroufe, institute of child development, received the Society for Research in Child Development award for Distinguished Scientific Contributions to Child Development in recognition of their major contributions to the field.

The Minnesota Association of Veterinary Technicians (MAVT) named Kim Horne, veterinary medical center, as Veterinary Technician of the Year. MAVT is the second-largest state technician association in the country.

The Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) has awarded the distinction of fellow to Joe Konstan, computer science and engineering. The ACM is the world’s oldest and largest professional organization dedicated to the advancement of computer science and information technology. Each year only about 20 individuals are selected as fellows.

Ann S. Masten, institute of child development, has been elected president of the Society for Research in Child Development, the leading international organization in developmental science.

The Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture has named Lance Neckar and David Pitt, landscape architecture, as co-editors of Landscape Journal.

Andrew Oxenham, psychology, was honored by The National Academy of Sciences for extraordinary scientific achievements in psychology. Oxenham was awarded the Troland Research Award for contributions to our understanding of the relationship between auditory perception and its underlying physiological mechanisms.

Arnd Scheel, mathematics, has received the 2009 J. D. Crawford Award by the SIAM Activity Group on Dynamical Systems for his work on planar defects and other research related to dynamical systems and partial differential equations.

*Black Box*, a novel by Julie Schumacher, English, has been named an American Library Association (ALA) Best Book for Young Adults and an ALA Quick Pick (for Reluctant Readers).
Fotir Sotiropoulos, civil engineering, and postdoctoral candidate Iman Borazjani were among the winners of the prestigious Gallery of Fluid Motion competition at the 61st Annual American Physical Society Division of Fluid Dynamics meeting.

Robert Washabau, veterinary clinical sciences, will be the 2009 recipient of the World Small Animal Veterinary Association WALTHAM International Award for Scientific Achievement. This award recognizes outstanding contributions by a veterinarian who has had a significant impact on the advancement of knowledge concerning the cause, detection, cure, and control of disorders of companion animals.

**Student Activities and Awards**

A model chair by architecture undergraduate Morgan Hertzfeld was one of the winners in the Design Within Reach Champagne Chair Contest, which required contestants to create an original miniature chair using only the foil, label, cage, and cork from no more than two champagne bottles and to fit the creation within a four-inch square box.

John Keane, doctoral candidate in electrical engineering, Shrinivas Venkatraman (M.A. ‘07) and Paulo Butzen, international student visitor, won the 2009 DAC/ISSCC Student Design Contest for their chip design project. The purpose of the competition is to promote excellence in the design of electronic systems.

Nina Kieves, veterinary medicine class of 2009, has received the Simmons Educational Fund (SEF) Business Aptitude Award, based on her resume and response to a SEF business case study. SEF is a non-profit corporation created to educate practitioners and students about the business of veterinary medicine.

UMC student Chris Waltz received the Student Conservationist Award, the top student award given by Minnesota Chapter of The Wildlife Society. This year’s award marks the eighth time in the last twelve years that a UMC student has received the award.

The University of Minnesota Duluth Mock Trial Team won first place among 20 teams at the Hatting Invitational Mock Trial Tournament held in January. Team members include: Krista Allgor, Josh Eberle, Kelsey Genevich, Eric Glasson, Peter Jessen, Rob Yount, Laura Zech, and Peter Zethraus. Singled out for special recognition were Yount as Outstanding Plaintiff’s Witness, Eberle as Outstanding Defense Attorney, and Jessen as Outstanding Plaintiff’s Attorney.

A team of nine undergraduate and four graduate students were awarded a silver medal in the International Genetically Engineered Machines competition (iGEM). The team engineered two types of “smart” bacteria which may be applied in biofuels production and biochemical sensors. The competition involved 85 teams from around the world.