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Agenda Item: Strategic Positioning Update: Welcome Week Initiative

discussion

Presenters: Laura Coffin Koch, Associate Vice Provost
Beth Lingren Clark, Director, Orientation and First Year Programs

Purpose:

background/context

Welcome Week is a new program for all first year students. This is a description of the program and its intended impact on students.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

• Increased opportunities for connections between faculty and students and among students;

• Promotion of the importance of campus community will help students become more involved academically and socially.

Background Information:

The first pillar of Strategic Positioning is to “recruit, educate, and graduate outstanding students who become highly motivated lifelong learners, leaders, and global citizens.” Research has demonstrated that student engagement is highly correlated with academic success and timely graduation. Welcome Week is a campus wide effort to assist students in navigating the campus while discovering and accessing the multitude of resources and opportunities available at the University. This program will enhance student engagement by encouraging a first year class identity, fostering institutional pride and respect, and acknowledging each student’s ownership and responsibility for their own college experience.
Welcome Week Initiative

As part of the strategic positioning process, we are undertaking a number of initiatives aimed at increasing our retention and graduation rates for undergraduate students. One such initiative which we believe will contribute to improved retention and graduation at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities is Welcome Week.

Welcome Week will commence this fall on the Twin Cities campus. It is a required six day program for all incoming first year students. The intent of Welcome Week is to assist students in their adjustment to the campus environment and campus life; help students develop and maintain meaningful relationships; allow students to navigate the campus while discovering and accessing the multitude of resources and opportunities available at the University; and build a sense of community by encouraging a first-year class identity, fostering institutional pride and respect, acknowledging individual responsibility to the community, as well as ownership and responsibility for their college experience. However, as with most new programs, the overarching goals are to impact academic and personal success for students which research has demonstrated leads to increased first to second year retention rates, improved student satisfaction, and higher graduation rates.

Across the country, first-year experience programs include guiding objectives which include: assisting students in the transition to college; helping students develop the academic and personal skills required for college success; increasing student awareness of campus resources that may be needed for skill development; assisting students to understand the connections between academic learning and applicability to the real world; and promoting critical thinking (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989).

First-year students need to be guided initially as they navigate the complex and new campus bureaucracy, new social and academic lives and work, family and home responsibilities. Purposeful integration of academic experiences with co-curricular experiences to create a seamless learning environment may enhance students’ academic and personal development (Kuh, 1996).

Increased opportunities for connections between faculty and students, and among students, and promotion of the importance of campus community, may help students become more involved academically and socially, resulting in increased cognitive and social student development, enhanced satisfaction, and ultimately, retention (Upcraft et al., 1989).
In light of the high attrition rate of first-year students, methods that increase the academic and social integration of new students into the community must be seriously considered.

The University of Minnesota Twin Cities Welcome Week program is a campus-wide initiative. A large number of University faculty and staff are supporting and participating in this important effort. The University has an opportunity and an obligation to our new students to welcome them and support them. All freshman admitting colleges have developed specific college programming for their students that will help them understand the mission of the college and opportunities within the colleges. In addition, almost every unit on campus has contributed either financial and/or human resources to support this program.

Sessions have been designed to help students set goals for their University experience, establish effective study habits, explore leadership opportunities, and participate in enjoyable (alcohol free) activities. Welcome Week will provide a foundation that supports responsible decision-making and accountability, giving students a structured opportunity to make connections where they live, through their college, and by their areas of interest and involvement. The intent is to make what may appear to the students as an overwhelming environment into a smaller, more comfortable community for students.

Students who have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the campus and the community prior to the opening of classes will be better prepared to succeed both academically and socially during their first year on campus. Through community building activities and exposure to the University’s history and traditions, each first-year class will have the opportunity to develop a unique sense of affiliation with the University. As a result of Welcome Week, we expect to see increased satisfaction with the overall student experience and increased first to second year retention rates. An evaluation and assessment committee has been developed to create and measure learning outcomes, as well as Welcome Week’s impact on retention and graduation rates.

Welcome Week will not replace our successful New Student Orientation program, but by incorporating and complementing some of the content traditionally included in Orientation, it should reduce some of the “information overload” problems frequently cited by Orientation staff and participants. The activities of the week will be developed and administered so as to minimize any increased workload for advising staff and others who are already working at full capacity during this time period. A key element in the program will be the involvement of many upper division students as program facilitators and group leaders. The program will build upon the highly effective training currently used to develop New Student Weekend Leaders, significantly expanding leadership development opportunities available to upper division students.

We have developed an extensive assessment plan to measure the success of Welcome Week in meeting our goals. This plan will look at retention and graduation rates, and student satisfaction, while also considering the University’s new Student Development Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes. Furthermore, in order to have a comparison
group, we used a variety of assessment instruments with the fall 2007 cohort including a fall to spring leavers study, fall and spring first year check-in surveys, and first year student focus groups. These measures indicated several important transitional issues the 2007 students faced, and as a result, adjustments are being made in the 2008 Welcome Week programming. Each assessment protocol conducted in the 2007-2008 academic year will be conducted again with the 2008-2009 cohort to provide year-to-year comparisons. A detailed database has been developed to allow for the analysis of each Welcome Week cohort until graduation. An initial analysis of the first Welcome Week cohort should be available in January 2009.

Questions/issues to consider:

1. In what ways does the programming in Welcome Week contributing to the overall success of first year students?

2. How does the significant investment in the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities Welcome Week program support our strategic positioning goal related to exceptional students?

3. How can we sustain the momentum and enthusiasm of the University community in future years?
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Agenda Item:  Post-Tenure Review: Update

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☒ discussion

Presenters:  Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan
            Vice Provost Arlene Carney

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☒ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☒ strategic positioning

To provide members of the Faculty, Staff and Student Affairs Committee with an update on post-tenure review procedures and outcomes.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

• The purpose of post-tenure review is to affirm and maintain the vitality of faculty members through review and recognition of their contributions by peers and administrators.

• Post-tenure review was fully implemented in the 2000-01 academic year, according to Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure and academic unit goals and expectations.

• Data from last year show that more than 99% (2,299 reviewed; 7 found by unit head and faculty committee to be below expectations) of faculty reviewed in the 2006-2007 academic year successfully met or exceeded the goals and expectations established by their academic units.

Background Information:

Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure, Section 7a; Rules and Procedures for Annual and Special Post-Tenure Review (approved by Tenure Subcommittee January 5, 1998; revised by the Tenure Subcommittee March 5, 1998). Prior discussions at March 8, 2001 and September 12, 2002 Faculty, Staff and Student Affairs Committee.
Post-Tenure Review Update

**Background:** Post-tenure review is a natural part of the life course of a faculty member, beginning with the initial appointment through promotion and/or tenure and continuing throughout the career of a tenured faculty member. The post-tenure review process is an important component of the University’s commitment to faculty accountability, faculty development, and faculty renewal. This process helps ensure that the University can further acknowledge faculty contributions to their fields and to the continued promotion of excellence at this institution.

One of the most important long-term outcomes of post-tenure review has been the ability of a chair or unit administrator to discuss annual performance with each tenured faculty member following a peer review. In addition to implementing the formal processes described below, a chair or unit administrator is able to counsel faculty at certain points in their careers about choices such as phased retirements. These numbers are not included in any tallies of faculty whose performance is below established departmental or unit standards. Nevertheless, this informal process plays a critically important role in working with tenured faculty at the end of their careers. The more informal channels among deans, department heads, and faculty are often the most efficient and effective means of resolving performance issues at certain times in a faculty member’s career.

**History:** The purpose of post-tenure review is to affirm and maintain the vitality of faculty members through review and recognition of their contributions by peers and administrators. The secondary purpose is to improve, if necessary, the performance of each tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The post-tenure review process was introduced as a part of the 1997 revision of the Regents’ Policy on Faculty Tenure. It is a peer-driven process conducted at the departmental or other academic unit level, with primary oversight by the unit heads and deans. The University of Minnesota’s post-tenure review process is consistent with the standards, policies, and practices on post-tenure review as adopted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1983 and amended by its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure in 1999. The AAUP recognizes post-tenure review as a system of periodic evaluation that goes beyond many traditional forms of continuous evaluations that already encourage responsible performance and academic integrity, conducted according to standards that protect academic freedom and the quality of education.

**Development:** The University fully implemented post-tenure review in 2000-01. The tenured faculty in each academic department developed goals and expectations regarding teaching, research or scholarly productivity, and contributions to service and outreach functions, along with the procedures they planned to use for post-tenure reviews. These post-tenure review criteria and procedures were reviewed and approved by the corresponding deans, vice presidents,
and/or chancellors. In addition, all post-tenure review documents were reviewed and approved by the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs, the vice president for human resources, and the chair of the Tenure Committee of the Faculty Senate to ensure compliance with the Tenure Committee’s rules and procedures for annual and special post-tenure review. Through this comprehensive review, we learned that most units conduct post-tenure reviews in conjunction with the annual review process for merit and compensation. Some units, however, developed separate post-tenure review processes on a rotating basis. For University Education Association (UEA) faculty at the University of Minnesota Duluth, their post-tenure review process was initiated in spring 2002 in accordance with the UEA collective bargaining agreement.

Changes as a Result of Strategic Positioning: The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost requested that each department or unit include its Post-Tenure Review policy as part of its new revised 7.12 Statement (the departmental statement of criteria and standards of performance for tenure and/or promotion in that unit). This has allowed departments or units to revisit and potentially revise their procedures for post-tenure review in light of their new criteria and standards for promotion and/or tenure. All yet-to-be-approved 7.12 Statements will be finalized during fall semester 2008. Currently, approximately 20% of the 7.12 statements have received final approval from the Provost’s Office and are posted on the Promotion and Tenure web site of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. An additional 20% are in the final stages of approval, with the remainder in some intermediate stage.

Current Process Followed for Post-Tenure Review (extracted from the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure):

**Annual review:** Each academic unit, through its merit review and post-tenure review process, annually reviews the performance of each faculty member in light of the goals and expectations of the academic unit established under the Faculty Tenure policy. This review is used for salary adjustment and faculty development. The faculty member is advised of the evaluation and, if appropriate, of any steps that should be taken to improve performance and will be provided assistance in that effort. If the head of the unit and the post-tenure review committee find a faculty member’s performance to be “substantially below the goals and expectations adopted by that unit,” they shall advise the faculty member in writing, including suggestions for improving performance, and establish a time period within which improvement should be demonstrated.

**Special review:** If at the end of the time period a tenured faculty member’s performance continues to be “substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit,” and there has not been a sufficient improvement of performance, the head of the academic unit and the post-tenure review committee may jointly request that the dean initiate a “special review” of that faculty member. The special peer review shall be conducted by a panel of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank selected to review that individual. The special review panel shall prepare a report on the teaching, scholarship, service, governance, and (when appropriate) outreach performance of the faculty member. It will also identify any supporting service or accommodation that the University should provide to enable the faculty member to improve performance. Depending on its findings, the panel may recommend one or a combination of varying remedies to maximize the faculty member’s contribution to the
mission of the University or to commence formal proceedings for termination or involuntary
leave of absence under sections 10 and 14 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy.

**Annual surveys for post-tenure review implementation:** Annual surveys are administered to
report post-tenure review outcomes and provide summary data by each college and coordinate
campus. The data from annual surveys are reviewed by the vice provost for faculty and
academic affairs, senior vice presidents, the vice president for human resources, other
administrators and chancellors, and the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee of the
Faculty Senate. Each year, the report to the Board of Regents is for the academic year prior to
the current academic year.

**Outcomes:** Post-tenure review data from the University’s most recent survey in FY 2006-2007
are consistent with the 2005-2006 review. The summary data for post-tenure review are
presented in Appendix A. Approximately 97.5% of tenured faculty received a post-tenure
review. The remaining 2.5% consisted of those with administrative appointments, faculty on
leave, faculty on phased retirement, faculty who have resigned, or faculty who were deceased
during the academic year.

Survey results from FY 2006-07 indicate that more than 99% of reviewed faculty successfully
met or exceeded the goals and expectations established by their academic unit. Less than one-
half percent (11 out of 2,299 tenured faculty who were reviewed) that had performance
“substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit” as judged by the unit head; a smaller
number (7 of the 11) were judged by both the unit head and the elected faculty committee to be
“substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit.

The outcome data for individual faculty are presented in Appendix B. These outcomes are quite
variable depending upon the specific case. Three faculty members had entered into performance
improvement plans (PIP); one achieved the goals established by the end of the PIP and another
did not. One faculty member received a differentiated work assignment. Two faculty elected
phased retirement and one elected immediate retirement. Only one faculty member went through
a special review at the college level, which ultimately resulted in a phased retirement.

**Faculty Development:** Post-tenure review is primarily developmental and supported by
institutional resources for professional development or change of professional direction.
Resources are available for developmental guidance and support to assist faculty members to
enhance their performance and address areas of need. The majority of faculty access a variety of
professional development opportunities such as sabbaticals and other forms of leave,
professional conference participation, workshops, seminars, and fellowships. Faculty with
performance “substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit” receive a significant
investment of time and resources leading to a formal development plan that lends itself to
improved performance, opportunities for reallocated efforts or career transitions, or sanctions.
Appendix A

Summary Data
Reporting of Post-Tenure Review Outcomes
For FY 2006-07
University of Minnesota
16 Twin Cities Academic Colleges and 3 Coordinate Campuses

Number of Tenured Faculty 2,357
Number of Post-Tenure Reviews of Tenured Faculty 2,299
Percent of Tenured Faculty Reviewed 97.5%

Number of cases in which the unit head found performance to be “substantially below the goals and expectations in the unit” for post-tenure review 11
Percent of cases in which the unit head found performance to be “substantially below the goals and expectations in the unit” for post-tenure review < .4%

Number of cases in which the elected tenured faculty post-tenure review committee found performance to be “substantially below the goals and expectations in the unit” for post-tenure review 7
Percent of cases in which the elected tenured faculty post-tenure review committee found performance to be “substantially below the goals and expectations in the unit” for post-tenure review < .3%

Number of cases in which both the unit head and the elected tenured faculty post-tenure review committee found performance to be “substantially below the goals and expectations in the unit” for post-tenure review 7
Percent of cases in which both the unit head and the elected tenured faculty post-tenure review committee found performance to be “substantially below the goals and expectations in the unit” for post-tenure review < .3%
Appendix B

Outcomes for Cases of Seven Faculty Identified in Post-Tenure Review as “substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit”

Professor A
Chose retirement instead of entering a performance improvement plan

Professor B
Chose a phased retirement beginning in summer 2007 instead of entering a performance improvement plan

Professor C
As a result of the review, received a differentiated work assignment (e.g. assumed more service or teaching duties with a reduction in research expectations)

Professor D
Failed to achieve the objectives of a previous performance improvement plan; had a subsequent “special review” at the college level; found below standards in the special review; elected phased retirement in 2008-2009.

Professor E
Entered a performance improvement plan and achieved the objectives of the plan satisfactorily

Professor F
Entered a performance improvement plan and failed to achieve the objectives of the plan; potential initiation of a special review

Professor G
Received a differentiated work assignment and did not fulfill the requirements of the new assignment; new review pending
Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee

Agenda Item: Financing Future Health Care Through Health Care Savings Plan Accounts

- review
- review/action
- action
- discussion

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier
Jackie Singer, Director, Retirement Programs

Purpose:

- policy
- background/context
- oversight
- strategic positioning

Public employees have a unique benefit opportunity in the Health Care Savings Plan. This plan, which is not available to private employers, provides a completely tax-free benefit to cover eligible health care expenses for those who have left employment at the University of Minnesota. As the costs of retiree medical coverage continue to rise, and given that the University does not generally contribute to the cost of retiree medical insurance, administration is constantly seeking alternative, tax-advantaged ways to help employees fund health care expenses. The Health Care Savings Plan represents one such method.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

The Health Care Savings Plan (HCSP) is administered by the Minnesota State Retirement System (MSRS) and covers 21,000 employees of more than 400 public employers in the state. Contributions to the plan are mandatory within an employee group (faculty, P&A, civil service and the various bargaining units) and are exempt from taxes, including Social Security and Medicare. Contributions are deposited into an investment account and are invested based on the employee’s fund choice until withdrawn. Withdrawals are also tax-free, but may be made for approved health care expenses and premiums only.

Depending upon employee group participation, the University’s anticipated tax savings could reach $250,000 annually. Employees would save a corresponding amount in Social Security and Medicare taxes, as well as saving any federal or state taxes normally paid.

Background Information:

Board of Regents Policy: Employee Health Benefits, identifies several principles related to the health care the university provides to employees through the UPlan, one of which is:

- The University is committed to providing employees, retirees, and their families a health plan that offers choice and high quality, comprehensive, and cost-effective care.

This presentation will provide background on health care savings accounts, which maximize the purchasing power of university employees with respect to health care expenditures after they leave University employment.
Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee

Agenda Item: Committee 2008-09 Workplan Discussion

☐ review       ☐ review/action       ☐ action       ☒ discussion

Presenters: Regent John Frobenius
            Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☐ policy       ☒ background/context       ☐ oversight       ☐ strategic positioning

An opportunity to discuss future workplan topics for the Faculty, Staff and Student Affairs Committee.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Discuss and identify proposed agenda items for the coming year. The Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee advises the administration on broad quality of life matters affecting students, faculty, and staff, including health, safety, insurance, retirement, and working conditions. This committee also reviews personnel-related issues and policies.

Background Information:

The Board of Regents has determined that standing committees of the Board shall establish a committee workplan for the coming year. Each year the committee engages in a preliminary conversation with the administration in preparation for development and adoption of a formal workplan for the year.
Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee

July 9, 2008

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.
Agenda Item: Information Items

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

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

Emergency Approval

Regents Simmons, Allen, and Frobenius approved, on Thursday, June 26, 2008, the following revision to an administrative appointment:

- The start date of the appointment of David Wippman as dean of the University of Minnesota Law School has been adjusted to begin on June 30, 2008.

The emergency process was used to obtain necessary approval due to the timing of the necessitated change and the next Board meeting. The approvals were consistent with Board of Regents Policy: Board Operations and Agenda Guidelines, Section II, Subd. 10, which states:

Upon the recommendation of the president, the Board chair, vice chair, and the respective committee chair may act on behalf of the Board when delay for Board approval poses a significant health, safety, or financial risk to the University. Any such emergency approvals will be brought to the next meeting of the Board, consistent with Board policy.

Background Information:

This report appears as a regular item on the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee agenda.
This report does not capture and record a complete listing of the significant awards and activities of the University community, but instead 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**

Following a nation-wide search, the University of Minnesota Rochester has announced the appointment of Dr. Claudia Neuhauser as the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Dr. Neuhauser will join the Rochester staff on July 1. For the past 12, years Dr. Neuhauser has been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities serving first as a full professor in the School of Mathematics and most recently as a Distinguished McKnight Professor and head of the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior in the College of Biological Sciences.

**Highlights**

The University received the 2007 Minnesota Association of Government Communications Award of Excellence in the category of public information projects: special event. The award recognizes the creative commuting solutions that the University implemented after the I-35W bridge collapse.

The University of Minnesota ranks among the top 20 schools in *The Advocate College Guide for LGBT Students*, a guide to finding the best schools for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender students. Other Big Ten schools in the top 20 are Ohio State, Penn State, and the University of Michigan.

The University received a gold Effie Award in the Government, Institutional and Recruitment category for the Driven to Discover campaign. Effie awards, whose name is a play on the word “effectiveness,” have been awarded since 1968 to creative marketing campaigns that achieve demonstrable results.

**Faculty Staff Activities and Awards**

Rayla Allison, kinesiology, was inducted into the Honor Wall of Fame honoring distinguished alumni at the University of Texas at Arlington.

James Boulger, UMD behavioral sciences and director of the Center for Rural Mental Health, received the President’s Award from the Minnesota Academy of Family Physicians.
Michael Davern, health policy and management, has been awarded the 2008 John D. Thompson Prize for Young Investigators from the Association of University Programs in Health Administration. The prize recognizes young investigators based on their contributions to the research literature in the field of health services.

Linda Deneen, UMD info tech systems and services, is completing a term as chair of the nominations and elections committee of EDUCAUSE and has begun a term on the program committee for the organization’s 2009 conference. EDUCAUSE is a nonprofit association whose mission is to advance higher education by promoting the intelligent use of information technology.

The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) has given its Tax Award to University tax director Kelly Farmer. NACUBO, founded in 1962, is a nonprofit professional organization representing chief administrative and financial officers at more than 2,100 colleges and universities across the country. The Tax Award is given to a NACUBO volunteer who has demonstrated a continuous commitment to the group’s tax advocacy efforts, educational programs, and publications focusing on higher education tax compliance and administration.

Joseph Gaugler, nursing, was named a fellow in the Behavioral and Social Sciences Section of the Gerontological Society of America.

Maria Gini, computer science and engineering, has been named a Fellow by the Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence for her major contributions to the field of multi-robot and multi-agent systems, her demonstrated leadership in the artificial intelligence community, and her work to inspire youth.

Tim Griffis, soil, water, and climate, has received an award from Agricultural and Forest Meteorology for his journal article on carbon balance of boreal forests, one of the journal’s ten most widely cited papers in the past five years.

Civil engineering professors Miki Hondzo and Michael Semmens, and former student Jeffrey Weiss, received the 2008 Samuel Arnold Greeley Award from the ASCE Environmental Water Resources Institute in recognition of their paper on storm water detention ponds.

Richard James, aerospace engineering and mechanics, has been selected to receive two prestigious awards: the William Prager Medal from the Society of Engineering Science and the Warner T. Koiter Medal from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

Phyllis Moen, sociology, was honored with a 2008 Work Life Legacy Award by the Families and Work Institute. The award, which celebrates the “work-life movement” in America, recognizes leaders from the corporate, academic and nonprofit sectors who have motivated individuals and entire organizations to change long held views and practices about how employees should work and live.
Ned Mohan, electrical and computer engineering, was chosen as the 2008 recipient of the Outstanding Power Engineering Educator Award from the IEEE Power Engineering Society.

In recognition of his dedicated service and duty to the poultry industry, K. V. Nagaraja, veterinary biomedical sciences, was presented with the Meritorious Service Award at the North Central Avian Disease Conference.

Susan O’Connor-Von, nursing, received the Nurse Educator Award from the Minnesota Nurses Association for her “commitment to patient care and to those who will be the profession’s future.”

Marshall Stern, animal science, received the 2008 American Feed Industry Association Award in ruminant nutrition research.

Traci Toomey, epidemiology, received the MADD Choice Award from the Minnesota Chapter of Mothers Against Drunk Driving. The award highlights individuals who, either in their work or in their daily lives, strive to erase drunk driving and underage drinking from communities. Toomey has served on the MADD national board of directors for four years.

Oliver J. Williams, social work, received the 2008 Adelante Esperanza! Award from the Casa de Esperanza for his pioneering work in the field of domestic violence and unwavering support of Casa de Esperanza as a past board member, volunteer, and supporter. Casa de Esperanza is a Minneapolis organization devoted to mobilizing Latina/Latino communities to end domestic violence.

**Student Activities and Awards**

UMD second year medical student Charles Branch received the American Medical Association Foundation’s Minority Scholars Award.

Medical student Joanna Burns received the Medical Student Award for Contributions to Family Medicine from the Minnesota Academy of Family Practitioners.

Architecture student Theresa Chan has been recognized by the International Association for the Exchange of Students for Technical Experience for her work in assisting international interns.

Electrical engineering seniors Eric Severson and Dominic Hogan won first and third prize, respectively, from the Minnesota Chapter of Sigma Xi for the posters they presented at the annual Undergraduate Research Symposium.

UMD pharmacy student Teresa Johnson is the recipient of a United States Public Health Service Excellence in Public Health Practice Award. This national award recognizes students for their contribution and dedication to public health.
Law student Emily C. Melvin ('08) won the Burton Award for legal writing for her article “An Unacceptable Exception: The Ramifications of Physician Immunity from Medical Procedure Patent Infringement Liability,” which was published in the April 2007 issue of Minnesota Law Review. She was one of only 15 student winners selected from law schools across the country.

University of Minnesota, Crookston baseball player Jake Poehler has been named Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference Co-Freshman of the Year by a vote of league coaches. He shares the honor with Nick Bidroski of Wayne State College.

Law student Bryan M. Seiler ('08) won the 2008 Equal Justice Award from the Minnesota Women Lawyers for his article, “Moving from ‘Broken Windows’ to Healthy Neighborhood Policy: Reforming Urban Nuisance Law in the Public and Private Sectors,” which was published in the February 2008 issue of Minnesota Law Review. The award honors an article or essay that best analyzes an equal justice topic, and that offers original solutions and fresh approaches to solving the problems within it.

After nine regional championships, the University of Minnesota, Crookston’s Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE) attained a new level of success at the SIFE National Exposition in Chicago, Ill., in May. By placing third in their league, the team reached the highest level of achievement in competition for any SIFE Team in Crookston campus history. For the competition, each team produces a written annual report and a live audio-visual presentation on their community outreach projects. A panel of business leaders serves as judges and evaluates the teams on their success in creating economic opportunity for others. Team members are: Joe Field, Nari Kim, Justin Klinkhammer, Theodis Powell III, Chansouda Rattanavong, and Raldy Romero.

Rodrigo Giacaman and Anjalee Vacharaksa, graduate program in oral biology, took first place in the postdoctoral and senior divisions, respectively, in the 2008 AADR/Johnson & Johnson Oral Health Products Hatton Competition at the annual meeting of the American Association of Dental Research.
June 26, 2008

FACSIMILE

To: President Robert Bruininks
From: Ann Cieslak, Executive Director
Re: Emergency Approval
Pages: 3 (including cover)

By telephone and in person yesterday and today, Chair Simmons, Vice Chair Allen, and Faculty, Staff, & Student Affairs Committee Chair Frobenius each approved the request from you for approval of the following (as described in the attached letter from you):

• Appointment of David Wippman as Dean of the Law School, to be effective June 30, 2008.

I understand that this action will be reported to the Board of Regents at the July 2008 meetings, as required by Board Policy.

c: Kathryn Brown, Vice President (w/o attachments)
   Carol Carrier, Vice President (w/o attachments)
June 24, 2008

The Honorable Patricia Simmons
The Honorable Clyde Allen
The Honorable John Frobenius

Dear Members of the Board:

Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority stipulates that the Board reserves authority to appoint individuals as senior University administrators, including the positions of chancellor, vice president, and dean.

On February 8, 2008, the Board of Regents approved the appointment of David Wippman as the new dean of the University of Minnesota Law School. This appointment was to be effective July 1, 2008. It has now come to my attention that the interests of the Law School and the University would be better served by initiating this appointment on June 30, 2008. Because this date occurs prior to the next Board meeting, I am asking that this change to his appointment be made in accordance with the emergency procedures outlined in Board of Regents Policy: Board Operations and Agenda Guidelines. Specifically, in Section II, Subd. 10, the policy reads as follows:

Upon the recommendation of the president, the Board chair, vice chair, and the respective committee chair may act on behalf of the Board when delay for Board approval poses a significant health, safety, or financial risk to the University. Any such emergency approvals will be brought to the next meeting of the Board, consistent with Board policy.

Upon the request of the Vice President for Human Resources, I am recommending Board approval of the following change to the administrative appointment of David Wippman as dean of the Law School.

  o Appointment of David Wippman to be effective June 30, 2008.

Attached is additional information and supporting documentation for this appointment

Sincerely,

Robert H. Bruininks
President

Enclosure

cc: Carol Carrier, vice president human resources
    Ann Cieslak, executive director, Board of Regents Office
BOARD OF REGENTS  
Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee  
June 24, 2008  

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Wippman</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>June 30, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dean Wippman’s appointment shall be an A-term (12-month), L-type (serving at the pleasure of) academic administrative appointment. The 2008-2009 salary shall be set at $385,000.