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Agenda Item:  Retirement Programs: Trends, Issues, and Benchmarks

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☑ discussion

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

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☑ background/context  ☑ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

The University of Minnesota sponsored or contributed to fourteen retirement plans and programs for its faculty and staff in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. The majority of the University’s full-time employees are required to participate in one of two mandatory retirement plans: the Minnesota State Retirement System (MSRS) for civil service and represented staff, or the University of Minnesota Faculty Retirement Plan for faculty and academic professionals and administrative staff (P&A). This second of two discussions will cover the current provisions of the Faculty Retirement Plan, including how it compares to other retirement plans within the University of Minnesota’s Top Ten Public Research University comparison group. This conversation continues a discussion of retirement benefits for civil service and represented employees that was held in December of 2010.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

On May 14, 2004, the Board of Regents adopted the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty and Staff Retirement, which provided the broad structure for retirement programs at the University, and documented the plans and programs which the University sponsors and funds. Included in this policy is the University of Minnesota Faculty Retirement Plan (FRP), the University’s largest defined contribution plan. Unlike MSRS, the FRP provides a certain contribution amount, rather than a certain monthly benefit at retirement. As a result, the risk that an individual may or may not have enough funds accumulated at retirement to provide an adequate income is born by the employee, as these accounts are invested by the employee at his or her sole discretion.
Background Information:

On May 14, 2004, the Board of Regents adopted the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty and Staff Retirement*, which provided the broad structure for retirement programs at the University. During the discussion of the committee workplan in October, the committee expressed interest in learning more about the retirement plans in place for University employees. The University of Minnesota sponsored or contributed to fourteen retirement plans and programs for its faculty and staff in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. This presentation, the second of two, will focus on the defined contribution plan. The University offers its faculty and staff a mix of defined contribution and defined benefit plans and programs, with substantially all full-time employees participating in one of several mandatory plans. Voluntary pre-tax savings plans are available to all employees paid on a regular basis.
Defined Contribution Plans

Defined contribution (DC) plans do not promise a benefit at retirement. Instead, DC plans promise a certain contribution level, which is generally invested according to the participant’s direction. As a result, the participants, rather than the employer, bear the risk with respect to whether their investments will result in adequate retirement income.

Faculty Retirement Plan (FRP)
The FRP is by far the largest defined contribution plan at the University of Minnesota. As of June 30, 2010, FRP assets totaled over $2.4 billion, with annual contributions of over $132 million. Employees contribute 2.5% of their salary, with the University contributing an additional 13% of salary, which is deposited each pay period in accordance with the employees’ investment instructions. The plan offers 52 investment funds, from Securian Retirement Services, TIAA-CREF, Fidelity, and Vanguard. Securian holds the majority of FRP funds, with 49% of total assets invested in Securian/Minnesota Life products. Vanguard follows with 31% of total assets. TIAA-CREF and Fidelity trail with 14% and 6%, respectively.

Defined Contribution Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Current Employee Contribution</th>
<th>Current Employer Contribution</th>
<th>Estimated Replacement Ratio</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Choice – DC reflected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Berkeley</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Choice – DB reflected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Choice – DB reflected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Choice – DB reflected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Washington-Seattle</td>
<td>5.0%-10.0%</td>
<td>5.0%-10.0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.0%-11.9%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.74%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Choice – DB reflected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defined Benefit Plans

Defined benefit (DB) plans pay a certain monthly benefit at retirement, generally calculated using a percentage of compensation multiplied by years of service. For example, the Minnesota State Retirement System (MSRS) pays retirees a monthly benefit equal to 1.7% multiplied by the participant’s average monthly compensation during his or her highest 5 years of service, multiplied by the participant’s years of service. For a career employee with 35 years of service and a starting salary of $50,000, MSRS pays a monthly benefit of approximately 56% of the employee’s final monthly salary. This percentage is commonly known as the plan’s replacement ratio. Because a DB plan defines the benefit, not the funding level, risk is born by those entities responsible for funding the plan. As employers and employees share the funding requirements for MSRS, they similarly share the risk that contribution levels will need to increase in the future to cover benefits payable.

MSRS is the largest DB plan at the University, covering over 9,200 civil service and represented employees. The MSRS replacement ratio is identical to that of the defined benefit plans offered by the University’s 5 benchmark public entities. Required contribution rates, however, are higher, as detailed below. In addition, the 6.0% and 7.0% PERA contribution rates below are scheduled to increase on January 1, 2011, ending in an employee contribution rate of 6.25% and an employer contribution rate of 7.25%. Again, these contribution increases do not increase benefits, only maintain them.

Defined Benefit Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Pay</th>
<th>Current Employee Contribution</th>
<th>Current Employer Contribution</th>
<th>Estimated Replacement Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Minnesota</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey County</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Minneapolis</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Paul</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Minnesota sponsored or contributed to fourteen retirement plans and programs for its faculty and staff in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. The majority of the University’s full-time employees are required to participate in one of two mandatory retirement plans: the Minnesota State Retirement System (MSRS) for civil service and represented staff, or the University of Minnesota Faculty Retirement Plan for faculty and academic professionals and administrative staff (P&A).

This second of two discussions will cover the current provisions of the Faculty Retirement Plan, including how it compares to other retirement plans within the University of Minnesota’s Top Ten Public Research University comparison group. This conversation continues a discussion of retirement benefits for civil service and represented employees that was held in December of 2010.
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Agenda Item:  Performance Management: Comprehensive Review of Deans

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☒ discussion

Presenters:  Senior Vice President/Provost Thomas Sullivan
Tom Fisher, Dean, College of Design
Joe Kelly, Chief of Staff, Office of Human Resources

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☐ background/context  ☒ oversight  ☒ strategic positioning

The deans play a critical role in carrying forward the strategic initiatives of the university, and it is important that we are diligent in ensuring the efficacy of our processes of recruitment, selection, development, and performance management. This presentation will provide an overview of the comprehensive review process that deans go through on a regular cycle as a component of our talent management model.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

To achieve the University’s goal of a world class faculty and staff will necessitate a strong talent management model for our University Leaders. Regular and ongoing feedback is a key component of development, and the comprehensive review process for deans provides such feedback in an efficient and informative manner.

Background Information:

In July 2006 this committee heard a presentation on strengthening the capacity of deans. A new process of comprehensive review was introduced at that time. The committee has expressed interest in learning more about the performance evaluation of university employees, and this presentation will focus on an aspect of the regular performance evaluation of the collegiate leaders of the University.
Performance Management: Comprehensive Review of Deans

Goals of presentation

This presentation will articulate the importance of the dean’s role as a major leader and will document the University’s system for selecting, reviewing, and developing strong deans. The presentation will highlight the comprehensive review process that has been in place since 2005, and its use as a core tool, among others, to strengthen capacity among our deans.

As part of our talent management process, the Office of Human Resources worked with deans and senior leaders to establish the core leadership competencies which we use in all of the processes related to ensuring the strength of our deans:

- The selection process
- Performance management or review process
- Development
- Succession planning

Critical nature of the dean’s role and importance of careful selection process

We currently have twenty-one dean positions on the Twin Cities campus, and an additional five deans at UMD. We have deans who have held their positions since 1995, and some that have started just this year. Our past experience has been that deans remain in position an average of seven years.

► The importance of the role of dean role as a critical leadership role
- deans will play a significant role in the university’s meeting its goals, and of achieving a world class faculty and staff.
- We need to support deans to be effective in all aspects of their leadership roles
- a good development and evaluation system is a key component of this support
- a set of strategies are being used to support the growth, development, and continuous improvement of a dean’s performance

► Deans are selected through national searches with specific criteria for selection
- national searches are used to recruit the best talent, with internal candidates encouraged to apply
- key core competency areas, which are important to a dean’s success and are reflected in reviews (Strategic leadership; Results leadership; People leadership; and Personal leadership) are used to screen
- during selection process, broad input is sought from relevant groups, such as faculty, staff and students, and other key constituencies of the university
The process for the evaluation of deans

Formal reviews conducted by the senior administrator occur annually. In addition, we have a comprehensive review procedure which features a standardized measurement tool to collect the data and to streamline the review process itself.

In accordance with the review process, the performance of each dean is reviewed in a comprehensive way after three full years in the position. This comprehensive review utilizes a web based tool which was developed through a partnership between the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Measurement Services. The tool asks participants to rate the dean’s performance in the following competency areas, utilizing both rating scales and open ended comments:

1. Strategic leadership
2. Results leadership
3. People leadership
4. Personal leadership

In order to gather a comprehensive perspective on the performance of the dean, we invite all faculty and staff within the college to participate, in addition to several student leaders. Beyond that, the tool is completed by peer deans and by other administrators within the university—including coordinate campuses, where appropriate. In addition, a group external reviewers (donors, alumni, others) responds to a set of questions.

A Standing Committees of distinguished university faculty and staff, chaired by a dean, reviews each report and advises the responsible senior officer, to whom the dean reports, on the interpretation of the results. The responsible senior officer uses the survey data plus other information (e.g., annual reviews) to prepare for a meeting with the dean to discuss the findings and to establish development plans.

The final rating question on the review is,

“How would you rate this person’s performance overall, as dean of the college/school?

In addition, the Office of Measurement Services calculates a composite score across all of the items included in the survey. The chart on the following page depicts the scores on the overall performance item, as well as the composite score, for each of the twenty reviews that have been performed under this process. This chart shows the range of scores across the comprehensive reviews since the initiation of this standardized web based survey, as well as the high correlation between the individual overall ratings and the composite, or mean of the ratings on the other 42 items.
Deans are supported to grow, develop, and increase their effectiveness

- We provide each new dean with extra support and a good orientation to their role
- Deans are provided information relevant to their college from sources such as PULSE, the enterprise employee climate survey, and exit interview data from faculty and staff who are terminating from the dean’s college
- Individual development plans
- Coaching from senior vice presidents
- External executive coaches
- Mentors
- Use of advisory groups that provide ongoing input into directions of the college
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Agenda Item: Comprehensive Internationalization at the University of Minnesota

☐ review ☐ review/action ☐ action ☒ discussion

Presenters: Meredith McQuaid, Associate Vice President and Dean, International Programs

Purpose:

☐ policy ☐ background/context ☒ oversight ☒ strategic positioning

Provide the committee with an update on the University’s efforts to internationalize the campuses, focusing on non-curricular programs and initiatives that support faculty, staff, and students.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Government, businesses, and even the American public are recognizing the need for students to be globally competent in order to work and succeed in a global environment. Academic knowledge and technical expertise, as well as international experience and intercultural skills, will be required. The Global Programs and Strategy Alliance (formerly the Office of International Programs) is leading efforts to internationalize the curriculum and campuses through a variety of curricular and non-curricular programs and initiatives for faculty, staff, and students.

Background Information:

This is the first time Dean McQuaid has presented to the Board of Regents Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee. She most recently presented to the Board of Regents Educational Planning and Policy Committee in July 2010 to provide an update on the internationalization efforts of the University of Minnesota, including a new strategic plan and name for the systemwide Office of International Programs (now Global Programs and Strategy Alliance).
Introduction: An Emergent Imperative

At numerous institutions, both in the United States and abroad, there has been a decades-long interest in and commitment to international programming involving a range of activities such as attracting and engaging international students and scholars, expanding study abroad and student and faculty cross-border exchanges, building cross-border research collaborations, expanding language learning and area and regional studies, and engaging international development.

Higher education internationalization is not a new concept. The movement of students, scholars, and ideas across national boundaries was a prominent feature of twelfth and thirteenth century Europe; communities of international scholars formed as a result at several prominent universities (Wildavsky 2010, 17–18). Such mobility significantly ebbed after the fifteenth century (albeit with pockets of resurgence) until the latter half of the twentieth century.

During the last several decades, powerful new factors have reinvigorated the international dimensions of higher education and the cross-border flow of students, scholars, and ideas as well as global growth in higher education. Altbach and colleagues (2009) report a 53 percent increase between 2000 and 2007 in overall global higher education enrollments. Alan Ruby (2009), notes that it is fairly “accepted wisdom” that from a 2000 base there will be a 150 percent increase in higher education seats globally to 250 million by 2025, mostly in the “developing world” and a more than doubling of student mobility from the current three to more than seven million annually by the same time, if not earlier (Banks et al. 2007; Haddad 2006). In just one year from 2007 to 2008 the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development reports (2010) that global mobility grew nearly 11 percent. The globalization of commerce, social forces, idea exchange, and growth in student mobility drive further significant internationalization of education.

A core reality that distinguishes current discussion and action from that of the past is the scale and scope of what internationalization encompasses—the breadth of clientele served, the outcomes intended, and a reshaping of institutional ethos. There is a growing sense that internationalization is an institutional imperative, not just a desirable possibility.

The business of universities is ideas: the creation of ideas through research and the dissemination of ideas through education and application. Increasingly, the business of universities is as much across as it is within borders, and not just in the free flow of ideas but in the global flow of students and scholars who generate them.

There are fewer workable restrictions on the global circulation of ideas than in almost any other area of trade. With the increasing flow of students and scholars worldwide, it becomes easier to talk about the free trade of minds. With easier travel and the internet providing near instantaneous access to hundreds of millions of idea generators throughout the world, more and more minds flow across borders physically and virtually—with the mode of transportation chosen sometimes having little practical impact on outcomes. “Comprehensive internationalization” is a recognition of these realities.
Excerpt from Section I: The Evolving Meaning of Higher Education

Internationalization

Definition of Comprehensive Internationalization

Comprehensive internationalization is a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise. It is essential that it be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. It is an institutional imperative, not just a desirable possibility. Comprehensive internationalization not only impacts all of campus life but the institution’s external frames of reference, partnerships, and relations. The global reconfiguration of economies, systems of trade, research, and communication, and the impact of global forces on local life, dramatically expand the need for comprehensive internationalization and the motivations and purposes driving it.

The Big Tent: Comprehensive Internationalization

The conceptual and operational tent for internationalization has to be large if it is to accommodate all of its possible dimensions. Comprehensive internationalization (CI) is a big-tent label for doing this. It can be the organizing paradigm for the institution as a whole, or one used by academic departments or professional programs at their level of operation. ACE views comprehensive internationalization as internationalization that is pervasive throughout the institution, affecting a broad spectrum of people, policies, and programs, and which leads to deeper and potentially more challenging change (Olsen et al. 2005).

CI is not a call for all institutions of higher education, or all of their academic units and programs, to engage in all ways of internationalizing—an impossibility for any individual institution. There is no uniform path toward CI. Varying missions and starting points will produce uniquely tailored responses to the challenges and opportunities of internationalization and globalization. The annual NAFSA Senator Paul Simon Awards for Campus Internationalization are testimony to the broad array of approaches and the genius of diversity displayed by the award-winning institutions. (See www.nafsa.org/about/default.aspx?id=16296.)

Nevertheless, there are common features to a commitment to CI. The 2008 NAFSA Task Force on Internationalization deliberately chose to define the concept as having broad and pervasive meaning.

“Internationalization is the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education. To be fully successful, it must involve active and responsible engagement of the academic community in global networks and partnerships.” (NAFSA Task Force on Internationalization 2008)

CI, effectively implemented, impacts the entirety of campus life and learning and fundamentally shapes the institution’s external frames of reference, partnerships, and relations. It will seek to instill international, global, and comparative dimensions not only in the classroom but also in field and experiential learning. It will encourage the introduction of such perspective into the paradigms of faculty research, graduate research programs,
institutional research priorities, and outreach engagement.

The specific policies and programs that institutions put into place to make CI real are important instruments that will vary across campuses, as will the details of goals and intended outcomes. But it is outcomes that give CI its value.

Ultimately, comprehensive internationalization changes the institution from mainly a local, regional, or national asset to a global one with significant bidirectional and multiple cross-border exchanges. It is a false dichotomy that higher education institutions must either think locally or globally; both are realities for the vast majority of today’s institutions although they may have different positions on a continuum of local-global orientation.

As recognized by the NAFSA Task Force (2008), “Internationalization can ultimately leverage the collective assets of the higher education sector to create a new generation of global citizens capable of advancing social, and economic development for all.” It is a complex process that can permeate every aspect of higher education:

- faculty development,
- curriculum design and delivery,
- instructional design,
- student diversity and faculty diversity,
- research and scholarship,
- training and education for outside clientele,
- development assistance,
- student support services and academic support services,
- resource development,
- financial management,
- risk management,
- institutional competitiveness and positioning,
- and civic engagement.

This list is not comprehensive, but sufficient to underscore the internal and external scope of impact and influence implied by a commitment to CI.

**Track Record Thus Far**

The report card for U.S. higher education to achieve the breadth, depth, and pervasiveness of CI is at best mixed. ACE’s 2008 Mapping Internationalization of U.S. Campuses concluded that U.S. institutions have made progress, but it is neither complete nor even. The report states, “Many institutions do not see internationalization as integral to their identity or strategy... Few institutions have an internationalization strategy... a gap exists between institutional rhetoric and reality (Green et al. 2008, 81–82).”

Earlier ACE findings, although based on data now more than five-years old, also point to a disconnect between student beliefs and attitudes and what institutions provide and what students actually do. The gaps between aspiration and performance are highlighted in ACE’s 2005 report, Internationalization in U.S. Higher Education: The Student Perspective, which summarizes findings from student surveys and interviews.

The internationalization of U.S. higher education is an emerging reality, but one with much work and progress to be achieved. Internationalization as a process has many dimensions, and institutions vary greatly in the manner and degree to which they embrace various
programmatic components of internationalization. CI offers a paradigm for a holistic institutional commitment to pervasive international engagement. But, it remains more aspirational than real on the vast majority of U.S. campuses.

Building the big tent of CI at U.S. institutions will deepen the engagement of U.S. higher education in the expanding global flow of ideas, minds, and talent.

A Sample of Student Attitudes and Beliefs (Green 2005, 4–8, 19)

- Only 27 percent of students agreed that learning about other countries, cultures, and global issues was useful but not necessary.
- Approximately 85 percent of students believe it is important to know about international issues and events to compete successfully in the job market.
- Nearly 90 percent believe it important to know and understand other cultures and customs to compete successfully in the job market.
- Nearly 60 percent say that all undergraduates should be required to study a foreign language.
- Over 70 percent say that all undergraduates should be required to study abroad.
- Nearly 75 percent say that all undergraduates should be required to take internationally focused courses.
- Nearly 90 percent agree that the presence of international students enriches learning.
- Two-thirds of students believe it is the responsibility of all faculty to help them become aware of other countries, cultures and global issues.

A Sample of Performance Indicators (Green 2005, 20–25)

- Nearly 60 percent of students report never or rarely learning about internationally focused events from faculty, from advisers, in class, or through public announcements.
- Nearly half report that faculty never or rarely bring international reading material into the classroom.
- A little less than half report that they never or rarely bring their international experiences into the classroom.
- Only about a quarter of students report that faculty frequently or always related course material to larger global issues; a third say they never or rarely do.
- Nearly 70 percent of students report that international students and scholars never or rarely give presentations in their courses.
- A third of students say that they have taken no international courses in a year.
- About 14 percent of students surveyed had studied abroad.
The single biggest issue on the minds of Americans today, and likely well into the future, is the state of the economy. How long will a recovery take? What will be needed to ensure that a future of economic vitality, innovation, and competitiveness on the global stage is possible for the United States when the current crisis subsides? Even amid the most dismal financial circumstances in decades and a political environment in which disagreements about the way forward appear to outweigh common ground, Americans remain committed to the principle that in order to thrive in the future, we must prepare students today by giving them the skills necessary to navigate life and careers in an age of global connectedness and global competition.

In November 2010, on the eve of the midterm elections, a NAFSA-commissioned survey\(^1\) polled a broad cross-section of Americans on their views about the value of international education—particularly the issues of foreign language learning, study abroad, and the recruitment of talent to fuel excellence in higher education. By strong margins, Americans were clear: international education is critically important. Without it, the graduates of the future will be at a disadvantage in their careers and will find themselves lacking the skills to thrive in the global workplace.

---

\(^1\)Lake Research Partners designed and administered this pre- and election night omnibus survey, which was conducted by phone using professional interviewers. The survey reached a total of 1,200 likely-registered voters nationwide. The survey was conducted October 31 through November 2, 2010. The sample was stratified geographically based on the proportion of likely voters in each region. Data were weighted to reflect the aggregated “national” Congressional vote as reported in the 2010 exit polls, as well as by gender, party identification, ideology, marital status, race, region, and probability of selection and phone usage. The Tarrance Group also provided analysis of the survey results.
International Education: Essential, Not a Frill

The NAFSA public opinion survey of more than 1,000 likely U.S. voters in November 2010 yielded the following results:

**QUESTION 1:** International education includes foreign language learning, studying abroad in other countries, and learning other cultures. If increasingly, what happens around the world affects us at home, please tell me on a scale from 0 to 10—where 10 is very essential and 0 is not essential at all—how essential you think international education is to the educational experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8–10 (very essential)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–7 (moderately essential)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (neutral)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4 (not essential)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 2:** Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with the following statement: If our children and grandchildren don’t learn other languages, they will be at a competitive disadvantage in their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so strongly agree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so strongly disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 3:** Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with the following statement: Unless our colleges and universities do a better job of teaching our students about the world, our children and grandchildren will not be prepared to compete in the global economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so strongly agree</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION 4:** Respondents were asked to say if they agree or disagree with the following statement: *In order to thrive in the global workplace, more students need the opportunity to participate in a study abroad program while in college—where they can spend time living and studying in another culture.*

A strong majority of Americans (57%) recognize that study abroad is a vital component of an education that prepares them for success in the global workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so strongly agree</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so strongly disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 5:** This question was divided into two statistically equivalent samples.

Respondents in the first sample were asked: *Do you think we should make it easier or harder for educational professionals from other countries—like professors, scientists, and researchers—to come to the United States to live, work, and build a career here?*

Respondents in the second sample were asked: *Suppose I told you that without educational professionals from other countries—like professors, scientists, and researchers—many colleges and universities would be unable to put a qualified instructor in every classroom, and the United States would be at a competitive disadvantage in our research and innovation. Knowing this, do you think we should make it easier or harder for educational professionals from other countries to come to the United States to live, work, and build a career?*

Even on the contentious and polarizing issue of immigration, a plurality (40%) of Americans think it should be easier for educational professionals from other countries to come to the United States to work and live. When told about the benefits of attracting educational professionals to the United States, even greater numbers say it should be easier for them to come here—nearly fifty percent. In addition, Americans who indicated support for foreign languages, study abroad, and international education in the previous questions were particularly strongly in favor of facilitating the ability of educational professionals from other countries to come to the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 2 (additional background provided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay the same</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Stay the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Americans believe that international education is vitally important to the success of today’s young people in navigating a competitive international landscape, thriving in the global workplace, and leveraging their talents and skills in ways that move the United States forward in an increasingly connected world. These survey results are particularly significant at a time when concerns about the economy are foremost on the minds of Americans.
# Open Doors Data

## U.S. Study Abroad: Leading Institutions by Institutional Type

### 2008/09

**INSTITUTIONS BY TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDY ABROAD STUDENTS: TOP 40 DOCTORATE INSTITUTIONS, 2008/09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Study Abroad Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>3,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Minnesota - Twin Cities</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Penn State University - University Park</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indiana University - Bloomington</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Open Doors Data

## International Students: Leading Institutions

### Top 25 Institutions Hosting International Students, 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Int'l Students</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>7,987</td>
<td>34,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>7,287</td>
<td>43,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>7,276</td>
<td>43,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purdue University - Main Campus</td>
<td>West Lafayette</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>6,903</td>
<td>41,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>6,833</td>
<td>24,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>6,095</td>
<td>41,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>39,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>47,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>50,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>5,172</td>
<td>31,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>50,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SUNY University at Buffalo</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>28,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indiana University - Bloomington</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>42,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ohio State University - Main Campus</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>55,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Minnesota - Twin Cities</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4,665</td>
<td>51,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>College Station</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4,611</td>
<td>48,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Penn State University - University Park</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>44,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4,522</td>
<td>24,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4,483</td>
<td>68,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>41,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>20,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>20,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>17,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 25 Total (19.0% of Total International Students) 131,510
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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

As required by Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, the administration seeks approval for the following:

• To seek approval of a temporary Retirement Incentive Option (RIO) program.

• Conferral of tenure for faculty members who have been hired at the University of Minnesota.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

• The new Retirement Incentive Option (RIO) is a one-time opportunity for voluntary retirement designed to meet the needs of both employees and departments. RIO will provide for a lump sum payment into the State of Minnesota Health Care Savings Plan for employees who are eligible for retirement. This payment will be roughly equivalent to the value of 24 months of University medical and dental subsidy, at 2011 rates, depending upon an employee’s coverage level, permanent residence and work location at retirement. Interested employees must apply for the RIO between February 15 and May 15, 2011, and voluntarily retire at a date mutually acceptable to the employee and his or her unit, but no later than January 11, 2012.

• The attached document outlines faculty members who have recently been hired, and whose colleges have voted to grant tenure upon hire. All files are reviewed by the Provost’s office following departmental and collegiate review.

Background Information:  22
Board of Regents Policy: *Reservation and Delegation of Authority* calls for items, such as proposed changes to retirement provisions, senior administrative appointments, bargaining unit contract approvals, tuition and fees policies, and appointments of certain trustees and board members, to be brought before the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee for action.

**President’s Recommendation for Action:**

The President recommends approval of the Consent Report.


Retirement Incentive Option

The Retirement Incentive Option (RIO) is an opportunity for voluntary retirement designed to meet the needs of both employees and departments. RIO will provide a lump sum deposit into the State of Minnesota Health Care Savings Plan, paid by the University, on behalf of employees who are eligible for retirement. This deposit will be based upon an employee’s coverage level, permanent residence and work location at retirement. Interested employees must apply for the RIO between February 15 and May 15, 2011, and voluntarily retire at a date mutually acceptable to the employee and his or her unit, but no later than January 11, 2012.

Reemployment following RIO is not permitted for three months following the date of retirement. Beginning the fourth month, reemployment is permitted, but only in non-benefits-eligible appointments of 49% time or less. Senior Vice Presidents or Chancellors must pre-approve the hiring of those who fill positions vacated by RIO participants.

RIO goals are to encourage voluntary departures from University employment, thus reducing layoffs, non-renewals and bumping activity; to provide units with a tool to help address budget challenges; and to support long-term faculty and staff.
## University of Minnesota Retirement Incentive Option Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>First Offering</strong></th>
<th><strong>Second Offering</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed Offering</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Eligibility**      | Normal eligibility for University retirement - Age 50 with 15 or more years of service, Age 55 with 5 years or more of service, 30 years or more of service without regard to age.  
Actively working a 75% or greater appointment of 9 months or more.  
Federal appointments ineligible | Normal eligibility for University retirement - Age 50 with 15 or more years of service, Age 55 with 5 years or more of service, 30 years or more of service without regard to age.  
Actively working a 75% or greater appointment of 9 months or more.  
Federal appointments ineligible | Normal eligibility for University retirement - Age 50 with 15 or more years of service, Age 55 with 5 years or more of service, 30 years or more of service without regard to age.  
Actively working a 75% or greater appointment of 9 months or more.  
Federal appointments eligible |
| **Estimated Eligible Employee Count** | 4,053 Total – 1,308 faculty, 647 P&A, 1,162 civil service and 936 bargaining unit | 5,415 Total – 1,604 faculty, 1,067 P&A, 1,492 civil service and 1,252 bargaining unit | 5,718 Total – 1,549 faculty (1,342 tenure/tenure track), 1,294 P&A, 1,527 civil service and 1,348 bargaining unit |
| **Acceptance Rate**  | 6.5%                                                                              | 8.3%                                                                               | Anticipated 7%                                                                       |
| **Estimated Savings**| $4.5 million annually for the subsidy period (first 3 years) $6.4 million annually thereafter – reported by the individual colleges and units in the fall of 2004 | $17.7 million annually for the subsidy period (first 3 years) $21.5 million thereafter – assuming 40% position replacement and based on subsidy rates at the time of the program | $11.3 million in the first year, $21.4 million thereafter, assuming an acceptance rate of 7%, 40% position replacement and lump sum costs at the two adult level |
| **Window to Accept** | April 15, 2003 to July 7, 2003 for most employees  
December 15, 2003 to February 12, 2004 for AFSCME6, AFSCME 4 and Teamster employees | May 14, 2008 to September 26, 2008 (4.5 months, including extension) | February 15 to May 15, 2011 (3 months) |
| **Latest Retirement Date** | June 13, 2004  
June 5, 2009 (A-term) | May 22, 2009 (B-term)  
Participants must be on regular appointment when they retire |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>First Offering</th>
<th>Second Offering</th>
<th>Proposed Offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 36 months of medical and dental subsidy and continuing coverage in the active medical and dental plans.</td>
<td>Up to 36 months of medical and dental subsidy and continuing coverage in the active medical and dental plans.</td>
<td>Health Care Savings Plan deposit equal to the value of 52 pay periods (2 years) of University subsidy for medical and dental coverage, based on the individual’s coverage level, permanent residence and work location on the last day of employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rehire Provisions | Rehires permitted after a break in service | No rehire for a minimum of 3 months following retirement. After 3 months, rehire only permitted in a non-benefits-eligible position of no more than 19.5 hours per week. | No rehire for a minimum of 3 months following retirement. After 3 months, rehire only permitted in a non-benefits-eligible position of no more than 19.5 hours per week. |
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College of Liberal Arts

Susan Craddock  Dept. of Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies

Recommendation for promotion from associate professor with tenure to professor with tenure.

In May, 2010, this case was listed as pending in the Board of Regents presentation on promotion and tenure recommendations. Provost Sullivan had requested a partial re-review of the case because the dossier did not provide sufficient information about which to make a recommendation to the Board. The partial re-review was completed in fall, 2010. The reviews and recommendations at each level (the department, college, and provost’s office) regarding teaching, research, and service were all exceptionally positive.

In the past three years, we have had three cases that were described as pending in May, 2010 and were later resolved with partial or full re-reviews of a case. Sometimes this was due to errors in procedure and other times to the need for additional information. The Provost must have sufficient information for each case regarding the criteria for promotion and tenure in order to make an informed recommendation to the Board.

College of Science and Engineering

Eric Kaler  Dept. of Chemical Engineering and Materials Sciences

Recommendation for appointment as Professor with tenure

President-Designate Kaler was reviewed by the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Sciences, the Dean of the College of Science and Engineering, and the provost’s Office. He far exceeds the standards and criteria for tenure and for appointment as a professor at both the departmental and university levels for scholarship, teaching, and service. Currently, President-Designate Kaler is Provost and a professor with tenure at the Stonybrook University. He is an eminent scholar with over 200 publications, extensive external research support, and patents, and has been elected to the National Academy of Engineering in 2010, the highest honor in Engineering. President-Designate Kaler has an outstanding record of teaching, advising, and mentoring at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels. He has served at all levels of university administration and has a distinguished record of service to his discipline.
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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.
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
None this month.

University Highlights
The University of Minnesota, Morris Welcome Center received the 2011 Minnesota Construction Association’s Special Recognition Award for its “resourceful blending of construction techniques and professionals.” The building, which is listed on the National Register for Historic Places, was redesigned to retain its original character while introducing modern amenities and energy performance.

Klout, an online company that tracks the popularity and impact of Twitter accounts, ranks the University of Minnesota in the top 10 most influential college and university accounts.

The Kiplinger’s Personal Finance list of the 100 Best Values in Public Colleges for 2011 ranks the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities 52nd and the University of Minnesota-Morris 87th. The list ranks schools that exemplify impressive academics while keeping tuition costs low.

Goldy Gopher was the top-ranked mascot among Division IA schools in the annual college cheer and dance team championships. The University of Minnesota also took home first-place awards in pom and jazz, third place in the all-girl cheer competition and 12th place in the cheer performance. More than 200 spirit teams competed.

Faculty and Staff Activities and Awards
Three College of Science and Engineering professors are among 503 new fellows named to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. They are: Douglas N. Arnold, mathematics, for outstanding research in the design, analysis and implementation of algorithms, and for leadership of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics; Mostafa Kaveh, electrical and computer engineering, for contributions to multiple sensor signal processing and applications to localization, imaging and communications; and Yousef Saad, computer science and engineering, for contributions in numerical linear algebra.

NASA and the U.S. Department of the Interior presented the William T. Pecora Award to Marvin Bauer, forest resources, for his pioneering work in remote sensing of natural resources.
David Beard, writing studies, received the Daniel Rohrer Memorial Outstanding Research Award of the American Forensic Association. Beard shares the award with his co-author, William Keith, for their piece “Toulmin’s Rhetorical Logic: What’s the Warrant for Warrants?”

Jeff Bender, center for animal health and food safety, has been named to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Science Advisory Committee. The committee offers independent expert advice on scientific, technical, and policy matters to assist in the FDA’s mission to protect and promote the public health.

A poster by a team from the College of Pharmacy (Angela Birnbaum, Chamika Hawkins-Taylor, Ilo Leppik, Susan Marino, Serguei Pakhomov, and John Rarick) was recognized for being among the top 10% presented at the annual meeting of the American Epilepsy Society.

A script for “Until Morning” by Hisham Bizri, cultural studies and comparative literature, won the Special Jury Prize for “most innovative and courageous script” at the Cairo International Film Festival and has been selected for participation in the Berlin International Film Festival.

Donna Bliss, nursing, was elected to a three-year term as chair designate of the clinical sciences section of the Gerontological Society of America.

Mary Chesney, nursing, has been named to the Work Force Shortage Working Group of the Legislative Commission on Health Care Access. The goal of this working group is to review issues and solutions for the health care work force shortage in Minnesota.

Germaine Cornelissen-Guillaume, Halberg chronobiology center, was elected to the International Academy of Science.

Research conducted by Christopher De Jonge, obstetrics and gynecology, and Nancy Bossert, UMPhysicians—with colleagues from Stanford University—was cited by Time magazine as one of the Top 10 Medical Breakthroughs for 2010. The team used sophisticated time-lapse video micrography to study development in human embryos.

Connie Delaney, nursing, was elected to the Board of the Women’s Health Leadership Trust, a group of 300 women in health care leadership positions throughout Minnesota. Delaney also accepted a three-year extension of her appointment on the Health Information Technology Policy Committee, which offers recommendations for the development and adoption of a nationwide health information infrastructure.

UMM English professor Julie Eckerle has been elected to a three-year term on the Nominating Committee of the Society for the Study of Early Modern Women.

The Encyclopedia of World Dress and Fashion, edited by Joanne B. Eicher, Regents professor emeritus in apparel design, received the 2011 Dartmouth Medal from the Reference and User Services Association, a division of the American Library Association. The encyclopedia, as well
as its online component Berg Fashion Library, was selected for its extensive and outstanding multidisciplinary coverage of dress, fashion, and its impact on society.

Dalibor Froncek, mathematics and statistics at UMD, was appointed to the steering committee of IWOGL, a series of International Workshops on Graph Labelings.

UMD mathematics professor Joseph Gallian won the Gung and Hu Award for Distinguished Service to Mathematics from the Mathematical Association of America. He was cited for his work with UMD’s Research Experience for Undergraduates program and for communicating mathematics to the widest possible audience. He also received a Certificate for Meritorious Service from the association’s North Central Section.

Michael Hancher, English, is serving a two-year term as president of the 400-member Dictionary Society of North America, which is dedicated to dictionary making, study, collection, and use.

Kristin Hickman, law school, has been named a runner-up for the 2010 Person of the Year by the national publication Tax Notes. Tax Notes called 2010 “the year of tax administration” and Hickman’s academic specialty, the intersection of administrative law and the tax code, “an area of increasing focus for courts.”

Kristin Janke, pharmaceutical care and health, has been re-appointed to the Continuing Pharmacy Education Commission of the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE). The commission recommends standards and policy to the ACPE board and oversees the self study process for accreditation.

Ross Janssen and John Jensen, both from the privacy and security office, are serving on the Privacy, Legal and Policy Workgroup for the MN E-Health Initiative by the Department of Health. Jensen has also been appointed to the Privacy and Security Practice Council of the American Health Information Management Association.

Laura Kieser, Extension educator in Carver and Scott counties, received the Extension Educator of the Year Award from the Minnesota Farm Bureau Foundation.

Laura Kirk, nursing, received the 2010 Society for Vascular Nursing Judith Troyer-Caudle Memorial Award for her presentation “Quality of Life in Peripheral Artery Disease: Does Exercise Make a Difference?” The award is given for the most highly rated presentation related to research on wound care.

Kjell Knudsen, Labovitz School of Business dean, has been appointed by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business to its blue ribbon Committee on Accreditation Quality.

Linda Krach, physical medicine and rehabilitation, received the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Outstanding Council Service Award.
Nita Krevans, classical and near eastern studies, received the American Philological Association’s 2010 Award for Excellence in Teaching, the most prestigious award for college level teaching in the field of classics.

Josephine Lee, English, is serving a two-year term as president of the Association for Asian American Studies.

Anatoly Liberman, German, Scandinavian and Dutch, is the winner of the Modern Language Association Prize for a Distinguished Bibliography for his *A Bibliography of English Etymology: Sources and Word List*.

The Duluth YWCA presented Women of Distinction awards to three UMD faculty and staff members: Jane Maddy, professor emeritus of education, Shannon Miller, head coach of women’s hockey, and Sharon Witherspoon, student assistance center.

Argie Manolis, office of community engagement at UMM, received the Morris Human Rights Award for 2010 from the Morris Human Rights Commission. Manolis was cited for her work with GLBT issues and the Community Meals program.

Biology program faculty members Randy Moore, Mark Decker, and Sehoya Cotner’s book *Chronology of the Evolution-Creationism Controversy* won an Outstanding Reference Source Award from the Reference User Services Association, a division of the American Library Association. The award is one the highest honors for a reference work.

Perry Moriearty, law school, has been elected to a three-year term on the Clinical Legal Education Association (CLEA) Board of Directors. CLEA, an advocate on matters relating to clinical teachers and clinical legal education, represents over 750 faculty at U.S. law schools.

Christine Mueller, nursing, was selected as co-chair for the National Quality Forum’s Steering Committee for the National Voluntary Consensus Standards for Nursing Homes. The committee reviews and recommends performance measures for nursing homes to be used for public reporting and quality improvement throughout the U.S.

UMD Bulldog head football coach Bob Nielson was named 2010 Liberty Mutual Coach of the Year for Division II. The award is the leading college football honor recognizing coaches for their sportsmanship, integrity, responsibility, and excellence, on and off field. Nielson also was named 2010 Division II Coach of the Year by the American Football Coaches Association. In his eight years at UMD, Nielson has won four Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference titles and earned four NCAA II playoff berths while amassing a 79-21 record.

Susan O’Conner-Von, nursing, was named the Hospice, Palliative Care & Home Health Nurse of the Year by the March of Dimes.

Michael O’Connor, genetics, cell biology, and development, was elected president of the North American Drosophila Research Board. Board duties include serving as advocates and facilitating communication for the Drosophila (commonly known as fruit flies) research community.
The Minneapolis St. Paul Business Journal named University Chief Financial Officer Richard Pfutzenreuter as CFO of the Year of a large, non-profit civic/cultural/educational institution.

Stephen Simon, law school, is the first recipient of the Minnesota County Attorneys Association Traffic Safety Award. The award honors individuals who work to save lives and improve safety on Minnesota’s roadways and to enhance the quality of justice in prosecuting impaired drivers. Simon is known for his service, research, and writing on DWI, traffic safety, and law reform.

Todd Sorensen received the Distinguished Achievement Award for Administrative Practice from the American Pharmacists Association Academy of Pharmacy Practice and Management (APhA-APPMA) and has been named a fellow in the APPM.

Joe Sowokinos, professor emeritus in horticultural sciences, earned the Meritorious Service Award from the National Potato Council for his dedicated service to the potato industry.

Robert A. Stein, law school, has been appointed co-chair of the Rule of Law Action Group of the International Bar Association. He also was named to the Czech Board of Directors of the CEELI Institute in Prague, Czech Republic. The CEELI Institute presents programs to train lawyers and judges worldwide on the rule of law.

Kristine Talley, nursing, received a first place award at the American Geriatrics Society’s Annual Residents and Fellows in training poster competition for “Is Restorative Care Underutilized in U.S. Nursing Homes.”

Ann Marie Vangstad, UMM office of residential life, received the 2010 Upper Midwest Region—Association of College and University Housing Officers Support Staff Recognition Award. Vangstad was recognized for 25 years of service in building and grounds work, in particular for her positive attitude, sense of humor, and dedication to students and their environment.

U.S. Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack appointed Elizabeth Wagstrom and Cindy Wolf, college of veterinary medicine, to two-year terms on the Secretary’s Advisory Committee on Animal Health. The committee will advise the Secretary of Agriculture on actions related to prevention, surveillance, and control of animal diseases of national importance.

Student Activities and Awards
UMD sophomore Ashley Bauer won the 2010 Presentation Award for her poster at the American Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS). The ABRCMS is the largest professional conference for biomedical and behavioral students. Approximately 2,800 participants representing 285 U.S. colleges and universities were in attendance.

Four University of Minnesota School of Dentistry students were chosen from a field of national candidates to assume 2011-12 leadership roles with the American Student Dental Association. Aruna Rao was appointed vice chair of the Legislative Grassroots Network, Katie Divine was named contributing editor, Megan Kack was appointed tripartite relations extern, and Aaron Bumann is the new western regional legislative coordinator.
Sheila Carleton, a UMC senior majoring in natural resources and agronomy, was presented with the Student Conservationist Award from the Minnesota Chapter of The Wildlife Society. The award is the top student award given by the professional organization. This is the ninth time in the past fourteen years that a UMC student has won the award.

Denis Evstuhin, D.M.A. candidate in piano, took fourth place in the Paderewski International Piano Competition. Forty participants from around the world were invited to take part in the two-week long competition in Bydgoszcz, Poland.

Classics doctoral student M. Christine Marquis was awarded the Women’s Classical Caucus 2010 award for the best orally-delivered pre-Ph.D. paper for “Juno and Amata: Powerful Wives and Political Disorder in the Aeneid.”

Prerna Nadathur, graduate student in mathematics, and Priya Sury, first-year medical student, have been named 2011 Rhodes Scholars. Nadathur plans to pursue a masters degree in general linguistics and comparative philology at Oxford, then to continue her studies to earn a doctorate in linguistics. Sury plans to earn a masters in medical anthropology at Oxford, and will then return to the U of M to complete her medical degree.

Nursing student Kelsey Scanlon was elected vice president of the National Student Nurses Association (NSNA). The NSNA, with a membership of approximately 50,000 nationwide, mentors the professional development of future registered nurses and provides educational resources, leadership opportunities, and career guidance.

Horticultural sciences graduate student Mike Wilson’s presentation at the American Bee Research Conference was chosen as best presentation by a student.

UMD students swept the three top awards at the Conference on the Environment’s annual Environmental Challenge. Team members were Aisha Beaty, Ben Duscher, Tim Isakson, Andy Just, Ashley Marston, Travis Tolaas, and Jake Weigleitner, all from environmental sciences, and Hirsi Ali, Jesse Hunter, Al Reich, and Danielle Truax, all from chemical engineering.

The UMC collegiate crops judging team finished second in two national crops judging contests held in Kansas City and Chicago in November. Team members were: Jon Borge, Andrew Gorentz, John Plass, and alternate Marc Walter. In individual scoring at Kansas City, Plass finished first overall, Gorentz fourth overall, and Borge seventh. Results in Chicago included a third place finish overall by Plass, a fourth place for Borge, and a sixth place finish for Gorentz. Crops contests integrate a student's knowledge of agronomy into three categories: seed analysis, grain grading, and crop and weed identification.

The University of Minnesota’s dairy judging team captured first place among 17 collegiate teams in competition at the North American International Livestock Exposition in Louisville, KY. Team members, all juniors in the college of food, agricultural, and natural resources sciences, are Emily Achen, Karen Anderson, Caitlin Durow, and Elizabeth Olson. Anderson also was the top individual finisher among 63 participants.