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Agenda Item: Board of Regents Policy: Employee Performance Evaluation and Development

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

To act on proposed Board of Regents Policy: Employee Performance Evaluation and Development.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

1. This proposed Board policy covering University employee performance management is one of the comprehensive set of Board of Regents policies on core Human Resource components. These policies have been supported by the Board.

2. At a high level, this policy guides the University’s evaluation of employee performance and supports employee development and improvement of professional competencies and outcomes as a part of the process.

3. This policy addresses regularly conducted and documented reviews of all employees, with shared responsibility between responsible administrators/supervisors and employees for an effective process with ongoing feedback and communication. Operational detail and procedural information are left to administrative documentation.

Background Information:

The September 2006 Board of Regents work session on Strengthening Human Resource Policies resulted in Board support for guiding principles for a comprehensive set of Human Resource policies. These policies communicate the strategic directions and values guiding the University’s Human Resource practices. The Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee reviewed and supported the comprehensive set of Human Resource Board policies.

President’s Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends adoption of proposed Board of Regents Policy: Employee Performance Evaluation and Development.
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

SECTION I. SCOPE.

This policy governs performance evaluation and development of University of Minnesota (University) faculty, academic professional and administrative, civil service, and union-represented staff employees.

SECTION II. DEFINITIONS.

Subd. 1. Performance Evaluation and Development. Performance evaluation and development shall mean a process undertaken between responsible administrators/supervisors and their employees reporting to them. This process includes assessing, guiding, and recognizing employee performance, resulting in effective achievement of organizational and individual goals.

SECTION III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

The following principles shall guide the University's evaluation and development of employee performance:

(a) The University cultivates a high performing workforce through employee performance evaluation and development that engages the entire organization, is appropriate to the nature of the work, recognizes and rewards exemplary performance, and addresses substandard performance.

(b) The University is committed to assessing and supporting the development of the behavioral and functional competence of its employees, consistent with expressed academic and administrative needs, the role of the employee, and performance expectations.

(c) The University aspires to a performance evaluation process that incorporates regular feedback and candid discussion about performance.

(d) The University is committed to responsible investments in its employees through professional development, education, and training directed at maximizing productivity, enhancing employee personal and professional competencies, supporting
employees as they seek new career opportunities within the University, and generating a succession of leaders prepared and able to lead the University into the future.

(e) The University holds its leaders, responsible administrators, and supervisors accountable for actively supporting and engaging in the performance evaluation and development process in a fair and equitable manner and for ensuring the alignment of employee and organizational goals and priorities.

SECTION IV. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS.

University leaders, responsible administrators, and supervisors shall conduct performance reviews for purposes of evaluation and development. The University expects ongoing evaluation of employee performance, with regularly conducted and documented reviews of all employees administered according to applicable administrative policies, rules, and collective bargaining agreements.

SECTION V. EMPLOYER RESPONSIBILITY.

Subd. 1. Leadership Accountability. University leaders, responsible administrators, and supervisors shall be held accountable for implementing a performance evaluation and development process that is consistent in the treatment of employees, provides for accurate performance reviews, and encourages open communication.

Subd. 2. Implementation. The University shall provide to its leaders, responsible administrators, and supervisors the necessary resources, tools, and training to effectively manage employee performance.

SECTION VI. EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITY.

Employees, recognizing are expected to (a) understand the importance of their contribution to the University's mission, values, and success, are expected and (b) to exercise responsibility for actively engaging in the performance evaluation process and subsequent development efforts.
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Agenda Item: Board of Regents Policy: Employee Compensation and Recognition

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☒ action  ☐ discussion

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☒ policy  ☐ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To act on proposed Board of Regents Policy: Employee Compensation and Recognition.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

1. This proposed policy covering University employee compensation and recognition is part of the comprehensive set of Board of Regents policies on core Human Resource components. These policies have been supported by the Board.

2. This proposed policy sets forth principles to guide the University in its compensation decisions, outlines consideration of appropriate criteria, and addresses the University’s adherence to applicable legal requirements. At a high level, it describes the University’s commitment to achieve and maintain a compensation structure that, when combined with a benefits package, is competitive relative to peer institutions and to other appropriate labor markets.

3. This proposed policy describes the University’s commitment to recognize the meritorious performance of its employees through compensation and other means.

Background Information:

The September 2006 Board of Regents work session on Strengthening Human Resource Policies resulted in Board support for guiding principles for a comprehensive set of Human Resource policies. These policies communicate the strategic directions and values guiding the University’s Human Resource practices. The Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee reviewed and supported the comprehensive set of Human Resource Board policies.

President’s Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends adoption of proposed Board of Regents Policy: Employee Compensation and Recognition.
EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND RECOGNITION

SECTION I. SCOPE.

This policy governs compensation and recognition for University of Minnesota (University) employees.

SECTION II. DEFINITIONS.

Subd. 1. Compensation. Compensation shall mean base salary and additional payments to employees, such as augmentations, lump sum payments, and incentives.

Subd. 2. Recognition. Recognition shall mean formal and informal acknowledgement of work or service performed.

SECTION III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

The following principles shall guide the University's compensation and recognition systems:

(a) The University strives to achieve and maintain a compensation structure that, when combined with benefits and other rewards, is competitive relative to institutional peers and other appropriate labor markets and serves to attract and retain a high performance workforce.

(b) The University seeks to reward meritorious performance and employee contribution to the success of the University through compensation and other forms of recognition.

(c) In the setting of initial salaries and subsequent pay adjustments, the University considers the work responsibilities, market, internal equity, experience and expertise, performance, and other criteria as appropriate.

(d) The University adheres to compensation and recognition practices that are fair and equitable in design, application, and delivery.
SECTION IV. IMPLEMENTATION.

Subd. 1. Compensation System. The University's compensation system shall articulate current compensation strategies, describe forms of pay, identify funding sources, and outline annual compensation plans for each employee group. Responsible administrators shall be held accountable for disseminating salary and other compensation within the defined parameters of the annual plans in a manner that supports the academic direction and investment strategies of the University. The University's compensation system shall (a) be administered in a manner that complies with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and laws and (b) be consistent with applicable administrative policies, rules, and collective bargaining agreements.

Subd. 2. Recognition System. The University shall have programs of awards, honors, and events that recognize excellence in performance by individuals, groups, and units.

SECTION V. MONITORING AND REPORTING.

The president or delegate shall monitor the effectiveness of compensation and recognition programs and report annually to the Board of Regents.
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Agenda Item:  Board of Regents Policy: Administrative Fringe Benefits

☐ review  ☒ review/action  ☐ action  ☐ discussion

Presenters:  Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☒ policy  ☐ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To rescind Board of Regents Policy: Administrative Fringe Benefits.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Reasons to rescind this policy include:

1. The current language is administrative in nature.

2. Language delegating to the President the type of oversight contemplated in this policy is incorporated under the existing Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority.

Background Information:

The September 2006 Board of Regents work session on Strengthening Human Resource Policies resulted in an examination of all Human Resource policies.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends rescission of Board of Regents Policy: Administrative Fringe Benefits.
ADMINISTRATIVE FRINGE BENEFITS

The following appointment information will be included in the senior vice president’s monthly report for deans, vice presidents, and chancellors if:

1. the arrangements present a personal benefit to the individual (in contrast to professional support such as equipment or space renovation);
2. they cover a time period following the date of initial appointment; and
3. the period extends more than six months from the date of initial appointment; or
4. the arrangements exceed one month’s salary in total value.
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Agenda Item:  Board of Regents Policy: Salaries for Administrative Officers

☐ review  ☒ review/action  ☐ action  ☐ discussion

Presenters:  Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☒ policy  ☐ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To rescind Board of Regents Policy: Salaries for Administrative Officers.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Reason to rescind this policy:

The current policy language is administrative in nature and will become administrative policy.

Background Information:

The September 2006 Board of Regents work session on Strengthening Human Resource Policies resulted in an examination of all Human Resource policies.

President’s Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends rescission of Board of Regents Policy: Salaries for Administrative Officers.
SALARIES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

Subd. 1. Salary Determination. Administrative posts (department heads and above) will carry a negotiated administrative augmentation of the base salary of the individual for the designed period of the administrative appointment (A or B). This augmentation will relate to the administrative position and not to the individual. Thus, as the administrative position is relinquished, the individual's salary will revert to the base amount. Any salary adjustments during the term of administrative office will be divided between the base and the augmentation.

Subd. 2. Fringe Benefits. All fringe benefits will relate to both the base salary, and the augmentation. Those fringe benefits paid during the period of office in an administrative post will be related to the term of the administrative appointment (A or B). In the event that the administrative post is relinquished, the fringe benefits will subsequently be based on the appointment then assumed by the individual and on the term of that appointment. When the administrative post has been relinquished and the augmentation has been discontinued, the fringe benefits related to the augmentation will also be discontinued.

Subd. 3. Retroactive Application. This policy is not intended to be retroactive but will apply for those cases negotiated after the approval of this policy by the Board of Regents or those previously negotiated on these terms.
**Agenda Item:** Board of Regents Policy: Severance for Academic Professional and Administrative Employees

- review
- review/action
- action
- discussion

**Presenters:** Vice President Carol Carrier

**Purpose:**

- policy
- background/context
- oversight
- strategic positioning

To rescind Board of Regents Policy: *Severance for Academic Professional and Administrative Employees.*

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

Reason to rescind this policy:

The current policy language is administrative in nature and will become administrative policy.

**Background Information:**

The September 2006 Board of Regents work session on Strengthening Human Resource Policies resulted in an examination of all Human Resource policies.

**President’s Recommendation for Action:**

The President recommends rescission of Board of Regents Policy: *Severance for Academic Professional and Administrative Employees.*
Subd. 1. Conditions. A severance agreement that terminates an employment contract for academic professionals on annual or fixed term contracts (J or K) or administrators (J or K) at or prior to the contract’s official end date may be implemented under the following conditions:

(1) The employee agrees in writing with the action to be taken.
(2) The president or a designee has reviewed and approved the proposed agreement. The Office of Human Resources will review the proposed severance agreement prior to final approval. If there is a lack of agreement between the designee and Human Resources, the President will make the final decision to approve or not approve.
(3) The severance period is no longer than the length of the notice period for which the employee is entitled, as specified in the Academic Professional and Administrative Staff Policies and Procedures.
(4) The University will make a lump sum payment to the individual that will not exceed the total value of the salary and benefits for the period.
(5) The employee shall terminate employment as of the date of the agreement and will release all claims against the University arising out of employment.

Subd. 2. Factors to Consider. In reviewing the proposed severance agreement, the president or a designee should consider the following factors:

(1) cost to the University;
(2) advantages to the University in replacement of the employee;
(3) advantage to the University in minimizing disruption to the unit; and
(4) the overall interests of the University.

Subd. 3. Consultation with Board. If, in the judgment of the president, a case is of unusual importance or significance, the president shall then consult with the chair of the Board of Regents.
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Agenda Item: Strategic Positioning: Equity and Diversity Initiatives

☐ review ☐ review/action ☐ action ☒ discussion

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier
Senior Vice President Robert Jones
Vice President and Vice Provost Nancy “Rusty” Barceló

Purpose:

☒ background/context ☐ oversight ☒ strategic positioning

To discuss with the Board of Regents the general principles that guide the University’s system-wide work on equity and diversity.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Questions for discussion:

1. Do the principles capture all that is needed to guide the University’s equity and diversity efforts?

2. How would the Board prefer to be advised of the progress made by the University in its system-wide equity and diversity efforts?

Background Information:

The Office of the Vice President and Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity has consulted with individuals and groups across the University system, reviewed and gathered documents and information about diversity efforts underway in all areas of the University, met with external constituencies, and initiated an assessment of all centrally administered equity and diversity resources, services, and units. This endeavor has included, and used as a foundation, the extraordinary work of the strategic positioning Diversity Task Force.

The information gained during this review, which includes the recommendations of the Diversity Task Force as well as the expertise of those in the Office for Equity and Diversity, has informed the development of several guiding principles. These principles will be presented to the Board for discussion.
The University's Work Toward Equity and Diversity is a Critical Element of Strategic Positioning

The University of Minnesota has a demonstrated commitment to equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity. This is evidenced in several Board of Regents policies, and has been specifically identified by President Bruininks as being a core value inherent to the University’s mission. In addition, for almost two years, the University has been engaged in the process of strategic positioning, with the goal of making the University of Minnesota one of the top three public research universities in the world. President Bruininks has recognized that in order to achieve this goal, we must transform all aspects of the institution, and has challenged us all to plan for, and implement, transformational change initiatives.

The connection between the goal of strategic positioning and the institution’s work on equity and diversity can be seen if reviewing the foundational language of the Transforming the U initiative:

In today’s competitive world, standing still means falling behind. We must:

• Keep the state’s only research university strong and of the highest quality as global competition for resources, high-ability students and top faculty grows.

• Respond to declining state funding. The University must make wise, but sometimes difficult choices in the face of declining state support. Dollars saved through academic redesign and administrative reform can be reinvested in improved education, research and outreach.

• Respond to changing demographics that will change the numbers, diversity, age and needs of the student population.

(Transforming the U; “Why Strategic Positioning” found at http://www1.umn.edu/systemwide/strategic_positioning/why_sp.html)

The accomplishment of the University's vision (Improve the Human Condition through the Advancement of Knowledge) and mission (Extraordinary Education, Breakthrough Research, Dynamic Public Engagement), depends on the institution's ability to successfully establish the six foundations for success identified through the strategic positioning process:

Foster Culture of Excellence
Cultivate International Learning
Advance Interdisciplinary Frontiers
Build Diverse Community
Generate Critical Resources
Account for Results

(Transforming the U, found at: http://www1.umn.edu/systemwide/strategic_positioning/pdf/SPposter-ltr.pdf)

Each of these foundational elements depends on the University’s success in achieving equity and in capitalizing on the benefits that true diversity can bring. Recognizing this, a Systemwide Task Force on Diversity was created and charged by Robert J. Jones, Senior Vice President for System Administration, and E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost with the following mission:
(1) To formulate recommendations regarding how to reaffirm and deepen the University’s commitment and capacity, system-wide and across all campuses, collegiate units, and supporting units, to become a national leader in articulating, respecting, embracing, and supporting diversity among faculty, staff, and students; and

(2) To produce a report that will serve as a framework for the subsequent development of the University’s system-wide diversity plan for all elements of the University.

The Diversity Task Force

The process used by the Diversity Task Force was ambitious, comprehensive, inclusive and transparent. This task force is to be commended for the commitment and competence with which it met its charge and delivered its findings and recommendations. In its report, dated February 3, 2006, the Diversity Task Force concluded that:

To achieve a climate and environment that supports diversity requires commitment, competence, and support to ensure equitable and accessible learning, working, and social environments for all members of the community (both internal and external), particularly those who have been historically underrepresented or marginalized.


The Task Force also concluded:

For the University to achieve preeminence in the world, diversity must be a driving force, and that with diversity as the priority the University would be able to (1) fully leverage its capacity, locally and globally, to expand knowledge through learning and research; (2) improve access and civic engagement with external communities; and (3) create productive and engaging working and learning environments.

These findings are included with and supplemented by specific recommendations in the Diversity Task Force report in which the task force advised that “the specific implementation strategies and budgetary recommendations are part of the next phase of the University’s work.”

Principles Developed by the Office of the Vice President and Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity

During the work of the Diversity Task Force, as well as the work of 33 other strategic positioning task forces, a search was underway for a new chief diversity officer who would be a member of the executive leadership team and whose task it would be to infuse, shape and transform current diversity initiatives and programs at the University. That search resulted in the appointment of Dr. Nancy ‘Rusty’ Barceló as the Vice President and Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity. Dr. Barceló is the first chief diversity officer at the University of Minnesota at the level of a Vice President and/or Vice Provost and her appointment at this level is consistent with the mandate for diversity set forth by President Bruininks and the recommendations made in the strategic positioning process by the Diversity Task Force.

Since its creation, the Office of the Vice President and Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity has reviewed voluminous documents and web-based data, consulted with individuals and groups across the University system, gathered information about diversity efforts underway in all areas of the University, met with external constituencies, and initiated an assessment of all centrally administered equity and diversity resources, services and units. This endeavor
has included, and used as a foundation, the extraordinary work of the strategic positioning Diversity Task Force.

The information gained during this review, which includes the recommendations of the Diversity Task Force, as well as the expertise of those in the Office for Equity and Diversity and their knowledge of the research and literature about diversity work, has informed the development of guiding principles. The development of these guiding principles has also been influenced by the numerous equity and diversity efforts currently being undertaken throughout the University in the colleges, administrative units and on the coordinate campuses. The Office for Equity and Diversity seeks input from the Board about these guiding principles. This discussion is critical as the Office develops its system-wide Equity and Diversity Strategic Plan.

Principle #1

**Equity and diversity initiatives are critical to achieving excellence at the University of Minnesota.**

Principle #2

**Equity and diversity contribute to new ways of thinking that improve the human condition through the advancement of knowledge.**

Principle #3

**Equity and diversity initiatives have been and will continue to be integral to transforming the University of Minnesota.**

Principle #4

**Equity and diversity require that we value multiple perspectives and allow individuals and groups to retain their unique identities and perspectives.**

Principle #5

**The success of equity and diversity initiatives is a shared responsibility.**

Principle #6

**Equity and diversity efforts must involve and engage external communities.**

Principle #7

**Equity and diversity work should be done holistically with an understanding that our efforts must be connected and are interdependent.**

Principle #8

**Achieving equity and diversity requires the development of sustainable new models that are tied to scholarly research and proven best practices.**

A discussion of these principles and their implications for the University will be a major focus of the Board presentation.
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Agenda Item: Student Interest Survey

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☒ discussion

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier
Gerald Rinehart, Vice Provost, Student Affairs
Tony Brown, Assistant Director, Recreational Sports

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☒ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

This report is intended to highlight findings from the 2006 Student Interest Survey. The survey, conducted at the University every five years since 1971, provides useful highlights regarding student life, including demographics, leisure interests, student involvement, sense of community, and satisfaction with the University.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Beginning in the 1990s, the University has made several investments aimed at improving the student experience, including investing in technology, expanding on-campus housing, renovating facilities, and enhancing student engagement and leadership opportunities. Data from the 2006 Student Interest Survey indicate that these investments have reaped benefits.

- Thirty-five percent of current undergraduates see themselves as commuters, compared to 58% in 1981.
- In the past 15 years, there have been dramatic increases in the percent of students involved in volunteer work on campus and in the community. Students also are more involved in political activities and social action groups.
- The percent of undergraduates involved in student organizations and activities has increased from 34% in 1986 to 54% in 2001 and 74% in 2006.
- Eighty-seven percent of undergraduates report being more satisfied than dissatisfied with their experience at the University.

Background Information:

From time to time the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee receives reports of surveys of University students. In recent years, data from the Student Experience Survey and the Senior Exit Survey have been discussed with this committee.
Activities, Interests, and Characteristics of University of Minnesota Students: 1971-2006

Selected Findings from the *University of Minnesota Student Interest Survey* (Twin Cities)

A Report to the Board of Regents Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee
March 8, 2007

The University of Minnesota Student Interest Survey spans 35 years of student life on the Twin Cities campus. It was first administered in winter quarter 1971 by Dr. Roger Harrold, director of what was then known as the Student Activities Bureau. Dr. Harrold was assisted by Benjamin Lowe, a sports sociologist, and by Greg Gordon, then sports editor for the *Minnesota Daily* and now Washington correspondent for the *Minneapolis StarTribune*. Conducted at five-year intervals since that time, it stretches from the winding down of the Vietnam War to the ongoing war in Iraq.

Numerous changes have happened to life at the University during this period. For example, in 1971 males constituted 60 percent and females 40 percent of the undergraduate population. By 2006, those percentages had nearly reversed to 47 percent and 53 percent, respectively. Since 1971, higher education and society as a whole have witnessed dramatic advances in technology which have transformed the world in which we live. This has been reflected in a variety of ways at the University, from a host of electronic entertainment innovations to educational methodologies to ways in which the U communicates with its students. The Student Interest Survey has been witness to these changes and many others as well.

This report summarizes selected findings between 1971 and 2006 from five aspects of student life on the Twin Cities campus: demographics, leisure interests, student involvement, sense of campus as community, and satisfaction with the University. It includes excerpts, figures, and tables from two documents authored by Dr. Harrold: *Student Interest Survey: 1971-2006* and *Executive Summary Student Interest Survey: 1971-2006*. Unless otherwise noted, the findings reported are specific to undergraduates. In a few selected instances, comparative data for graduate and professional students will be reported. Additional analysis of data pertaining to graduate and professional students, as well as students of color is underway.

**Selected Findings from the Student Interest Survey: 1971-2006**

On several measures the Student Interest Survey demonstrates the impact of University investments in on-campus housing, student engagement and leadership, facilities improvements, and technology.
Demographics

The Twin Cities campus of the University has usually been thought of as an urban commuter student campus. In the 1990s, major efforts were made to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience at the University and to build a stronger sense of community. Much has been written about the values of living on or near campus. New on-campus apartments were built, additions were constructed to several residence halls, and a host of new apartment complexes have been built at the eastern edge of the Minneapolis campus.

The percentage of undergraduates who live on campus or walk to campus had increased from 28 percent in 1976 to 36 percent in 1991, and increased further to 50 percent in 2006. As a consequence, the percentage of students seeing themselves as commuters dropped from 58 percent in 1981 to 35 percent in 2006.

Leisure Interests

Computers and Technology

Use of computers for a variety of purposes by students has been monitored for the past 15 years. In the 1990s, use was confined primarily to word processing, games, e-mail and the World Wide Web. Use of word processing, e-mail and the web is now essentially universal among students, while use of computers for games has dropped off somewhat.

New uses of the computer in the past five years have exploded, particularly for blogs and socializing. The University has developed new applications including U of M Portals and electronic portfolios which have curricular and co-curricular uses. The University now communicates with students primarily through the internet, not through U.S. mail.

Public Affairs

Three specific interests could be used to gauge public affairs awareness and understanding of local, national, and international events. All contribute to the cultivation of an enlightened citizenry considered essential to a democracy. They are: reading newspapers, reading weekly newsmagazines, and watching the daily news on television. Since 1986, the percentage of undergraduates engaged in these activities has dropped dramatically.

Community Involvement

The University encourages its students to become involved in the community by doing volunteer work as a form of civic involvement. The past 15 years have witnessed dramatic increases in the percentage of both men and women involved in volunteer work, both on and off campus. The 2006 survey reported significant increases in the percentage of both men and women students involved in political activities and groups and in social action groups since 2001.
Student Involvement

Involvement in Student Organizations and Activities

The percentage of undergraduates involved in student organizations and activities increased steadily from 34 percent in 1986 to 54 percent in 2001, then rather dramatically to 74 percent in 2006. Certainly some of this increase must be attributed to a significantly higher percentage of students living on or near campus. The reopening of Coffman Memorial Union and enhanced efforts to promote student engagement and leadership are contributors to this increase as well.

Students deeply involved in campus groups and activities reported a significantly greater impact on the development of their leadership skills, interpersonal skills, program/event planning skills, critical thinking skills, commitment to civic involvement and development of global perspectives as a result of their involvement.

Recreational Sports Involvement, 2006

One-third (33.9 percent) of undergraduate men and about one-fourth (27.6 percent) of undergraduate women who responded to the 2006 survey use Recreational Sports facilities at least once a week. The greatest percent that use these facilities are freshmen (72.2 percent), and the percent drops off steadily to fourth-year seniors (49.5 percent). The rate of recreation facility use by graduate and professional students was 42 percent. This committee has previously heard that preliminary data indicates that students who use the University Recreation Center or St. Paul Gymnasium on a regular basis are retained at higher rates.

Use of Coffman Union, 2006

Nearly all Twin Cities campus undergraduates (97.6 percent) visited Coffman Union during the 12 months preceding the 2006 survey and 46.7 percent visited Coffman at least weekly. More than half of those students who function primarily on the St. Paul campus (51.5 percent) visited Coffman at least monthly. Half of all undergraduates (49.9 percent) visiting Coffman report a major reason is visiting the bookstore. Roughly one-fourth (22.6 percent) report food is a major reason for visiting Coffman.

Use of St. Paul Student Center, 2006

Only 28.4 percent of all Twin Cities campus undergraduates visited the St. Paul Student Center in the 12 months preceding the 2006 survey. Obviously students functioning primarily if not solely on the Minneapolis campus have less reason to visit the St. Paul campus. In contrast, 93.9 percent of St. Paul Campus students had visited the Student Center in the previous 12 months, and 57.6 percent had visited the Student Center at least weekly. As with Coffman Union, the two primary motivators bringing students to the Student Center are food and the bookstore.
Sense of Community at the University

The Student Interest Survey has engaged in a study of the Twin Cities campus as a community for students for 15 years, since 1991. Three basic questions were asked in each survey:

- To what extent is it important to you personally to experience a sense of “community” at the University?
- To what extent do you experience a feeling of “community” at the University?
- To what extent have a number of specific experiences contributed to your having a sense of community at the University?

Two thirds (67.2 percent) of all undergraduates surveyed in 2006 thought that experiencing community was at least moderately important while one-third (32.8 percent) thought that experiencing community was either not at all important or, at best, slightly important to them. These results were virtually identical with the 1996 and 2001 survey findings. Nearly half (46.6 percent) of respondents to the 2006 survey experienced community to some extent or to a great extent.

Cross-tabulating these two questions enabled us to focus attention on two of four groups: (1) those for whom a sense of community was at least moderately important and they actually experienced it so some extent or to a great extent (*success*); and (2) those for whom a sense of community was at least moderately important but they experienced it either not at all or only to a small extent (*failure*).

The first group (*success*) amounted to 39.4 percent of all undergraduates (10,680 students). The second group (*failure*) amounted to 27.9 percent of all undergraduates (7,560 students). While the first group is to be celebrated, the second represents a challenge for the University. A sense of community is important to them, but they are not experiencing it. Approximately 43 percent of students of color who responded to the 2006 survey were in this group. Not surprisingly experiencing a sense of community was more important to undergraduates than to graduate and professional students.

Student Satisfaction with the University

Overall satisfaction with the University was significantly higher in 2001 and 2006 than 1991 and 1996. Nearly nine in ten 2006 undergraduates (87.5 percent) were more satisfied than dissatisfied with their experience at the University. Similar percentages were satisfied with the academic portion of their University experience.

Among undergraduates who used, visited, or participated, similar levels of satisfaction were expressed for Recreational Sports, Coffman Union and the St. Paul Student Center, student organizations and activities, and Boynton Health Service health promotion programs and health-care provider services.

For the most part graduate and professional students reported similarly high levels of satisfaction with their University experiences. They were particularly satisfied with their academics, the St. Paul Student Center, and Boynton Health Service.
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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.
Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee  
March 8, 2007

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.
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.

University Highlights
The Corridor Housing Initiative, a project convened by the Center for Neighborhoods and the University’s Metropolitan Design Center, won the 2007 National Grassroots Planning Award from the American Planning Association.

The calf and heifer facility at the Southern Research and Outreach Center in Waseca recently earned the Dairy Quality Assurance Stewards of the Land designation, which accompanies five-star recognition, the highest level of attainment for dairy businesses.

Renovation of the Gopher Spot game room and convenience store at the St. Paul Student Center won the 2007 Interiors Award from Contract magazine.

Faculty and Staff Activities and Awards
Ananya Chatterjea, theatre arts and dance, was named one of 21 Leaders for the 21st Century by Women’s e-news in the category “Seven Who Will Not Be Stopped.”

John Cogan, educational policy and administration, was honored by Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, Thailand, with the Honorary Doctorate in Education. Cogan is the only non-Thai citizen to receive the award this year.

Stan Deno, educational psychology, is the recipient of the American Educational Research Association’s Distinguished Researcher Award in Special Education. Deno won the award for his research in curriculum-based measurement with learning-disabled children.

University of Minnesota Extension dean Beverly Durgan received the Research and Tech Transfer Committee Award from the Minnesota Soybean Research and Promotion
Council. Durgan was cited for her integral role in the council’s research programs over several years and in construction of a biocontainment facility.

Ali Khalif Galaydh, Humphrey Institute, received the George Arents Pioneer Medal from his alma mater, Syracuse University. The annual award is the highest alumni honor the university bestows.

Robert Herman, genetics, cell biology, and development, received the Genetics Society of America’s George W. Beadle award for his outstanding contributions to the community of genetic researchers.

Phillip Koski, architecture, is one of six recipients of the 2007 Young Architects Award for leadership in design and service from the American Institute of Architects. Koski is a principal with Inland Office for Tomorrow’s Architecture and also chairs the Minneapolis Historic Preservation Commission.

Cliff Lamb, animal science, received the 2006 Service Award from the Minnesota State Cattlemen’s Association in recognition of his outstanding service to the industry and his support of the state’s cattle producers.

Judith Lambrecht, work and human resource education, received the Russell J. Hosler Award in Business Education from the Wisconsin Business Education Association.

DeAnn Lazovich, epidemiology, was recently named vice chair of the Minnesota Cancer Alliance Steering Committee and will assume her one-year position as chair in 2008.

Carl Malmquist, sociology, was awarded the 2007 American Psychiatric Association’s Manfred S. Guttmacher Award for his book “Homicide: A Psychiatric Perspective.”

Pam Matti, CEHD student and professional services, received the Distinguished Service Award for outstanding and significant contributions to the Minnesota Colleges and Universities Career Services Association.

Ronald Phillips, agronomy and plant genetics, has won the 2007 Wolf Prize in Agriculture, one of the world’s highest honors in agriculture. Phillips and cowinner Michel George from the University of Liege in Belgium were cited “for groundbreaking discoveries in genetics and genomics, laying the foundations for improvements in crop and livestock breeding, and sparking important advances in plant and animal sciences.”

Dan Svedarsky, Northwest Research and Outreach Center, was elected vice president of The Wildlife Society and will eventually become president. He is the first Minnesotan elected to this office.

Frank Symons, educational psychology, received the Council for Exceptional Children’s Early Career Research Award.
The Minnesota Veterinary Medical Association presented the Distinguished Service Award to Julia Wilson, veterinary population medicine, in February. Retired professors John Arnold, Bee Hanlon, and Walter Mackey were named Veterinarians of the Year in recognition of their involvement in forming the Minnesota Veterinary Historical Museum.

**Student Activities and Awards**
Ph.D. students Pamela Butler, English, and Avana Weekley, gender, women and sexuality studies, were awarded The Woodrow Wilson Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship in Women’s Studies. The Foundation awards a small number of these awards to outstanding Ph.D. students writing on women’s issues in humanities and social science fields.

Julia Conkel, Ph.D. student in educational psychology, received the Minnesota Career Development Association’s Sunny Hansen Award for demonstrated dedication to the field of career development.

Brent Hulke, a graduate student in agronomy and plant genetics, received the National Council of Commercial Plant Breeders Graduate Student Award at the American Seed Trade Association Corn & Sorghum and Soybean Research Conference.

Three students from the UMD Labovitz School of Business and Economics, Jackie Claseman, Sarah Fockler, and Terrance Thompson, were named The Business Strategy Game 2006 Season II Best Strategy Invitational Grand Champions. The UMD team won over a field of 6,500 other teams from throughout the world competing entirely online.

Two theatre students from the University of Minnesota, Morris took home awards from the regional American College Theatre Festival held in Ames, Iowa in January. Amanda Holter was selected as top critic and will critique shows at the national level in April at the Kennedy Center in Washington, DC. Sara Herman was selected for the best costume designs.

Cornercopia, the student-run organic farm on the St. Paul campus, won the St. Paul Garden Club Award from the Minnesota State Horticultural Society. The award is given to a group that is developing and perpetuating vegetable gardens that are educational and sustainable and provide opportunities for community members to grow fresh produce.

Four members of Morris campus’s Symphonic Winds have been nominated to the 2007 Intercollegiate Honor Band of the College Band Directors National Association: Thomas Henchal, Jessica Henry, Brian Hotila, and Lisa Musielewicz.